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Executive Summary

For the past four years, Chicopee has seen improvement in student achievement K–8. In 2015–2016, all Chicopee’s K–5 and 6–8 schools were classified as Level 1 or 2; however, Chicopee has been a Level 3 district because in each of the last four years its two larger high schools were classified as Level 3. Its alternative middle/high school, the Academy, with 101 students, which had sufficient numbers for accountability purposes in 2014, has been classified as Level 3 since 2014. Chicopee high schools have had percentile ranking in the lowest 10 percent of schools for the past five years.

As part of the site visit, the team observed 80 classes throughout the district: 39 at the 3 high schools, 21 at the 2 middle schools, and 20 at the 9 elementary schools. The team observed 38 ELA classes, 21 mathematics classes, 16 science classes, and 5 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were one special education class and two career/vocational 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.

In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction varied. While there were some examples of effective, standards-based teaching at the high-school level, the review team consistently found a higher incidence of the characteristics of high-quality instruction at the K–8 levels. There, many observed lessons followed the district’s K-8 lesson design structure that emphasizes large as well as small data-driven group instruction, often challenging students with grade-appropriate learning activities and enrichment activities. In the high schools, however, observed lessons generally followed a more traditional teacher-centered format. Many classes were built around low-level question/answer sessions in which students gave short answers to questions or followed a teacher’s lecture while sometimes taking notes. In observed classrooms, it was rare to see high-school students fully engaged in active learning experiences that gave them opportunities to demonstrate higher-order thinking. High-school students rarely explained or applied what they knew or understood about key lesson concepts. Although in observed classrooms differentiated instruction to meet students’ specific learning needs was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction at all school levels, the instructional model with small-group work provided more differentiation K–8.

Assessment practices are stronger at the K–8 levels than at the high schools, with clear procedures that are beginning to inform instruction and provide frequent monitoring of students’ progress. District expectations for use of data at the high schools are inconsistent and practices are not aligned across all three schools; all high schools work independently on data analysis and develop their own initiatives to address challenges.

Instructional and curricular leadership is provided through the position of assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability. Principals, content area supervisors, and teachers are further supported through the positions of assistant for curriculum and staff development, assistant for English language learners and teacher support, and an instructional data specialist. The review team found evidence of the ability for strong instructional leadership with this relatively new team. At the school levels, content-area supervisors provide curricular and instructional support at the high schools, and math and literacy coaches or specialists work with principals and teachers at the 6–8 schools, as do literacy coaches at the K–5 schools.

Chicopee provides a continuum of specialized programs that address students’ learning, behavioral, and social-emotional needs, enabling almost all its students to attend district schools. The district has also developed strong career development and career/vocational technical education programs that prepare students for post-secondary education and the world of work. The district has developed systematic procedures for identifying and addressing the needs of struggling students and students at risk at the elementary- and middle-school levels. Academic support services at the high- school level are not organized or administered as a coherent program. Students with moderate special needs are not typically included in general education core classes at the two larger high schools.

In fall 2016–2017 district leaders began to engage more actively with high-school principals and staff about curriculum and instruction. Although district and school leaders have recognized the significant challenges in teaching and learning at the high-school level, they have not developed an effective strategy to address them. An actionable, focused, and aligned district improvement planning and implementation process will clarify expectations and goals, refocus the energy and efforts of administrators and teachers, and dramatically move the district closer to achieving the improvements in teaching and learning that it seeks.

**Strengths**

Chicopee has effective leadership and structures in place to ensure that curricula are developed and continuously improved; teachers K–12 participate in the curriculum review and development process and the collaborative structures between teachers and district leaders is an effective model for the district. Formal data analysis takes place at each level. Assessment use to monitor learning is more effective and consistent at the K–8 schools than at the high schools. The district has a strong and well-developed professional development program which is informed by student achievement data; it is connected to district and school priorities and supports teachers at all stages of their careers.

The district provides a continuum of specialized programs that address students’ learning, behavioral, and social-emotional needs, including an alternative middle and high school (grades 6–12). Chicopee also provides strong career development and career/vocational technical education programs and maintains effective partnerships with community resources to support career exploration.

Community support for the schools is evident in the funding of four major new school and renovation projects, including 2 high schools in the past 12 years. Maintaining clean and well-functioning buildings and up-to-date technology infrastructure are priorities of the district.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

The district’s vision of improving teaching and learning and monitoring progress at the high schools is limited to improving test scores and graduation rates; District and School Improvement Plans do not provide adequate direction, support, or accountability to improve teaching and learning throughout the district. Although district and school leaders have recognized the significant challenges in teaching and learning at the high-school level, they have not developed an effective strategy to address them.

While a review of curriculum documents indicated generally rigorous content at the high-school level, observed instruction did not sufficiently emphasize critical thinking. For example, in observed lessons, the team found moderate and strong evidence that students assumed responsibility for their own learning in 95 percent of classrooms at the elementary level, in 72 percent of classes at the middle-school level, but in only 36 percent of classrooms at the high-school level.

High-school teachers are at an early stage in the use of data to inform their instruction; their primary sources to monitor student performance are MCAS tests so that they do not have broad enough data to frequently monitor student progress throughout the year. Although teachers also have access to Scholastic Reading Inventory data, teachers have found it insufficient and the district is seeking to replace this assessment tool. At the high-school level, some content areas have adopted improvement initiatives as a result of data analysis, but some teachers experience these as uncoordinated and reported that there has not been sufficient follow–through.

Although the district has aligned its educator evaluation system with the state framework, it has not implemented the system consistently and it has not taken action on the more recent components of the Educator Evaluation Framework which require the collection and use of multiple measures of evaluative evidence.

High-school students with moderate special needs are not typically included in general education core classes. Further, academic support services at the high school level are not organized or administered as a coherent program and services are not evaluated.

The development of the district budget is not driven by district and school plans, goals, priorities, or student achievement data but rather by the net school spending requirement and concerns such as class size and personnel layoffs. One exception is the purchase of a new elementary reading program for all the district’s K-5 schools. Budget documents do not contain a summary or narrative highlighting district goals or priorities.

**Recommendations**

District and school leaders should develop goals and priorities for action that are based on student achievement data and other data sources and include these goals and priorities for action in District and School Improvement Plans. More oversight and support from the central office would help district leaders target efforts, programs, and resources more strategically toward improving student achievement. District and school leaders should survey staff and collaboratively develop action plans to address those issues that are most critical for improving student learning.

The district should ensure that the taught curriculum develops students’ higher-order thinking and that instruction provides all students with opportunities to learn at high levels. The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data sources. District and school leaders should help strengthen teachers’ understanding of how to use data to improve instruction so that all students might learn and achieve at high levels.

The district should enhance its efforts to fully and effectively implement all elements of the state Educator Evaluation Framework by improving the overall quality and efficacy of teachers’ and administrators’ evaluations and by developing systems for the collection and use of multiple measures of evidence to inform the evaluation process.

The district should consider ways of extending its student support programs and practices at the elementary- and middle-school levels to the high-school level so that they more effectively support learning for all students. The district should monitor the proportion of students with moderate special needs in general education core classes so that they receive sufficient attention and support.

District administrators and the school committee should base budget decisions about the allocation of resources on student achievement data and other data sources and on strengthened district and school improvement plans. Budget documents should contain a summary or narrative highlighting district goals and priorities.

Chicopee Public Schools Comprehensive District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of systemwide functions, 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 2016–2017 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the six district standards above. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in each of the district standards reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a four-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with such stakeholders as school committee members, teachers’ association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. 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 Chicopee was conducted December 12–15, 2016. The site visit included 30 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 189 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 9 elementary-school teachers, 38 middle-school teachers, and 28 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 80 classrooms in 14 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

Chicopee has a mayor/city council form of government, with the mayor serving as the chair of the school committee. The 12 members of the school committee meet twice each month. The committee has one member elected by each of nine wards and two members elected at–large.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2005. The district leadership team includes an assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability, an assistant superintendent for student support services, a director of budget and human resources, a director of career technical education, and a director of special education. An assistant to the superintendent for telecommunications and a director of maintenance also report directly to the superintendent. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past several years although there have been some recent changes. The district has 15 principals leading 15 schools including one early childhood center. There are 43 other school administrators, including 21 vice-principals and a career and technical education director; each high school also has content area supervisors who work with principals in evaluating staff. In the 2015–2016 school year, there were 625 teachers in the district.

In the 2016–2017 school year, 7,683 students were enrolled in the district’s 15 schools:

**Table 1: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2016–2017**

| **School Name** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Szetela | EES | Pre-K | 281 |
| Belcher | ES | K–2 | 269 |
| Barry | ES | K–5 | 425 |
| Bowe | ES | K–5 | 452 |
| Bowie | ES | K–5 | 366 |
| Litwin | ES | K–5 | 422 |
| Lambert-Lavoie | ES | K–5 | 305 |
| Fairview Elementary | ES | K–5 | 448 |
| Stefanik | ES | K–5 | 391 |
| Streiber | ES | K–5 | 284 |
| Bellamy Middle | MS | 6–8 | 788 |
| Dupont Middle | MS | 6–8 | 769 |
| Chicopee Academy | MS-HS | 6–12 | 106 |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | HS | 9-12 | 1,430 |
| Chicopee High | HS | 9-12 | 947 |
| **Totals** | **15 schools** | **Pre-K–12** | **7,683** |
| \*As of October 1, 2016 | | | |

Between 2013 and 2017 overall student enrollment decreased by 1 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 similar to the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 35 K–12 districts of similar size (5,000-7,999 students) in fiscal year 2015: $13,710 as compared with $12,947 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/default.html)). Actual net school spending has been equal to or slightly above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**Chicopee is a Level 3 district because Chicopee Academy, Chicopee High, and Chicopee Comprehensive High are in Level 3 for being among the lowest performing 20 percent of schools in their respective grade-spans.**

* Chicopee Academy has a persistently low graduation rate for all students.
* Chicopee High is a focus school because its students with disabilities and Hispanic/Latino students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups. Chicopee High also has a persistently low graduation rate for students with disabilities and has low assessment participation (less than 95 percent) for students with disabilities.
* Chicopee Comprehensive High is a focus school because its students with disabilities and high needs students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups; it also has a persistently low graduation rate for students with disabilities.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Chicopee Public Schools**  **District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **Group** | **Annual PPI** | | | | **Cumulative PPI** | **School**  **Percentile** | **Accountability**  **Level** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| Szetela ECC | All | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry ES | All | 110 | 95 | 0 | 120 | 100 | 73 | 1 |
| High Needs | 105 | 90 | 90 | 115 | 100 |
| Belcher ES | All | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Bowe ES | All | 60 | 115 | 0 | 95 | 96 | 36 | 1 |
| High Needs | 65 | 115 | 115 | 90 | 100 |
| Bowie ES | All | 25 | 90 | 90 | 70 | 76 | 33 | 2 |
| High Needs | 60 | 85 | 85 | 60 | 73 |
| Chicopee Academy | All | 69 | 60 | 75 | 11 | 46 | 2 | 3 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Litwin ES | All | 50 | 60 | 0 | 120 | 93 | 34 | 1 |
| High Needs | 65 | 60 | 0 | 120 | 95 |
| Lambert-Lavoie ES | All | 85 | 115 | 90 | 75 | 89 | 53 | 1 |
| High Needs | 85 | 119 | 119 | 40 | 84 |
| Fairview Elementary | All | 75 | 25 | 75 | 60 | 59 | 22 | 2 |
| High Needs | 75 | 25 | 75 | 70 | 63 |
| Streiber ES | All | 65 | 35 | 90 | 105 | 83 | 40 | 2 |
| High Needs | 63 | 31 | 81 | 85 | 71 |
| Stefanik ES | All | 100 | 115 | 90 | 70 | 88 | 45 | 1 |
| High Needs | 100 | 115 | 115 | 65 | 94 |
| Bellamy Middle | All | 50 | 70 | 85 | 90 | 81 | 28 | 2 |
| High Needs | 50 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 70 |
| Dupont Middle | All | 75 | 50 | 80 | 30 | 54 | 22 | 2 |
| High Needs | 60 | 50 | 70 | 20 | 45 |
| Chicopee High | All | 68 | 64 | 29 | 75 | 58 | 5 | 3 |
| High Needs | 79 | 75 | 75 | 71 | 74 |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | All | 61 | 21 | 96 | 57 | 62 | 8 | 3 |
| High Needs | 71 | 46 | 86 | 57 | 65 |
| District | All | 68 | 50 | 68 | 54 | 59 | -- | 3 |
| High Needs | 75 | 54 | 0 | 54 | 57 |

Between 2015 and 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 3 percentage points in ELA and improved by 3 percentage points in math.

* The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 3 percentage points in ELA and improved by 3 percentage points in math.
* The percentage of economically disadvantaged students meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 5 percentage points in ELA and improved by 2 percentage points in math.
* The percentage of ELL and former ELL students meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 7 percentage points in the ELA and by 1 percentage point in math.
* The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 2 percentage points in ELA and by 8 percentage points in math.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Chicopee Public Schools**  **ELA and Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (Grades 3–8) 2015–2016** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | |
| **2015** | **2016** | **Change** | **2015** | **2016** | **Change** |
| All students | 54% | 51% | -3 | 48% | 51% | 3 |
| High Needs | 45% | 41% | -4 | 39% | 42% | 3 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 43% | -5 | 41% | 43% | 2 |
| ELL and former ELL students | 42% | 35% | -7 | 43% | 42% | -1 |
| Students with disabilities | 15% | 17% | 2 | 15% | 23% | 8 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science improved by 12 percentage points for all students, and by 9 to 10 percentage points for high needs students, ELL and former ELL students, and students with disabilities. In 2016 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 6 and 9 percentage points below the state rates for the district as a whole and for students with disabilities, respectively. In 2016 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 3 to 4 percentage points above the state rates for high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and ELL and former ELL students.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** |  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** | **Above/Below**  **State (2016)** |
| All students | District | 33% | 37% | 40% | 45% | 12 | -9 |
| State | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 |
| High Needs | District | 24% | 28% | 29% | 34% | 10 | 3 |
| State | 31% | 33% | 31% | 31% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | District | -- | -- | 30% | 35% | -- | 3 |
| State | -- | -- | 34% | 32% | -- |
| ELL and former ELL students | District | 13% | 18% | 20% | 23% | 10 | 4 |
| State | 19% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 0 |
| Students with disabilities | District | 6% | 9% | 12% | 15% | 9 | -6 |
| State | 21% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 0 |

**The district did not reach its 2016 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for any group except economically disadvantaged students in science.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Chicopee Public Schools**  **2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | | **Science** | | |
| **Group** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** |
| All students | 85.8 | 89.6 | No Change | 80.3 | 83.0 | Improved Below Target | 74.7 | 79.3 | Improved Below Target |
| High Needs | 80.8 | 87.1 | No Change | 74.8 | 79.6 | Improved Below Target | 67.8 | 75.1 | Improved Below Target |
| Economically Disadvantaged[[1]](#footnote-1) | 82.1 | 84.3 | No Change | 76.2 | 77.5 | Improved Below Target | 68.1 | 69.0 | On Target |
| ELLs | 70.9 | 80.2 | Declined | 70.3 | 76.1 | No Change | 53.8 | 66.1 | No Change |
| Students with disabilities | 67.1 | 74.8 | Improved Below Target | 60.7 | 66.9 | Improved Below Target | 56.4 | 64.4 | Improved Below Target |

**In 2016, students’ growth in ELA was below target for all students and each subgroup that makes up the high needs population and low compared with their academic peers statewide for each group except English language learners. Students’ growth in math was moderate compared with their academic peers statewide and below target for each group except students with disabilities.**

**Table 6: Chicopee Public Schools**

**2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **2016 Median ELA SGP** | | | **2016 Median Math SGP** | | |
| **District** | **CPI Rating** | **Growth Level** | **District** | **CPI Rating** | **Growth Level** |
| All students | 40.0 | Below Target | Low | 44.0 | Below Target | Moderate |
| High Needs | 38.0 | Below Target | Low | 44.0 | Below Target | Moderate |
| Econ. Disad. | 37.0 | Below Target | Low | 43.0 | Below Target | Moderate |
| ELLs | 42.0 | Below Target | Moderate | 49.0 | Below Target | Moderate |
| SWD | 36.0 | Below Target | Low | 42.0 | On Target | Moderate |

**Between 2013 and 2016, the district’s out-of-school and in-school suspension rates declined for all students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population, but in 2016 were above the state rates for each group.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Type of Suspension** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | ISS | 11.1% | 8.7% | 6.8% | 5.9% | 2.9% |
| OSS | 10.7% | 9.5% | 7.3% | 7.5% | 4.9% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | ISS | 11.4% | 9.0% | 6.9% | 6.1% | 3.2% |
| OSS | 11.0% | 9.8% | 7.5% | 7.6% | 5.6% |
| ELLs | ISS | 6.8% | 5.6% | 4.3% | 5.0% | 1.9% |
| OSS | 6.5% | 6.8% | 3.8% | 5.7% | 4.0% |
| Students with disabilities | ISS | 13.9% | 12.4% | 7.9% | 6.5% | 3.5% |
| OSS | 16.6% | 13.6% | 10.1% | 9.9% | 5.9% |
| All Students | ISS | 9.4% | 7.2% | 5.4% | 4.7% | 1.9% |
| OSS | 8.7% | 7.7% | 5.5% | 5.5% | 2.9% |

\*Low income students’ suspensions used for 2013 and 2014

**Between 2012 and 2015, the district’s four-year cohort graduation rate improved by 7.7 percentage points for all students and by 9.1 to 28.9 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. In 2016, the rates for all subgroups except English language learners were lower than the state rates. The district reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students but not for any of the subgroups that make up the high needs population.**[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012–2015** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2015)** | **Cohort Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2012–2015** | | **Change 2014-2015** | | **State (2015)** |
| **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 427 | 63.3 | 63.3 | 70.4 | 73.3 | 10.0 | 15.8% | 2.9 | 4.1% | 78.5 |
| Low income | 396 | 62.9 | 63.8 | 70.7 | 74.0 | 11.1 | 17.6% | 3.3 | 4.7% | 78.2 |
| ELLs | 19 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 70.4 | 78.9 | 28.9 | 57.8% | 8.5 | 12.1% | 64.0 |
| SWD | 113 | 42.2 | 41.6 | 41.1 | 51.3 | 9.1 | 21.6% | 10.2 | 24.8% | 69.9 |
| All students | 637 | 72.5 | 72.6 | 78.1 | 80.2 | 7.7 | 10.6% | 2.1 | 2.7% | 87.3 |

**Between 2011 and 2014, the district’s five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 8.1 percentage points for all students, and by 9.0 to 24.6 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and English language learners. In 2014, the rates for all subgroups except English language learners were lower than the state rates. The district’s five-year cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities declined by 6.2 percentage points. The district did not reach the five-year cohort graduation target for all students or for any of the subgroups that make up the high needs population.**[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Five-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 | 415 | 65.7 | 67.2 | 67.9 | 74.7 | 9.0 | 13.7% | 6.8 | 10.0% | 80.3 |
| Low income | 396 | 65.1 | 67.0 | 67.8 | 75.3 | 10.2 | 15.7% | 7.5 | 11.1% | 79.6 |
| ELLs | 27 | 45.8 | 59.4 | 60.7 | 70.4 | 24.6 | 53.7% | 9.7 | 16.0% | 69.8 |
| SWD | 95 | 55.7 | 49.1 | 50.4 | 49.5 | -6.2 | -11.1% | -0.9 | -1.8% | 73.5 |
| All students | 640 | 73.2 | 75.4 | 75.7 | 81.3 | 8.1 | 11.1% | 5.6 | 7.4% | 88.5 |

**In 2015, the district’s drop-out rates for all students were twice the state rates and above the state rates for high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities, and the drop-out rate for English language learners was lower than the 2015 state rate.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 10: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2012–2015**[[4]](#footnote-4) | | | | | |
|  | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **State (2015)** |
| High Needs | 5.3% | 5.2% | 5.5% | 5.9% | 3.4% |
| Econ. Disad.[[5]](#footnote-5) | 4.8% | 4.6% | 5.7% | 5.3% | 3.3% |
| ELLs | 13.6% | 4.9% | 7.6% | 4.8% | 5.7% |
| SWD | 7.4% | 7.4% | 7.4% | 6.8% | 3.5% |
| All students | 4.3% | 4.3% | 4.0% | 3.9% | 1.9% |

**Grade and School Results**

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students improved by 3.0 points, from 82.8 in 2013 to 85.8 in 2016, and improved in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 7th, and 10th grades.**

* ELA CPI improved by 4.6 points in the 3rd grade, by 6.8 points in the 4th grade, by 8.1 points in the 5th grade, by 3.5 points in the 7th grade, and by 1.5 points in the 10th grade.
  + ELA CPI in the 10th grade was 95.6 in 2016, 1.1 points below the 2016 state CPI of 96.7.
* ELA CPI declined by 1.7 points in the 6th grade, and by 0.7 point in the 8th grade.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 11: Chicopee Public Schools**  **ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 3 | 551 | 82.3 | 83.6 | 84.1 | 86.9 | -- | 4.6 | 2.8 |
| 4 | 500 | 74.2 | 76.6 | 79.4 | 81.0 | -- | 6.8 | 1.6 |
| 5 | 519 | 80.2 | 81.5 | 85.6 | 88.3 | -- | 8.1 | 2.7 |
| 6 | 495 | 81.7 | 80.3 | 84.6 | 80.0 | -- | -1.7 | -4.6 |
| 7 | 524 | 79.9 | 85.2 | 82.6 | 83.4 | -- | 3.5 | 0.8 |
| 8 | 513 | 85.5 | 85.8 | 90.6 | 84.8 | -- | -0.7 | -5.8 |
| 10 | 587 | 94.1 | 92.6 | 94.7 | 95.6 | 96.7 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| All | 3,762 | 82.8 | 83.9 | 86.1 | 85.8 | -- | 3.0 | -0.3 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA ranged from 44 to 86 percent in the 3rd grade, from 45 to 74 percent in the 4th grade, from 42 to 76 percent in the 5th grade, from 36 to 53 percent in the 6th grade, from 49 to 53 percent in the 7th grade, and from 37 to 43 percent in the 8th grade. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA in the 10th grade was 88 percent at Chicopee High and 90 percent at Chicopee Comprehensive High.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12: Chicopee Public Schools**  **ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016[[6]](#footnote-6)** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Szetela ECC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belcher ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry ES | 86% | 70% | 76% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 77% |
| Bowe ES | 49% | 49% | 42% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| Bowie ES | 61% | 59% | 67% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 62% |
| Litwin ES | 62% | 63% | 58% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 61% |
| Lambert-Lavoie ES | 47% | 64% | 62% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 57% |
| Selser ES | 53% | 45% | 56% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 52% |
| Streiber ES | 54% | 74% | 62% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 63% |
| Stefanik ES | 44% | 59% | 49% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 51% |
| Bellamy Middle | -- | -- | -- | 53% | 53% | 43% | -- | 49% |
| Fairview Middle | -- | -- | -- | 36% | 49% | 37% | -- | 41% |
| Chicopee Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19% | -- | -- |
| Chicopee High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 88% | 88% |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 90% | 90% |
| District | 57% | 58% | 58% | 45% | 50% | 39% | 88% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI improved by 3.5 to 12.8 points in 7 out of the 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 5.0 points at Bellamy Middle, and by 2.1 and 1.7 points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.**

* ELA CPI for high needs students improved by 4.6 to 12.8 points in 7 out of the 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 3.9 points at Bellamy Middle, and by 3.0 and 3.1 points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.
* ELA CPI for English language learners improved by 7.5 to 24.0 points in 4 out of the 5 elementary schools with reportable data, and by 18.0 points at Chicopee High.
* ELA CPI for students with disabilities improved by 10.3 to 26.6 points in 7 out of the 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 12.2 points at Bellamy Middle, and by 6.4 and 6.7 points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13: Chicopee Public Schools**  **ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Szetela ECC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belcher ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry ES | 89.2 | 89.0 | 86.6 | 92.7 | 3.5 |
| High Needs | 85.3 | 84.9 | 83.3 | 91.4 | 6.1 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 83.1 | 91.3 | -- |
| ELLs | 83.1 | 82.0 | 85.2 | 90.6 | 7.5 |
| SWD | 78.6 | 72.6 | 74.4 | 89.0 | 10.4 |
| Bowe ES | 69.3 | 75.3 | 74.3 | 80.4 | 11.1 |
| High Needs | 68.1 | 73.8 | 69.2 | 75.8 | 7.7 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 69.5 | 76.0 | -- |
| ELLs | 58.3 | 67.5 | 76.1 | 73.8 | 15.5 |
| SWD | 53.3 | 52.6 | 52.9 | 63.6 | 10.3 |
| Bowie ES | 76.7 | 81.5 | 88.6 | 87.3 | 10.6 |
| High Needs | 69.3 | 74.4 | 84.0 | 80.9 | 11.6 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 86.0 | 82.7 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 41.7 | 54.6 | 63.0 | 61.9 | 20.2 |
| Litwin ES | 76.7 | 78.2 | 81.1 | 89.5 | 12.8 |
| High Needs | 73.6 | 73.8 | 75.6 | 86.4 | 12.8 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 78.6 | 87.6 | -- |
| ELLs | 65.6 | 59.2 | 67.3 | 89.6 | 24.0 |
| SWD | 59.2 | 57.3 | 58.3 | 77.2 | 18.0 |
| Lambert-Lavoie ES | 79.3 | 85.9 | 86.9 | 85.2 | 5.9 |
| High Needs | 73.8 | 82.5 | 82.3 | 78.5 | 4.7 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 83.0 | 79.6 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 38.5 | 59.2 | 60.0 | 61.4 | 22.9 |
| Fairview Elementary | 77.0 | 77.1 | 83.0 | 82.0 | 5.0 |
| High Needs | 74.7 | 75.8 | 81.6 | 80.1 | 5.4 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 81.9 | 80.6 | -- |
| ELLs | 72.7 | 67.0 | 89.8 | 84.4 | 11.7 |
| SWD | 50.0 | 55.3 | 62.5 | 62.9 | 12.9 |
| Streiber ES | 82.3 | 77.0 | 84.0 | 88.2 | 5.9 |
| High Needs | 75.4 | 68.5 | 72.3 | 80.0 | 4.6 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 77.5 | 80.5 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 44.4 | 40.4 | 50.0 | 71.0 | 26.6 |
| Stefanik ES | 84.2 | 84.1 | 87.3 | 81.0 | -3.2 |
| High Needs | 82.6 | 83.3 | 86.0 | 79.6 | -3.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 85.9 | 80.0 | -- |
| ELLs | 76.9 | 73.1 | 76.7 | 69.4 | -7.5 |
| SWD | 70.3 | 73.0 | 72.1 | 60.0 | -10.3 |
| Bellamy Middle | 81.6 | 82.8 | 85.7 | 86.6 | 5.0 |
| High Needs | 77.7 | 79.0 | 81.3 | 81.6 | 3.9 |
| Eco Disad | -- | -- | 83.3 | 84.0 | -- |
| ELLs | 68.8 | 71.9 | 68.5 | 64.8 | -4.0 |
| SWD | 54.8 | 57.6 | 67.8 | 67.0 | 12.2 |
| Dupont Middle | 85.9 | 87.4 | 87.7 | 80.1 | -5.8 |
| High Needs | 81.7 | 84.0 | 81.5 | 71.4 | -10.3 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 83.5 | 73.6 | -- |
| ELLs | 74.3 | 75.0 | 75.6 | 57.1 | -17.2 |
| SWD | 61.2 | 61.2 | 65.4 | 56.3 | -4.9 |
| Chicopee Academy | 65.2 | 66.7 | 70.3 | 63.1 | -2.1 |
| High Needs | 61.9 | 65.4 | 70.3 | 63.2 | 1.3 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 73.3 | 58.3 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 50.0 | 57.5 | -- | -- | -- |
| Chicopee High | 93.3 | 94.0 | 93.1 | 95.4 | 2.1 |
| High Needs | 89.6 | 91.9 | 88.9 | 92.6 | 3.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 90.6 | 93.5 | -- |
| ELLs | 72.9 | 82.5 | 75.0 | 90.9 | 18.0 |
| SWD | 70.7 | 80.0 | 74.0 | 77.1 | 6.4 |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | 94.9 | 93.3 | 96.7 | 96.6 | 1.7 |
| High Needs | 92.0 | 90.2 | 94.5 | 95.1 | 3.1 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 94.5 | 95.8 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | 85.4 | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 75.9 | 71.6 | 87.9 | 82.6 | 6.7 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI improved by 5.5 points for all students, from 74.8 in 2013 to 80.3 in 2016. Math CPI also improved in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th, and 10th grades.**

* Math CPI improved by 7.6 points in the 3rd and 4th grades, by 11.7 points in the 5th grade, by 4.8 points in the 7th grade, by 6.7 points in the 8th grade, and by 2.3 points in the 10th grade.
  + Math CPI in the 10th grade was 83.6 in 2016, 6.1 points below the 2016 state CPI of 89.7.
* Math CPI declined by 2.6 points in the 6th grade.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 14: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Math Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 3 | 552 | 85.5 | 85.3 | 87.4 | 93.1 | -- | 7.6 | 5.7 |
| 4 | 499 | 76.5 | 78.0 | 81.4 | 84.1 | -- | 7.6 | 2.7 |
| 5 | 521 | 74.2 | 76.8 | 81.9 | 85.9 | -- | 11.7 | 4.0 |
| 6 | 496 | 77.3 | 74.7 | 77.2 | 74.7 | -- | -2.6 | -2.5 |
| 7 | 524 | 62.3 | 65.2 | 65.3 | 67.1 | -- | 4.8 | 1.8 |
| 8 | 508 | 66.4 | 66.7 | 77.6 | 73.1 | -- | 6.7 | -4.5 |
| 10 | 580 | 81.3 | 79.7 | 82.9 | 83.6 | 89.7 | 2.3 | 0.7 |
| All | 3,746 | 74.8 | 75.4 | 79.1 | 80.3 | -- | 5.5 | 1.2 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math ranged from 53 to 93 percent in the 3rd grade, from 50 to 77 percent in the 4th grade, from 46 to 76 percent in the 5th grade, from 37 to 45 percent in the 6th grade, from 34 to 39 percent in the 7th grade, and from 39 to 49 percent in the 8th grade. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in the 10th grade was 61 percent at Chicopee High and 69 percent at Chicopee Comprehensive High.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 15: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016[[7]](#footnote-7)** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Szetela ECC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belcher | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry | 92% | 74% | 76% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 81% |
| Bowe | 93% | 55% | 60% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 71% |
| Bowie | 53% | 53% | 59% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 55% |
| Litwin | 75% | 53% | 48% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 60% |
| Lambert-Lavoie | 53% | 62% | 69% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 61% |
| Selser | 65% | 50% | 46% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 54% |
| Streiber | 67% | 74% | 47% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 62% |
| Stefanik | 62% | 77% | 52% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 63% |
| Bellamy Middle | -- | -- | -- | 45% | 39% | 49% | -- | 44% |
| Fairview Middle | -- | -- | -- | 37% | 34% | 39% | -- | 37% |
| Chicopee Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6% | -- | -- |
| Chicopee High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 61% | 61% |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 69% | 69% |
| District | 70% | 60% | 56% | 40% | 35% | 43% | 64% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI improved by 2.2 to 21.4 points in 8 out of the 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 7.7 points at Bellamy Middle, by 1.7 points at Chicopee Academy, and by 2.2 points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High.**

* Math CPI for high needs students improved by 2.1 to 20.6 points in 8 out of the 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 4.8 points at Bellamy Middle, by 3.2 points at Chicopee Academy, and by 2.2 and 3.7 points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.
* Math CPI for English language learners improved by 2.0 to 24.1 points in 5 out of the 5 elementary schools with reportable data, and by 13.8 points at Chicopee High.
* Math CPI for students with disabilities improved by 12.6 to 31.0 points in 6 out of the 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 8.9 points at Bellamy Middle, and by 12.9 and 15.3 points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 16: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Math Composite Performance Index by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **3- or 4-Year Trend** |
| Szetela ECC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belcher ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry ES | 91.9 | 93.6 | 92.2 | 96.2 | 4.3 |
| High Needs | 89.6 | 91.8 | 89.9 | 95.5 | 5.9 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 89.5 | 95.2 | -- |
| ELLs | 94.1 | 95.5 | 94.4 | 96.1 | 2.0 |
| SWD | 80.5 | 85.5 | 82.2 | 95.9 | 15.4 |
| Bowe ES | 68.4 | 74.1 | 85.0 | 89.8 | 21.4 |
| High Needs | 66.8 | 71.6 | 82.0 | 87.4 | 20.6 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 82.4 | 87.4 | -- |
| ELLs | 59.7 | 55.0 | 84.1 | 83.8 | 24.1 |
| SWD | 48.9 | 57.8 | 70.7 | 79.9 | 31.0 |
| Bowie ES | 73.4 | 76.8 | 80.6 | 83.9 | 10.5 |
| High Needs | 65.9 | 68.0 | 71.5 | 75.3 | 9.4 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 74.3 | 77.4 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 38.6 | 37.0 | 44.6 | 51.2 | 12.6 |
| Litwin ES | 75.8 | 74.4 | 78.3 | 87.6 | 11.8 |
| High Needs | 71.7 | 70.8 | 74.3 | 84.7 | 13.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 77.1 | 86.0 | -- |
| ELLs | 67.2 | 68.4 | 78.6 | 89.6 | 22.4 |
| SWD | 56.7 | 55.9 | 62.8 | 76.8 | 20.1 |
| Lambert-Lavoie ES | 80.0 | 86.3 | 88.0 | 86.7 | 6.7 |
| High Needs | 75.5 | 83.0 | 82.0 | 81.7 | 6.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 82.2 | 82.5 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 42.0 | 56.6 | 56.7 | 62.5 | 20.5 |
| Fairview Elementary | 82.0 | 76.1 | 79.5 | 84.2 | 2.2 |
| High Needs | 80.4 | 73.9 | 76.9 | 82.5 | 2.1 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 76.9 | 82.1 | -- |
| ELLs | 81.8 | 69.0 | 87.5 | 91.2 | 9.4 |
| SWD | 75.0 | 56.1 | 60.6 | 72.7 | -2.3 |
| Streiber ES | 81.6 | 75.7 | 83.5 | 90.0 | 8.4 |
| High Needs | 77.8 | 68.2 | 72.3 | 82.0 | 4.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 76.0 | 83.7 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 52.8 | 40.4 | 55.2 | 72.5 | 19.7 |
| Stefanik ES | 81.4 | 87.3 | 90.2 | 89.9 | 8.5 |
| High Needs | 80.2 | 86.8 | 89.5 | 88.3 | 8.1 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 90.4 | 88.2 | -- |
| ELLs | 65.4 | 86.5 | 83.0 | 79.0 | 13.6 |
| SWD | 78.9 | 79.4 | 80.1 | 75.7 | -3.2 |
| Bellamy Middle | 67.2 | 68.0 | 71.6 | 74.9 | 7.7 |
| High Needs | 63.0 | 63.0 | 64.9 | 67.8 | 4.8 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 67.2 | 70.2 | -- |
| ELLs | 57.4 | 54.7 | 58.7 | 57.5 | 0.1 |
| SWD | 40.6 | 41.4 | 45.9 | 49.5 | 8.9 |
| Dupont Middle | 73.3 | 72.6 | 78.1 | 70.4 | -2.9 |
| High Needs | 66.7 | 66.6 | 70.6 | 61.2 | -5.5 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 73.2 | 63.3 | -- |
| ELLs | 62.2 | 68.0 | 74.4 | 53.7 | -8.5 |
| SWD | 49.2 | 41.6 | 50.7 | 47.3 | -1.9 |
| Chicopee Academy | 35.2 | 42.9 | 40.6 | 36.9 | 1.7 |
| High Needs | 35.0 | 42.6 | 40.6 | 38.2 | 3.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 41.7 | 38.3 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 38.6 | 52.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -38.6 |
| Chicopee High | 78.4 | 80.2 | 79.8 | 80.6 | 2.2 |
| High Needs | 70.0 | 73.2 | 71.2 | 72.2 | 2.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 75.0 | 73.1 | -- |
| ELLs | 46.2 | 50.0 | 53.1 | 60.0 | 13.8 |
| SWD | 38.5 | 52.1 | 48.4 | 51.4 | 12.9 |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | 85.0 | 82.4 | 88.0 | 87.2 | 2.2 |
| High Needs | 78.7 | 75.7 | 82.8 | 82.4 | 3.7 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 85.3 | 83.2 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | 70.5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 49.1 | 53.9 | 64.5 | 64.4 | 15.3 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates improved by 12 percentage points in the district as whole, from 33 percent in 2013 to 45 percent in 2016, 9 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 54 percent.**

* The 5th grade science proficiency rates improved by 17 percentage points, from 32 percent in 2013 to 49 percent in 2016, 2 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.
* The 8th grade science proficiency rates improved by 18 percentage points, from 16 percent in 2013 to 34 percent in 2016, 7 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.
* The 10th grade science proficiency rates improved by 3 percentage points, from 50 percent in 2013 to 53 percent in 2016, 20 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 5 | 533 | 32% | 43% | 43% | 49% | 47% | 17% | 6% |
| 8 | 520 | 16% | 20% | 27% | 34% | 41% | 18% | 7% |
| 10 | 547 | 50% | 47% | 50% | 53% | 73% | 3% | 3% |
| All | 1600 | 33% | 37% | 40% | 45% | 54% | 12% | 5% |

**In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in science in the 5th grade ranged from 38 percent to 59 percent, and at 6 of the 8 schools with a 5th grade was above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent. In the 8th grade the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in science ranged from 0 percent to 36 percent, and in all three schools with an 8th grade was below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent. In grade 10 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 57 and 56 percent at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively, below the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 18: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Szetela ECC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belcher ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry ES | -- | -- | 54% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 54% |
| Bowe ES | -- | -- | 38% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 38% |
| Bowie ES | -- | -- | 59% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 59% |
| Litwin ES | -- | -- | 53% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 53% |
| Lambert-Lavoie ES | -- | -- | 51% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 51% |
| Fairview Elementary | -- | -- | 49% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 49% |
| Streiber ES | -- | -- | 52% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 52% |
| Stefanik ES | -- | -- | 38% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 38% |
| Bellamy Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 35% | -- | 35% |
| Dupont Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 36% | -- | 36% |
| Chicopee Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% | -- | 0% |
| Chicopee High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 57% | 57% |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 56% | 56% |
| District | -- | -- | 49% | -- | -- | 34% | 53% | 45% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 41% | 73% | 54% |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates improved by 1 to 31 percentage points in 8 out of 8 elementary schools with reportable data, by 24 and 13 percentage points at Bellamy and Dupont middle schools, respectively, and by 1 and 6 percentage points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.**

* Science proficiency rates for high needs students improved in 7 out 8 elementary schools with reportable data by 1 to 30 percentage points, by 18 and 3 percentage points at Bellamy and Dupont middle schools, respectively, and by 8 percentage points at Chicopee Comprehensive High.
* Science proficiency rates for English language learners improved by 17 percentage points at Bellamy Middle School.
* Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 4 and 21 percentage points at the 2 elementary schools with reportable data, by 1 percentage point at Bellamy Middle, and by 4 and 22 percentage points at Chicopee High and Chicopee Comprehensive High, respectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 19: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Szetela ECC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belcher ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barry ES | 43% | 74% | 58% | 54% | 11% |
| High Needs | 38% | 57% | 51% | 44% | 6% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 43% | 42% | -- |
| ELLs | 31% | 70% | 55% | -- | -- |
| SWD | 31% | 25% | 47% | 35% | 4% |
| Bowe ES | 7% | 35% | 58% | 38% | 31% |
| High Needs | 8% | 35% | 53% | 33% | 25% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 56% | 30% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | 55% | -- |
| Bowie ES | 30% | 38% | 50% | 59% | 29% |
| High Needs | 27% | 30% | 38% | 44% | 17% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 35% | 48% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 5% | -- | 10% | -- |
| Litwin ES | 25% | 28% | 29% | 53% | 28% |
| High Needs | 15% | 16% | 20% | 45% | 30% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 24% | 48% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 3% | 8% | 3% | 24% | 21% |
| Lambert-Lavoie ES | 45% | 71% | 56% | 51% | 6% |
| High Needs | 40% | 76% | 52% | 35% | -5% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 54% | 35% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 0% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Fairview Elementary | 48% | 32% | 20% | 49% | 1% |
| High Needs | 39% | 23% | 19% | 43% | 4% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 19% | 42% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 13% | -- | 10% | -- |
| Streiber ES | 43% | 52% | 53% | 52% | 9% |
| High Needs | 37% | 41% | 31% | 38% | 1% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 37% | 40% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 8% | 8% | 10% | -- |
| Stefanik ES | 28% | 36% | 38% | 38% | 10% |
| High Needs | 26% | 33% | 35% | 36% | 10% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 38% | 35% | -- |
| ELLs | 18% | -- | 8% | 18% | 0% |
| SWD | -- | 10% | 7% | 13% | -- |
| Bellamy Middle | 11% | 21% | 23% | 35% | 24% |
| High Needs | 8% | 18% | 12% | 26% | 18% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 10% | 28% | -- |
| ELLs | 0% | 6% | 14% | 17% | 17% |
| SWD | 1% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 1% |
| Dupont Middle | 23% | 20% | 33% | 36% | 13% |
| High Needs | 18% | 15% | 26% | 21% | 3% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 27% | 20% | -- |
| ELLs | 10% | -- | 11% | -- | -- |
| SWD | 10% | 6% | 13% | 9% | -1% |
| Chicopee Academy | 0% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| High Needs | 0% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 5% | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 0% | -- | -- | -- |
| Chicopee High | 56% | 52% | 46% | 57% | 1% |
| High Needs | 41% | 40% | 29% | 40% | -1% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 34% | 44% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | 9% | -- | -- |
| SWD | 3% | 17% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| Chicopee Comprehensive High | 50% | 47% | 55% | 56% | 6% |
| High Needs | 40% | 34% | 43% | 48% | 8% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 45% | 49% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 8% | 7% | 24% | 30% | 22% |

Leadership and Governance

***Contextual Background***

Chicopee’s 12-member school committee is a veteran board. One member has served for 31 years, and most began their terms of service shortly before or after the current superintendent was appointed in 2005. The committee is chaired by the mayor who has served the city twice as mayor, from 1997 to 2005 and from 2013 to the present. Both the superintendent and committee described their relationship as generally supportive and respectful. Committee decisions are not guided by district or school improvement plans, nor does the committee regularly evaluate the superintendent.

Chicopee has a “flat” organization favored by the superintendent who is in his twelfth year in the position. He directly supervises 22 administrators, including 7 central office staff: the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability, the assistant superintendent for student support services, the director of budget and human resources, the director of special education, the director of career technical education, the assistant to the superintendent for telecommunications and technology services, and the director of maintenance. He also directly supervises the one preschool, nine elementary-, two middle-, and three high-school principals. While the superintendent meets regularly with all administrators, he does not regularly formally evaluate them.

The superintendent’s major initiatives in recent years have included: piloting and in 2016–2017 adopting in all elementary schools a new English language arts series and aligning it to the revised Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, and converting the former Chicopee High School into Dupont Middle School. The superintendent stated that this would give the city one middle school on each side of the river, thereby ensuring comparable demographics for the city’s two middle schools and saving money on transportation.

After a period of leadership stability, the district is facing a period of transition. The assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability is in her second year and the director of special education is in her first year. At the time of the onsite in December 2016, the long-time director of budget and human resources was planning to leave in February 2017 to take a position in another state. The superintendent reported that he plans for succession and likes to prepare people for promotion. He told the team that he planned to elevate the grants administrator to the position of interim director of budget and to distribute responsibility for grants administration among several administrators. The principal of Chicopee High School would become the part-time assistant superintendent for human resources in January 2017 and transition full time to the position in July 2017, by which time the superintendent expected to have chosen a new principal for Chicopee High School.

ESE conducted a review of the district in January 2011. That team’s findings about leadership and governance centered on the support from teachers and administrators enjoyed by the superintendent and his leadership team, the school committee’s role in administrative matters, the absence of a central office administrator with mathematics expertise to lead those improvement efforts, and the absence of a strategic plan.

Six years later, the district has appointed a person who has a mathematics background to the central office position of assistant for curriculum and professional development. The superintendent has collaborative relationships with the school committee and town leaders, but some teachers and administrators indicated that communication, collaboration, and instructional leadership at the high schools could be improved. Finally, there are serious shortcomings in strategic planning processes at the district and school levels.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**The district’s plan to improve teaching and learning and monitor progress at the high schools is limited to raising test scores and increasing graduation rates. District and School Improvement Plans do not provide adequate direction, support, or accountability to improve teaching and learning throughout the district.**

* 1. The District Improvement Plan (DIP) limits its vision of improving teaching and learning at the high schools to raising test scores, reducing drop-out rates, and increasing graduation rates.

1. The vision described in the DIP is “to prepare students and teachers for the 21st century.”
2. Five of the DIP’s eight strategic objectives that can be linked to teaching and learning are numerical targets for improved scores related to district and school accountability, i.e., math and ELA CPI, math and ELA SGP, four- and five-year graduation rates, and percentage of graduates completing MassCore.
3. The remaining three objectives are activities rather than goals. One is driven by compliance with state regulations, “support teachers through various (SEI) endorsement channels”; the second calls broadly for providing “relevant, effective and quality professional development” and a “quality induction and mentor program”; and the third calls upon staff to “use EWIS reports for early identification of students at risk of failure.”
4. The superintendent reported that the district was late in recognizing the urgency for improvement at the high schools.

**B.** The high-school School Improvement Plans (SIPs) developed to address challenges are incomplete.

The Chicopee Comprehensive SIP mirrors closely the District Improvement Plan and reflects most of the same weaknesses: few strategies, general or limited timelines, no clear accountability, and benchmarks to assess progress limited to MCAS scores and drop-out and graduation rates.

Implementation depends heavily on DSAC support, including training staff for peer visits; conducting a math lesson study; training administrators, supervisors, and data team in analysis and use of data to inform instruction; and helping staff to use EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) to identify at-risk students.

One action step identified to improve graduation and drop-out rates is to “use faculty meetings to share important information with staff regarding at-risk students.” Examples of related strategies include “at risk students seen every 10 days as per district directive” and “online credit recovery.”

The Chicopee High SIP details a more comprehensive list of strategies and action steps, and includes “progress indicators,” but it, too, includes some general strategies, is unclear about who is being held accountable for actions steps, and does not have timelines for the action steps related to improving ELA MCAS scores.

**C.** The DIP process and plan do not play a significant role in district decision-making.

* + 1. Administrators and teachers described the district’s focus as raising MCAS scores and getting and keeping its schools out of Level 3.

2. High-school teachers reported that there is little formal awareness of district goals.

3. The DIP is not referred to in the professional development plan or the school budget nor does it appear on the district’s website.

4. Administrators and school committee members confirmed that the committee is not aware of or guided by the DIP.

5. With the exception of a single one-page report on progress made on 1 of the 54 action steps, the review team did not find evidence that progress on district goals is monitored or assessed.

**D.** The de facto district strategy and annual action plan is the annual fall “State of the Schools” report to the school committee by the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability, an eight-slide presentation that she posts to the district’s website.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The slides focus on changes in level designations earned by each school based on the prior year’s testing, participation, graduation, and drop-out results.

One slide in each year’s presentation identifies next steps for the district, most of which are not included in the DIP and none of which are accompanied by mention of progress.

**E.** School Improvement Plans (SIPs) vary significantly in the strategic and practical direction they offer.

1. Typically, SIPs offer little strategic or practical direction.

2. A few SIPs offer specific strategies and objectives, and provide clarity about action steps, the person responsible for each step, and the resources required and available.

Some SIPs also include benchmarks and timelines for assessing and monitoring progress. SIPs for Belcher, Chicopee Academy, and Streiber are examples of more well-developed plans.

**F.** Interviews and a document review indicated that school leaders are not supported or held accountable to monitor or report progress on their improvement plans.

1. Principals develop their SIPs independently and with little support beyond being provided with information about the SIP template and timelines.

Principals send completed SIPs to the assistant superintendent for student support services.

In 2016–2017, for the first time, the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability reviewed completed SIPs and offered feedback to several principals.

2. The superintendent and district and school administrators said that the superintendent does not review completed SIPs or refer to them in principals’ evaluations.

The school committee does not receive completed SIPs, nor are they posted on the district’s or schools’ website.

**Impact**: Without a widely understood, comprehensive, and strategic approach to improving teaching and learning, stakeholders do not know the direction in which the district’s schools are heading or the plans for achieving their goals.

**District and school leaders have been late to recognize the significant challenges in teaching and learning at the high-school level and have not developed an effective strategy to address them.**

**A.** Despite a five-year trend of low and decreasing percentile ranking among Massachusetts high schools, district and school leaders have not responded with a sense of urgency for improvement until 2016–2017.

1. According to ESE data, the district’s high schools have had percentile ranking in the lowest 10 percent of schools for the past 5 years.

* 1. In 2012, 2013, and 2014 Chicopee High was at the seventh percentile rank among the state’s high schools; in 2015 it was at the sixth percentile, and in 2016, at the fifth.
  2. In 2012, Chicopee Comprehensive was at the tenth percentile; it dropped to ninth in 2013 and seventh in 2014 and 2015, before increasing to eighth in 2016.
  3. Chicopee Academy first qualified for a percentile ranking in 2014 when it was at the second percentile, rising to third the next year, and returning to second in 2016.

1. The superintendent reported that the district was late in recognizing the urgency for improvement at the high schools.

**B.** High-school staff told the review team about several strategies focused on raising MCAS scores. These strategies are taking time and attention away from solutions far more likely to successfully address the challenge of improving students’ skills as readers, writers and mathematical problem solvers.

1. Administrators, supervisors, and teachers referred to the “bubble kid initiative” to identify and move students “from Needs Improvement to Proficient, and from Proficient to Advanced.”
2. Administrators and supervisors reported on plans to assign advisory teachers to proctor MCAS in the spring.

**C.** In the fall 2016–2017, for the first time, the assistant superintendent made a presentation at the high schools about MCAS scores that was seen as critical to staff understanding of the seriousness of the situation.

1. A member of the high-school staff reported that teachers had “no clue” about what the scores meant and noted that for some teachers it was the first time the meaning was clear.

2. Another member of the staff reported that for a while, “people who were not math, science or English thought this was not about them,” adding that the assistant superintendent articulated why this involved everyone at the high schools.

3. Members of the staff reported that the focus in 2016–2017 was on the “threat of becoming Level 4” and said: “We’re on code red right now and just focusing on math scores.”

**D.** In 2016–2017, district leaders are engaging more actively with the high-school principals and staff around curriculum and instruction.

1. The superintendent has charged the director of special education with working with high-school leaders to make the special education program more inclusive.

2. The assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability is working with the high schools for the first time, and estimates that she is spending close to half of her time on this work.

3. The district data specialist and the director of curriculum and professional development are working with the high school principals and others.

4. The district curriculum and professional development coordinator has begun meeting with high-school staff to examine the possibility of having students earn credits quarterly instead of by semester.

**Impact**: Without sufficient strategic direction, support, and accountability to improve teaching and learning at the high-school level, improvement in teaching practice and student achievement at the high-school level is compromised.

**3. At the time of the review, some high-school teachers and administrators indicated that communication, collaboration, and instructional leadership at the high schools could be improved.**

1. Association leaders and some teachers and administrators reported an absence of communication and collaboration at the high schools.
2. Association leaders and some teachers stated that they are not being listened to, and spoke of an absence of “system collaboration.”
3. Administrators and association leaders reported that the district has not followed up the TELL MASS Survey,[[9]](#footnote-9) and has not taken steps to include teacher feedback in the evaluation process for administrators.
4. Some teachers and administrators expressed the view that instructional leadership teams (ILTs) were not effective or representative voices for teachers, particularly the team at Chicopee Comprehensive which has lost members and is “in transition” after the departure of the vice principal who led the ILT.
5. Association leaders and some teachers and administrators expressed concern about instructional leadership, direction, consistency, and follow through at the high schools.

Some high-school teachers reported that administrators do not provide adequate instructional leadership, noting that some administrators have never been classroom teachers.

They also spoke of an absence of administrative visibility in classrooms, of long-term direction, and of support and follow–through.

3. Some high-school teachers said that supervisors have not gained the confidence of teachers who meet with them once a month in department meetings and at other times to discuss classroom observations as part of the evaluation process.

4. Some high-school teachers stated that inconsistency was a “big problem.”

5. Association leaders reported a general absence of collaboration and “participatory problem solving,” noting that there have been some recent efforts to create more teacher collaboration and solicit more teacher input at the high-school level.

**Impact**: Without effective communication and collaboration between teachers and administrators, efforts to improve programs and teaching and learning at the high-school level are likely to fall short.

**Recommendations**

**Under the leadership of the superintendent, a working group with wide representation should formally and systematically analyze student achievement data and other data and use this data to inform goals and priorities for action in the District Improvement Plan and in all School Improvement Plans.**

1. It is critically important that this stakeholder group recognize, and be committed to, the role of the District Improvement Plan (DIP) in creating a blueprint for student success, achieving greater teacher effectiveness, and strongly influencing each School Improvement Plan (SIP).
2. The district has several resources to inform this, including the State of the Schools report, practices in place K–8, and the TELL MASS Survey results.
3. The DIP should include the district’s mission or vision, goals, and priorities for action.

1. DIP goals should be SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked).

**D.** The DIP’s performance goals for students should drive the development, implementation, and modification of the district’s educational programs.

1. SIPs should be created in alignment with the DIP and based on an analysis of student achievement data.

a. Principals should provide the superintendent, school committee, and staff with regular updates on progress toward SIP goals.

b. The principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and progress toward Educator Plan goals should be used as evidence during implementation.

2. The identified district and school priorities established in the improvement plans should be supported by appropriate allocation of resources that are clearly identified in the improvement plans and in the annual district budget.

3. Professional development should be designed to support DIP initiatives and goals.

**E.** The DIP should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.

1. The superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff, families, and community on progress toward DIP goals.

2. The district should establish procedures to review the DIP annually. Strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted to meet current conditions.

3. The superintendent and the school committee should consider aligning some goals in the superintendent’s Educator Plan (as part of the educator evaluation system) with DIP goals.

**Benefits:** A broad effort to develop and communicate a District Improvement Plan, and to include all stakeholders in the improvement planning process, will clarify expectations, and refocus the energy of administrators and teachers on greater teacher effectiveness and improved student achievement. The DIP and the SIPs will provide guidance and ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district’s short- and long-term goals.

**Recommended resources:**

* The *Massachusetts Definition of College and Career Readiness* (<http://www.mass.edu/library/documents/2013College&CareerReadinessDefinition.pdf>) is a set of learning competencies, intellectual capacities and experiences essential for all students to become lifelong learners; positive contributors to their families, workplaces and communities; and successfully engaged citizens of a global 21st century. This could be a helpful resource as the district articulates its vision and goals.
* ESE’s *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
  + - *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/level-4-guiding-principles-effective-benchmarks.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
* *Massachusetts Transfer Goals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MATransferGoals.pdf>) are long range goals that students should work toward over the course of their PK-12 academic experience. They were written to provide an explicit connection between the standards-based Model Curriculum Units and Massachusetts’ definition of College and Career Readiness. They are not recommended for use as a checklist, evaluation tool, or as an assessment tool, but they could be a helpful resource for the district as it articulates a vision and engages in long-term planning.
  + 1. **Building on the practices in place K–8, the district should establish greater central office direction for improvement planning and implementation efforts at the high schools.**

1. The district should consider giving the position of assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability clear authority to oversee and monitor school improvement planning and implementation efforts.

1. Principals should be responsible for achieving and reporting on measurable progress toward SIP goals (see recommendation above).

1. The assistant superintendent should communicate with DSAC staff to ensure alignment of efforts.

**C.** The district should consider administering the ESE model staff feedback survey or developing its own instrument (see Human Resources and Professional Development recommendation below).

1. The district should lead a collaborative process for analyzing the results and using them to inform the high schools’ SIPs.

**Benefits:** Greater oversight and support by the district office will help ensure that administrators, supervisors, and teacher leaders at the high schools get the support and direction they need to develop, communicate, and follow through on plans for improving school climate, teaching practice, and student outcomes.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *Conditions for School Effectiveness* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/school-effect-self-assessment.pdf> , page 2) identify the research-based practices that all schools, especially the state's most struggling schools, require to effectively meet the learning needs of all students. This tool also defines what each condition looks like when implemented purposefully and with fidelity.
* *Turnaround Practices in Action* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>) is a practice guide that highlights practices and strategies observed in turnaround schools that have shown significant and rapid gains in student achievement. It presents key practices for consideration as avenues to improve and sustain ongoing and future turnaround efforts.
* *Quick Reference Guide: Student and Staff Feedback (*<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Feedback.pdf>) describes the rationale and requirements for using feedback from students and staff in the educator evaluation process.
* Using Student and Staff Feedback to Improve Practice (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/feedback/ImprovePractice.pdf>) is a practical guide to using feedback for teachers and school leaders developed by ESE’s Teacher and Principal Advisory Cabinets.
* ESE Model Feedback Instruments and Administration Protocols (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/feedback/surveys.html>) include a model staff feedback survey for school-level administrators developed by ESE.

Curriculum and Instruction

***Contextual Background***

After the retirement of a long-term assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability, the district appointed a former Chicopee elementary- and middle-school principal to the position in 2015. The assistant superintendent’s core responsibilities focus on curriculum as well as instruction and accountability through collaboration with the superintendent, principals, coaches, supervisors, and teachers. An assistant for curriculum and staff development, an assistant for English language learners and teacher support, and an instructional data specialist all work under the assistant superintendent’s leadership.

Chicopee’s process for ongoing curriculum review and revision for each content area is assigned to K–12 curriculum committees. Their work is more *ad hoc* than systematic and central office curriculum leaders recently discussed developing a more comprehensive and timely curriculum renewal process. Nevertheless, the ELA/English committee did identify the need for a K–5 core literacy program in 2015, the first new ELA program initiative in 14 years. The literacy program was piloted in 2015–2016 in three elementary schools and is now being implemented in all nine elementary schools.

K–12 ELA/English and math curriculum maps, using a Moodle platform,[[10]](#footnote-10) are aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts frameworks and identify standards, what students should know and be able to do, resources, suggested strategies, and some assessments. Math Moodles also include critical understandings, conceptual categories, and topics of study. In 2016, the district developed a new science/STEM Moodle for grades 1-6 aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and one for grades 7–12 is in process. However, the teaching of science has not been a priority in K–5. Only 4 of the 9 elementary schools have science teachers and K–5 science is taught only a few days a week.

Curriculum is taught using a highly structured instructional model introduced by the prior assistant superintendent that prescribes the pacing of lesson activities. Observations indicated that the model is well embedded in lesson design, particularly K–8.

District leaders reported that since the onsite review the district has begun to make changes to planning, assessments, training, instruction, and resources, especially at the high schools where the district plans to provide more small-group instruction, inclusive practices, and differentiated instruction.

**Strength Findings**

**1. The district provides adequate leadership and a collaborative process for curriculum renewal.**

**A.** The assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability is responsible for curriculum oversight, and works with curriculum committees to renew curriculum.

**B.** Administrators told the review team that the district has K–12 curriculum committees in ELA, math, and science who monitor and review curriculum, and have a role in decision making about curriculum.

1. Administrators said that one teacher from each school participates on the ELA and math committees and there are nine teachers on the science committee. The committees meet with the assistant superintendent 10 times a year. Principals do not attend curriculum committee meetings.
2. Administrators stated that committee members set the agenda for short- and long-term initiatives. Committee members are responsible for communicating information to their schools and the committee's meeting minutes are posted online.
3. The assistant superintendent keeps the district leadership team informed about curriculum initiatives at team meetings, at monthly meetings with all principals, and at separate monthly meetings with elementary and secondary principals. She also meets with principals individually to discuss school-specific curricular and instructional topics such as writing strategies and data.

**C.** Curriculum is updated and aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks in ELA and math K–12 and in science for grades 1–6.

1. The district completed alignment of the K–12 ELA and mathematics curriculum to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks in 2012, with additional revisions to K–5 ELA and math curriculum taking place in August 2013. Algebra 1 and Geometry were also revised in 2016.
2. A review of the district’s self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit indicated that the district completed alignment of the grade 1–6 science curriculum to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) in 2016. A review of science curriculum indicated that alignment to the NGSS for middle-school science and high-school biology, chemistry, and physics curriculum is incomplete; interviewees told the team that the alignment is in process.

**D.** The ELA curriculum committee was instrumental in initiating and helping to plan the adoption of the first new elementary core literacy program in the district in 14 years.[[11]](#footnote-11)

1. Administrators and teachers told the team that the program was piloted in 2015–2016 in 3 schools with different socio-economic profiles. The publisher provided three days of professional development (PD) to teachers in the pilot schools. One full day and two half-days of PD are planned for 2016–2017, tailored to school needs as the other 6 K–5 schools implement the program.

2. The ELA curriculum committee prepared a binder for each school of “lessons learned” during the pilot to support implementation in the other six schools.

3. The assistant superintendent and the new instructional data specialist, who is a former elementary literacy coach and teacher, are tracking and supporting adoption of the new program.

4. The literacy program is aligned to Common Core state standards. The district uses its online Moodle (i.e., curriculum map) to identify the sequence to teach standards from the 2011 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. The district is organizing a new committee to update Moodle resources to the new ELA program.

**E.** Multiple levels of school level staff are responsible for curriculum alignment, oversight and implementation, particularly in kindergarten through grade 8.

1. All K–5 schools have a full- or a part-time literacy coach (also called a literacy specialist or reading specialist) who meets regularly with teachers, the assistant superintendent, and the instructional data specialist. They coach teachers, share model lessons, and monitor curriculum alignment and implementation.

2. The schools do not have K–5 math coaches; however, elementary teachers who are members of the math curriculum committee serve as math liaisons to communicate information to their schools.

3. One full-time ELA coach and one full-time math coach at each middle school monitor curriculum implementation, model lessons, and coach teachers.

4. In several interviews and a focus group, the team was told that content supervisors in core academic departments function as department heads at Chicopee High School and at Chicopee Comprehensive High School.

a. Supervisors monitor curriculum pacing and ensure rigor and alignment to standards by observing lessons and checking lesson plans twice a month.

b. Principals expect supervisors to communicate with them about curriculum and instruction. However, principals’ expectations and frequency of meetings with supervisors and the keeping of department meeting minutes vary by school.

c. When asked about curriculum review, supervisors stated that they provided feedback to the curriculum committees. Updating curriculum can take place as new learning resources, such as new novels, are added to lesson themes.

**Impact**: With adequate leadership and collaboration, curriculum is monitored and revised in a timely way and students can benefit from updated lessons, units of study, and assessments that develop their mastery of the knowledge, and skills and understandings in the state curriculum frameworks. Carefully monitored and engaging curriculum can also provide students with rigorous and active learning experiences if attention is also given to implementing high-quality instructional practices.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction at the elementary and middle schools was substantially stronger than at the high schools where students were not consistently challenged with rigorous and high expectations for learning and higher-order thinking. Lessons in grades 9–12 did not consistently address students’ individual and diverse learning needs.**

* 1. **Focus Area #1 – Learning Objectives & Instruction** In most observed classrooms, teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content. At the same time, there was variation in the provision and use of learning objectives, the presence of high expectations aligned to the learning objective, and the use of appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objectives.
     1. In 84 percent of observed lessons, there was moderate and strong evidence that teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content (characteristic #1) so that most students fully participated in lesson activities.

2. The team saw moderate and strong evidence that teachers provided and referred to clear learning objectives (characteristic #2) in 50 percent of elementary lessons and in just 40 percent of high-school lessons. Only at the middle school, in 90 percent of lessons, did teachers consistently frame learning objectives so that students knew what they were learning that day. At the high schools, an agenda or list of tasks was often posted without learning objectives.

3. Observed lessons showed moderate and strong evidence of high expectations aligned to learning objective(s) (characteristic # 3) in 75 percent of elementary lessons, in 57 percent of middle-school lessons, and in only 48 percent of high-school lessons.

a. An example of a lesson that did not reflect high expectations was a grade 12 English vocabulary and reading comprehension test which required students to match vocabulary words in one column to definitions in a second column. The reading comprehension section consisted of six multiple-choice questions for two short reading selections. Students were not required to demonstrate understanding by using vocabulary words in sentences or provide responses to writing prompts to analyze and think more deeply about the readings.

b. In contrast, students challenged each other’s thinking in a grade 11 chemistry lab while discussing the law of conservation of mass in groups of four.

4. The team found moderate and strong evidence that appropriate instructional strategies were well matched to learning objectives (characteristic #4) in 85 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 86 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 48 percent of high-school lessons.

a. An example of a class that used appropriate instructional strategies was a grade 2 lesson to distinguish between common and proper nouns. An observer saw a variety of instructional activities and materials aligned with the objective, such as an exercise for pairs of students that stressed comprehension and students applying grammar rules to nouns. Similarly, in a grade 7 large-group math lesson, students learned to define related vocabulary and calculate unit rates and ratios and then practiced calculating in small-group activities and games.

b. In three high-school science lessons, the team observed limited instructional strategies. In one class, the teacher was lecturing, with a few students taking notes; in another, the teacher completed all the computations on the board while students copied them; in a third, the teacher lectured and there was no student verbal participation during the 20-minute observation.

**B. Focus Area #2 – Student Engagement & Critical Thinking** Classroom observations showed variation in how well lessons motivated and engaged students, in how well lessons encouraged students to develop higher-order thinking, and in how well students assumed responsibility for their own learning. The district has focused on student engagement as a characteristic of effective teaching since the 2015-2016 school year.

1. Observers noted moderate and strong evidence of student motivation and engagement (characteristic # 5) in 100 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 77 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 51 percent of high-school lessons.

* + - 1. In a grade 5 ELA lesson, students eagerly engaged in multiple writing tasks such as paired writing with buddies, conferencing with each other on completed writing, and working in small groups with a classroom aide. In a grade 7 math lesson on inequalities, pairs of students who completed an assignment were enthusiastically volunteering and sharing their work.
      2. In contrast, in a high school honors English class of 27 students with an objective to read and analyze text, 26 students listened to one student read aloud and seemed to struggle to pay attention to the analysis of text.

2. The team saw moderate and strong evidence that tasks encouraged students to develop and engage in critical thinking (characteristic #6) in 60 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 67 percent of middle-school lessons, and in only 48 percent of high-school lessons.

* + - 1. In one grade 5 math class, students were generally attentive and on task. However, the lesson on dividing decimals emphasized process rather than understanding and thinking about the mathematical concept.
      2. In an example of students engaging in developing and engaging in critical thinking, students in a grade 8 science lesson watched and intermittently discussed a NOVA video about the atomic structure and properties of gold, copper, and bronze. At the end of the video, they discussed how an engineer would think about atomic structure and properties when building something.
      3. Similarly, in a lively grade 8 ELA lesson, the teacher reviewed the use of figurative language by having students use complete sentences to describe what it meant to be “wiry,” “quizzical,” and “to equivocate.” Figurative language then became the topic of a kinesthetic exercise in which students moved sequentially from desk to desk every 15 seconds to record on a grid the type of figurative language used in sentences found on a card placed on each desk.
      4. In a high school English lesson, students responded to higher-order questions about a text and were asked to explain their thinking. However, engagement levels were very inconsistent since many students were not actively participating in the task. In that lesson, the teacher relied on volunteers to respond and they did so repeatedly while the rest of the class sat and listened, without asking or answering any questions.

3. Moderate and strong evidence of students assuming responsibility for their learning whether individually, in pairs or in groups (characteristic # 7) was seen in 95 percent of elementary lessons, in 72 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 36 percent of high-school lessons.

a. In a grade 2 math lesson, students enthusiastically worked in pairs rolling dice and using spinners to add numbers.

b. In a grade 8 ELA lesson on writing a literary essay, some students worked with the teacher in a focus group while others worked independently on writing activities either individually, in pairs, or in small groups.

c. In the two observed CTE classes, instructors were facilitators who enabled students to work individually or in groups to meet their specific lesson targets. Objectives, expectations, assignments, and steps were posted on the board and reviewed. In one class section, each student used a personal binder to manage and record the work. And in both classes, all students were engaged and motivated to complete their class assignments.

d. In contrast, in a high-school science class, students engaged more in off-task conversation than in the lesson.”

1. **Focus Area #3 – Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture** While review team members found that differentiated instruction was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction at all school levels, the instructional model with small-group work provided more differentiation K-8. Team members saw disparities across school levels in the alignment of appropriate resources to students’ diverse learning needs and in the use of formative assessments.
   * 1. There was moderate and strong evidence that teachers differentiated instruction to make lesson content accessible for all learners (characteristic #8) in 65 percent of elementary lessons, in only 34 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 23 percent of high-school lessons.
        1. In a number of observed elementary- and middle-school ELA lessons, students worked in a variety of settings in small groups using various materials and activities, usually with multiple adults to address specific learning needs for reading and writing.
        2. Many high-school lessons, on the other hand, were “one-size-fits-all” such as a teacher reading aloud to a whole group class. Further, in several high-school math classes teachers solved equations on the board while students watched and responded orally to questions by providing numbers to name the value of X or Y.
        3. In several high-school science classes, students sat listening to lectures, sometimes taking notes or responding to questions that sought lower-level answers rather than students’ engagement in critical thinking. In most observed science lessons, students did not explain the outcome of an experiment or engage in inquiry by seeking evidence or using observation. Of the dozen science classes observed at the three high schools over several days, only one was a lab.
     2. Team members observed moderate and strong evidence that appropriate resources (i.e., technology, manipulatives, support personnel) were aligned to students’ diverse learning needs (characteristic # 9) in 75 percent of elementary lessons, in only 48 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 33 percent of high-school lessons.

a. In a grade 4 ELA lesson, multiple activities simultaneously addressed the needs of student groups working on various reading comprehension and writing tasks; all were highly focused. Two students worked on laptops, one used a DVD player, and three small groups worked with adults on reading comprehension.

b. In a number of lessons, particularly at the elementary level, special education teachers, ELL teachers, and paraprofessionals addressed the specific learning needs of individuals or groups of students.

c. While observers noted well-equipped classrooms with white boards and/or digital projectors and flat-screen TVs, these devices were not fully used to enhance lessons. Rather, they were more often used as overhead projectors, particularly at the high school. At the elementary level, some teachers used the technology for the new *Wonders* literacy program. Middle-school math teachers used white boards to graph functions and complete equations.

* + 1. In observed classrooms, there was moderate and strong evidence that teachers conducted appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students (characteristic # 11) in 75 percent of elementary lessons, in 81 percent of middle-school lessons, and in only 46 percent of high-school lessons.

a. Examples of effective formative assessments include a first grade ELA lesson on writing, punctuation and question words in which students wrote a paragraph and then were asked questions about their writing using “what?” “why?” and “how many?” They then were asked to read their paragraph into a microphone and listen to themselves to assess their work. In a middle school ELA lesson, students were asked to provide textual evidence in a writing exercise to demonstrate that Oliver Twist did not have an easy life.

**Impact**: Inconsistencies in the quality of instruction means that all students are not benefitting from strong, purposeful, and rigorous lessons that prepare them well for their next steps as learners. At the high-school level, the low incidence of effective instructional strategies indicates many missed opportunities to maximize students’ learning potential and achievement.

**3. District efforts to improve instruction have not sufficiently focused on developing teaching strategies that lead to high engagement and achievement for all students. All schools do not have regular, frequent time for grade-level or content-based teams to collaborate to improve instruction.**

1. The district has defined an instructional model that emphasizes lesson structure, but does not sufficiently introduce challenging content and active learning strategies that require students to make meaning of their learning, engage often in critical thinking, and apply knowledge and skills.

Multiple interviews, focus groups, and lesson observations indicated that in general the expectations for high-quality teaching in the district included providing a standards-based learning objective(s) in student-friendly language, a 10-minute “Do Now,” followed by 15–20 minutes of teacher-led large-group instruction and then small-group activities for practice or enrichment. Interviewees said that lessons should end with a “wrap-up” such as a summary or an assessment.

The team observed that the lesson structure was not consistently used to emphasize deeper, more rigorous ideas and critical thinking.

In observed classrooms in the high schools, students were not always required to demonstrate understanding of key concepts and lessons were often teacher-centered with students responding to questions with short answers, taking notes, or copying as a teacher solved an equation on the board in a math or science class.

**B.** Instructional improvement efforts have focused on a number of “best practices” each year, but these practices have not become consistently and effectively embedded in teaching across all schools.

1. Interviews and a document review indicated that improvement initiatives have prioritized student engagement, differentiated instruction, and higher-order thinking skills. These topics have been addressed in professional development, shared videos, and faculty meetings and have been the focus of classroom observations.

2. However, classroom observations conducted during the review team’s visit indicated that these strategies are not rooted in instructional practice across all schools.[[12]](#footnote-12)

3. In particular, differentiated instruction to meet the needs of the district’s increasingly more diverse learners was the least well-developed characteristic of high-quality instruction at all levels.

**C.** Also, there were variations in improvement efforts at the middle schools. For example, at one middle school learning walks were implemented with support from DSAC, when the school was designated a Level 3 school. Interviewees said that at the other middle school learning walks were not replicated because it was designated a Level 2 school without DSAC support. The district did not have in place an initiative to support learning walks at both schools.

**D.** Staff in specific roles share responsibility for instructional improvement at the school level, but their efforts are uncoordinated.

1. The district has full-time and part-time literacy coaches but does not have math coaches in the elementary schools or full-time literacy and math coaches in the middle schools. There is little clarity and consistency about the role of coaches, especially K–5.

a. An administrator told the team that there is no district model for coaching. The time allocated for coaching varies across K–5 schools and each principal has a different view of the role; for example, some coaches teach, others do not.

2. Part-time content supervisors at Chicopee High School and Chicopee Comprehensive High School function as department heads. They meet regularly with their principal to address school and department concerns and monthly with the assistant superintendent to discuss improvement strategies, but meetings do not always focus on improving teaching and learning.

a. When asked about the focus of meetings with principals, supervisors from one high school said that the meetings focus on a wide range of topics, such as parking and assigning student parking spaces.

a. When asked about the focus of meetings with principals, supervisors from one high school said that the meetings focus on a wide range of topics, such as parking and assigning student parking spaces.

3. High-school instructional leadership teams (ILTs) were appointed in response to the NEASC follow-up planning process. ILT members and leaders described the ILT’s role as supporting teachers, but noted that practices were inconsistent across schools.

a. In the 2015–2016 school year, the ILT at one high school learned to conduct walkthroughs with support from DSAC (District and School Assistance Center) as part of the school’s focus on improving student engagement. In 2016–2017, however, walkthroughs are “morphing into more informal peer observations” because teachers want to see whole lessons rather than focus on improving specific qualities of high-quality practice.

b. At another high school, the ILT is starting to add value because of effective follow-up on recent district initiatives. A district leader gave as an example how well the ILT and teachers were beginning to analyze and discuss data.

d. In a focus group, high-school teachers expressed the view that the ILT is an extension of the administration rather than an opportunity for collaborative problem solving.

e. High-school ILT members and teachers in focus groups stated that efforts to improve teaching were done in “crisis mode” or “code red.” The emphasis was to improve MCAS results, since the perception was that both high schools were close to Level 4 status.

4. Principals’ efforts to improve instruction are inconsistent and unevenly effective across school levels.

a. Principals stated that they share their expectations for teaching with teachers and gave several examples: being well organized, having a specific plan, differentiation, student engagement, groupings based on data, and using technology well.

b. Principals stated that they informally walk through lessons, often daily, to check various practices such as differentiation, curriculum pacing, and student engagement.

c. When teachers were asked in focus groups about principals’ learning walks, the quality of feedback, and the principal’s role in improving teaching, some teachers noted that their principal was approachable, listened to their concerns, and observed and shared what worked well and what was not working well. Other teachers indicated that principals’ walkthroughs were rare, and that they received little feedback to help them improve their practice.

**E.** Time for teachers to collaborate and meet with coaches or with supervisors to address improvement goals varies across levels.

1. Administrators and teachers described common planning time in elementary schools as informally organized during common prep time and more formal when data was discussed. Regular, frequent time for all grade-level teams to collaborate with coaches and each other on improvement initiatives does not exist in all elementary schools.

2. At the middle schools, teachers have regular common planning time when they work with coaches and collaborate in content teams or in interdisciplinary grade-level teams.

3. High-school teachers at one school described common planning time when they have shared time with a colleague who teaches the same course as “random with no accountability.”

4. At Chicopee High School, the grade 9 team meets daily in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) to talk about students, instruction, special education, and academic content. Interviewees described common planning time for teachers of grades 10-12 as “sporadic,” usually every other day with teachers who teach the same courses.

**Impact**: Without sufficient opportunities for students to engage in learning experiences that help them to think critically and analytically and without lessons structured to be accessible by all learners, the district’s students are not well prepared for the next stage of their education or for work and careers. Without frequent, structured common planning time, teachers have limited opportunities to improve instruction in a collaborative and consistent way.

**Recommendation**

**1. The district should ensure that the taught curriculum develops students’ higher-order thinking and that instruction provides all students with opportunities to learn at high levels.**

**A.** The district should convene a representative group of teachers and administrators to enhance its instructional model to ensure that students are sufficiently engaged in challenging learning experiences that promote the development and application of critical thinking skills, understanding, and the application of knowledge.

1. Key instructional strategies should be defined as the district’s non-negotiables.

2. These might be drawn from the best practices that the district has focused on in the past.

3. The group should include high-school teachers to ensure that the instructional model meets the need for instructional improvement at the secondary level.

**B.** The district should also fine-tune the curriculum and units of study to reinforce deeper learning through the inclusion of:

* Learning goals (i.e., content standards, objectives, learning outcomes)
* Enduring understandings (the “big ideas” that students will understand)
* Essential questions (the questions that foster inquiry, understanding, and the application/transfer of learning)
* More personalized learning activities for large and small groups tailored to students’ diverse learning needs
* Performance tasks for some assessments and evidence of understanding for others

1. The district has the *Understanding by Design* (curriculum mapping resource) to support this.

**C.** Once key instructional strategies have been identified and curriculum has been revised to reinforce deeper learning, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing these instructional expectations with staff.

1. Using grade-level, department meetings, faculty meetings common planning time and/or professional development days, the district is encouraged to discuss instructional strategies.

**D.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they provide more student-centered, engaging learning experiences.

1. Professional development should focus on key instructional strategies.

2. Teachers should receive frequent, helpful feedback that enables them to continually improve their instruction (see Human Resources and Professional Development recommendation below).

3. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district’s expectations for instruction.

4. The district should review and if possible modify teaching schedules so that teachers at all levels have regular, frequent common planning and meeting time that can be used to collaboratively reflect on and improve curriculum and instruction and coaches have sufficient opportunities to supervise and work with groups.

a. The district has models to build on in the grade 9 Professional Learning Community at Chicopee High School and the common planning structure at the middle schools.

b. The district should consider providing opportunities for teams to learn lesson study, to use peer observations, and to look at student work---as vehicles for collaborative reflection and action to improve teaching and learning.

c. The administrative team is encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs districtwide in pairs/small groups, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers. The district has a model to build on at Bellamy Middle School.

**E.** The district should clarify the responsibilities of coaches, supervisors, principals, and school-based groups whose work focuses on curricular and instructional improvement.

**Benefits**: Implementing this recommendation will mean clear and articulated expectations for administrators and teachers for key instructional strategies. This will provide a common language that will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. A district that provides high-quality instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement, resulting in professional growth and increased student achievement.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf>) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units.
    - *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=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.
    - *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/CandI/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf>) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.
    - Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.
* ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

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

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

Assessment

***Contextual Background***

The district has assigned responsibility for the collection and analysis of student performance data systemwide to the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability. District oversight of data collection and analysis was formalized in 2015 after the prior assistant superintendent, who focused on K–8 data literacy, retired. In 2016, an instructional data specialist began to assist K–12 teachers and school leaders with the analysis of data, a position expanded from an existing data technician role.

There are consistent practices at each of nine elementary and two middle schools with clear expectations about how data is collected, disseminated, and used to guide instruction. The K–8 schools use several sources of data: DIBELS, Discovery, Computational Fluency Progress Monitoring assessments, and common writing benchmarks. Several of these serve as K–8 District-Determined Measures (DDMs). Data is compiled and compared with early warning indicators on “data sheets” and “at a glance” forms for teachers. There are formal data teams at the middle-school level while in the elementary grades data is formally analyzed at grade-level meetings. K–8 teachers have common planning time or grade-level meeting time to analyze data. Students’ progress on assessments is monitored so that students can flow in and out of intervention groups depending on their needs. Data literacy is evident in teachers’ discussions about the value of using data to plan for student learning. The K–8 instructional model provides opportunities for teachers to form small groups for more strategic teaching.

The three high schools are in the early stages of using data to improve student achievement. Clear, consistent expectations for the collection and use of data at the high school have not been set. Data team members and some school leaders have participated in summer DSAC (District and School Assistance Center) data institutes and are actively working with the DSAC to formalize and improve practices. The three high schools do not collaborate on data analysis so there is limited analysis of student performance data across the district. Within each school, each content-area supervisor has responsibility for analyzing and disseminating data for his or her content area, likely contributing to the variability in teachers’ skill in the use of data. All high schools assess basic reading competency using the Scholastic Reading Inventory although some content area supervisors expressed the belief that this was insufficient and not aligned to more complex high-school reading requirements. The high schools also use content area benchmark essays, open-response assessments, and content area mid-term and final exams, some of which have been identified as DDMs. All high schools mainly rely on MCAS tests to identify curricular gaps and to identify students who need academic support.

**Strength Finding**

1. **At the elementary- and middle-school levels the district has developed structures to collect and analyze multiple sources of data to inform instruction and student interventions. Data literacy is apparent in the way K–8 educators talk about and conduct their work, including modifying instruction based on assessment data.**

**A.** The assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability is responsible for data analysis at the district level and oversight of school-level data teams. She also conducts professional development workshops on data analysis for school leaders and teams.

1. The district has a full-time instructional data specialist, responsible to the assistant superintendent, who provides data reports and support with analysis to principals and teams of teachers.

* + 1. The collection and disaggregation of assessment data at the school level is typically the responsibility of a team of individuals that may include coaches, grade-level teachers, program leaders, and vice-principals.

a. SchoolBrains is the district’s parent and student portal; data team members also create user-friendly reports called data-sheets or at-a-glance reports for each teacher.

b. Elementary- and middle-school teams monitor local and EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) data to track factors such as attendance, tardiness, and behavioral referrals that may have an impact on learning.

c. All teams meet regularly; for example administrators at one elementary school reported that five times per year they replace a scheduled faculty meeting with an “intervention” meeting to track students using data. At another school, following benchmark testing, each classroom teacher meets with an interventionist to talk about at risk students. At one middle school, in addition to looking at data from sending schools, coaches attend monthly meetings with teachers to identify patterns.

* + 1. K–8 schools have instructional support teams (ISTs) that use data to monitor the effectiveness of interventions for individual students.
  1. Teams and teachers at the elementary- and middle-school levels demonstrate data literacy and effectively analyze and use data to drive decision-making.
     1. Elementary teachers use data to cluster students for the next school year, to form and continuously re-form instructional groups within their classes, and to determine participation and effectiveness in intervention services. Teachers at each school have formally scheduled meetings to use data to track students and to decide what to do next with the students. Some elementary schools have a data wall in the room where the ILT meets so that whole-school progress can be monitored and students who may be at risk are clearly visible to teachers.

Elementary teachers have received professional development on developing “meaningful and differentiated centers” to better match center activity to individual learners’ needs.

In observations of 20 elementary classrooms, the team found moderate and strong evidence in 15 classes (75 percent) of the use of strategies such as “dipsticking” or selective questioning to check for understanding.

* + 1. Middle- school teachers use data to plan for small groups within their classes, and to analyze the curriculum and make accommodations. Data analysis also guides instructional strategies. Middle-school teachers told the team that if they wished to instruct in a different way they could “try it out” as long as they collected data to show how the strategy worked.
       1. In observations of 21 middle-school classrooms, the team observed moderate and strong evidence of the use of formative assessments in 75 classrooms (81 percent). For example, teachers were observed conferencing with students during writing classes, helping them to develop their thinking and clarify their writing.
       2. Instructional support teams (ISTs) use data to monitor students’ progress. At the middle schools, students who participate in Café Catchup and “ICU” help sessions are also monitored for progress and may exit either program when school performance improves.
  1. Data collection and dissemination processes are characterized by the continuous collection and timely dissemination of academic and EWIS data.
     1. interviews with district and program leaders and classroom teachers and a document review indicated that K–8 teachers administer numerous formative, summative, benchmark, and diagnostic assessments in math and ELA up to three times per year to assess student learning. These include: writing benchmarks, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Discovery ELA and math benchmarks, grade 6–8 Computational Fluency Benchmark and Progress Monitoring (grades 6–8), and science benchmarks (grades 4–7).
     2. Principals, counselors, and/or teachers at the elementary- and middle-school levels cross reference academic and EWIS data to identify at-risk students, to determine the reasons why they may be at risk, and to ask, “What are we doing or what can we do?” The team observed in one elementary school’s staff meeting room a display of student data on a wall that showed the progress of groups of students throughout the year.
     3. Interviewees told the team that the elementary and middle schools also use data from numerous student, teacher, and parent surveys for program planning and evaluation.

**Impact**: Because the elementary and middle schools have developed structures to analyze data they are able to effectively monitor students’ progress to make instructional decisions in the classroom and assess program effectiveness. Teachers speak knowledgeably about the progress of their students and the impacts of intervention programs; they are able to communicate how and why they group students daily to provide strategic instruction based on student performance data.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. At the high schools the use of data to improve practice and inform decision-making is limited. The high schools have insufficient data sources to monitor student progress and to plan for improvement. Teachers do not have sufficient focused support in understanding and using data to improve classroom teaching and learning.**

**A.** The high schools have few common practices and no common protocols for the use of data. In 2016–2017, the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability is in her first year overseeing data analysis districtwide; the high schools have had many years of autonomy.

1. The assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability assumed the role in 2015 and her predecessor focused mainly on kindergarten through grade 8.

* 1. District leaders expressed awareness that the secondary schools’ systems of data analysis are missing coherency and consistency. They noted that compared with the elementary- and middle-school levels the high schools are in the elementary stages of data-based decision making.

2. Each high school has identified staff members who are responsible for disaggregating the data and disseminating it to the appropriate content-area teachers. At each high school, content-area supervisors (department heads) are responsible for conducting analyses of the data that is provided by the K–12 instructional data specialist using spreadsheets and SchoolBrains.

a. The district does not have a data team to compare student performance across all programs and schools.

3. Because analysis takes place independently at each high school, activities that might lead to improvement are not consistent and are not formally shared across all schools. For example, at one school a content-area supervisor identified low growth on the MCAS long composition and planned professional development to identify the focus concept and “weave it across the essay.” Another group identified the need for attention to math skills and began an initiative to review math briefly at the start of class in other content areas.

a. One district leader said that some initiatives “bubble up” and are useful, but they do not make it into the other schools.

* 1. High-school teachers said there were too many initiatives to improve instruction. They said that they were not long term and there was little follow-through.
  2. School leaders stated that “while the conversations about data have grown,” all three high schools are at different places of readiness in using data to inform instruction. There are no common protocols for organizing and analyzing the data.
  3. High-school teachers said that they wanted clarification and direction from school leaders about data. They told the team that data was not shared and explained systematically and regularly.

i. Data team members, coaches, and administrators expressed the view that a fall 2015 presentation by the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability “for the first time” made performance data clear to some teachers.

4. In observed high-school classrooms, the review team found moderate and strong evidence that teachers conducted appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students in only 46 percent of classrooms.

**Impact**: Without uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices needed for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of data districtwide, the district cannot target curriculum and instruction based on students’ progress and needs or provide professional development and support to guide teachers’ use of data.

**Recommendation**

**1. The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data sources.**

**A.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data across the district.

1. Building on the practices in place K–8, the district should establish systematic, consistent processes for the analysis and use of assessment data.

a. The district should ensure that all assessments, particularly at the high school level, are aligned with appropriate curricular and grade-level expectations.

2. The district should ensure that educators at all levels use data strategically to inform instruction, ongoing curriculum revision, program evaluation, and the educator evaluation system.

a. Data use should include ongoing analysis of the performance of student subgroups.

**B.** Ongoing, targeted training in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided for staff in each school, grade level, and subject area.

1. Training should include, for appropriate staff, the development of skills to use EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) and Edwin Analytics for making decisions about high-needs students.

2. District leaders and teachers should review how meetings are used; these could provide opportunities for more frequent data analysis to improve response time to student performance data.

**C.** District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision making, including budget development, district and school improvement plans, and the evaluation of educational programs and services.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will provide clarity and consistency in the district’s use of data for decision-making. It will help all stakeholders to evaluate programs, texts, and services. It will enable the district to provide all students with greatly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - ESE’s *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.
    - ESE’s *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/leadership-and-governance.html>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
    - ESE’s *Student Growth Model* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/>) provides links to tutorials and documents that explain the Student Growth Model, along with research supporting the model, materials to help education leaders present the model, and links to student growth data.

Human Resources and Professional Development

***Contextual Background***

The Chicopee Public Schools were last reviewed by ESE in 2011. In that review report the district’s professional development (PD) program was described as effective and comprehensive and characterized by collaborative planning, adequate support, and proper differentiation in order to meet the needs of educators at all stages of their professional career. The review team observed many of those same attributes during the current review, as well as evidence of improved long-term planning, communication, and alignment of the district’s PD program with district and school priorities and goals.

The 2011 district review report also identified a number of concerns about district policies and practices for the evaluation of its professional staff. Among the most significant was the absence of “instructive comments” and feedback needed to improve the professional competencies of teachers, inconsistent and uneven supervisory and evaluative policies and practices across the district, and the missed opportunity to annually complete performance evaluations for principals and district administrators. Although the district was an early adopter of the state Educator Evaluation Framework and has made a genuine effort to meet the requirements and support the full implementation of the educator evaluation framework, many of the challenges noted in the earlier review of the district’s evaluative policies and practices remain. Further, the district has not implemented more recent components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework that require the collection of multiple measures of evaluative evidence.

**Strength Finding**

**1. The district demonstrates a commitment to creating and sustaining a collaborative and comprehensive professional development program that supports teachers at all stages of their careers, and is based on district and school priorities, staff needs, and student achievement data.**

**A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district’s professional development (PD) program is well developed, planned, and supported. It seeks to promote adult learning through ongoing and differentiated programming and effective communication, and by emphasizing a shared responsibility for student achievement. Further, it is aligned with a number of key components of the Massachusetts *Standards for Professional Development*. The guiding principles of these standards ensure that PD: (a) is intentional; (b) is a structured, comprehensive, and coordinated process; and (c) requires strong leadership.

**B.** The district’s PD committee meets regularly and is responsible for overall planning and programming.

1. Interviewees said that the committee is a collaborative group composed of teacher representatives from the elementary-, middle- and high-school levels, and includes the president of the Chicopee Education Association. The committee is chaired by the assistant for curriculum and staff development and supported directly by the office of the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability.

* + - 1. Teachers on the committee indicated that they felt empowered through this leadership opportunity and stated that they have played an active and important role in developing improved PD programs, services, and communication over the past several years.

**C.** The district has developed a comprehensive two-year PD plan which contains goals that are clear, specific, and focused on improving professional practice and student learning.

1. Committee members said that efforts are made to ensure that the goals are measurable and aligned with priorities articulated in the District Improvement Plan and School Improvement Plans.

2. Interviewees stated that PD planning is increasingly informed by the collection and analysis of multiple sources of student data including MCAS results, benchmark writing, Scholastic Inventory reading, Discovery benchmarks in ELA and math, DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), restorative practice and suspension data, as well as academic data beginning to be generated by grade level and content-area common assessments across the district.

3. Committee members reported that considerable efforts are also made to compile data from staff for the planning and evaluation of PD programs.

a. They stated that an annual online needs assessment is posted each spring to solicit teacher input for offerings.

b. An annual technology use survey is administered in June to gather faculty feedback to identify PD technology needs.

c. Also, online feedback surveys for all PD offered throughout the year are used to evaluate the effectiveness of current programs and plan PD.

d. The results of all surveys are posted on the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Support webpage.

**D.** Interviewees described the district’s PD programming as designed to advance and properly balance district goals and priorities with those unique to individual schools. Further, in order to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach, programs are differentiated to meet the diverse needs, interests, and skill and experience levels of the professional staff.

1. Interviewees said that programming is flexible and is provided in a variety of ways, including whole-staff workshops, small study groups, reading groups, individually pursued learning, mini-workshops, and small focus groups.

a. A notable component of the district’s PD program is its partnership with Elms College in Chicopee. Interviews and a review of the district’s PD plan indicated that staff members are provided a subsidized rate for up to two courses in the fall and two in the spring based on agreed upon eligibility criteria and funding availability.

**E.** The district is trying to provide expanded opportunities for staff to meet, share ideas, and work together to achieve well-defined goals.

1. Although embedded teacher common planning time is currently limited primarily to the middle schools and grade 9 at Chicopee High School, interviewees identified a number of alternative structures for staff collaboration. They include: five full days of PD built into the school calendar, monthly faculty, department, and grade-level meetings that are often designated for specified PD work, summer and weekend programs, and offerings provided to staff through district, state, and federal funds and grants.

* + - 1. At the time of the onsite in December 2016, members of the PD committee told the review team that plans are underway to offer after-school mini-courses to teachers beginning in January 2017. The mini-course catalogue was being finalized. Members of the PD committee said that faculty presenters would receive stipends and attendees, PDPs.

**Impact**: The district has made notable efforts to develop a comprehensive and coordinated PD program and structures with the capacity to effectively support all educators, advance district priorities, and focus on improving student achievement. If sustained, this commitment to providing opportunities and supports for educators to work together in purposeful ways and on well defined district needs and strategic goals has the potential to create a culture of continuous professional growth and an increasing recognition of the shared responsibility among all staff for student learning. Ultimately, these efforts should result in significant and lasting improvements in classroom practices, professional competencies, curriculum, and most importantly in creating enriched learning opportunities and increased academic achievement for all students.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system. It has not taken action on the more recent components of the Educator Evaluation Framework that require the collection and use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence.**

**A.** The district was an early adopter of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework and it has made a genuine effort to comply with its technical requirements, procedures, and timelines, including initial and ongoing training for district administrators.

1. Principals reported that they are responsible for the implementation of the educator evaluation system within their respective schools and that they closely monitor the process to ensure that all evaluative components and contractual requirements are adhered to and that all timelines are met.

a. Principals stated that they use the district’s TeachPoint software system to monitor the quality and timeliness of all evaluative documentation.

2. Principals indicated that in an effort to improve the overall quality of teacher evaluations and inter-rater reliability among the district’s many evaluators, the district has hired an educational consultant to provide ongoing training and support.

3. Interviewees told reviewers that the district maintains an Implementation Committee to monitor the ongoing implementation of the educator evaluation system to ensure consistency and equity across the district’s schools.

**B.** Although the district has met the technical and procedural requirements of the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework, overall implementation has been uneven and inconsistent.

1. The team reviewed the evaluative documentation of 30 teachers randomly selected from schools across the district. Although supporting documents (e.g., self assessments, goal setting, educator plans, etc.) were generally timely and complete, the evaluations themselves, both formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations, were typically abbreviated and incomplete. They often contained few instructional details and little concrete supporting evidence. They rarely provided feedback for improved classroom practice that was specific, measurable, or actionable, nor did they contain recommendations capable of improving instruction or contributing to professional growth.

2. Team members conducted a similar review of the evaluation folders of all 16 district principals. Because administrative evaluations have not been included in the district’s TeachPoint system, the team was not able to access the evaluative documentation (e.g. goal setting, self assessments, supporting data, etc.). As was the case with teachers, principal evaluations seldom were informative or instructive.[[13]](#footnote-13) They generally did not contain feedback or recommendations that were specific, actionable, or of sufficient quality to contribute in any meaningful way to the principal’s professional growth or enhanced leadership capacity.

a. Although the state’s educator evaluative regulations require administrators to provide teachers with “effective and timely supervision and evaluation,” to make “frequent unannounced visits to classrooms,” and to “give targeted and constructive feedback to teachers,” reviewers noted the absence in the principals’ evaluations of any references to these expectations or to the degree to which they were being met.

3. In well-attended focus groups, teachers expressed ambivalence as well as dissatisfaction with the educator evaluation system. They indicated that evaluative practices, expectations, and the overall quality and value of teacher evaluations themselves varied widely across the district and within individual schools.

a. Some teachers, particularly at the middle schools, expressed the view that the educator evaluation system had resulted in increased administrative visibility in their classrooms and improved communication and collaboration around goal setting and instructional practice.

b. Many teachers in the elementary focus group indicated that educator evaluation was “not very authentic” and was “very factory-esque.” In general, they described it as “task centered” and “not helpful.”

c. High-school teachers articulated the strongest dissatisfaction, reporting that there was “little administrative presence or visibility…in classrooms” and that administrators “don’t walk through classrooms.” They mentioned the absence of collaboration, consistency, and communication as contributing to morale problems, expressed the belief that administrators were “not invested in the classroom,” and concurred that current evaluative practices were “not improving classroom instruction in any meaningful way.”

**C.** As of the 2015–2016 school year, state educator evaluation regulations (603 CMR 35.07) call for all districts to collect and use student feedback as evidence in a teacher evaluation process and staff feedback as evidence in the administrator evaluation process.[[14]](#footnote-14) The district is currently out of compliance with this regulatory requirement.

Administrators and teachers acknowledged that the district has not taken action to implement this component of the educator evaluation system.

**D.** The educator evaluation regulations also require the identification of common assessments to assess student learning, growth, or achievement and inform judgments about educator impact. Interviewees noted some progress with this regulatory requirement.

1. Under the direction of the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability the district has been working for the past two years to develop a comprehensive battery of common academic assessments and has devoted some professional development to it.

2. Interviewees stated that relevant assessments are included in a teacher’s TeachPoint folder. They acknowledged that this data is not included or reflected in teachers’ evaluations.

**Impact:**  The Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework has the potential to transform teaching, learning, and leadership and thereby provide greatly enhanced academic opportunities for all students. By not systematically expanding the competencies and enhancing the professional skills and practices of its teachers and administrators, the district is missing a critical opportunity to create significantly improved learning experiences and increased academic achievement for its students. Without moving forward with the systematic collection and use of student and staff feedback and multiple common assessments of student learning, the district limits its ability to promote the professional competencies of staff and to enhance learning opportunities, classroom instruction, and academic achievement for all students.

**Recommendation**

**1. The district should fully and effectively implement all components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework. Prioritized attention should be given to improving the overall quality and efficacy of teachers’ and administrators’ evaluations and to developing systems for the collection and appropriate use of multiple sources of evidence to inform educators’ evaluations.**

**A.** The district’s Implementation Committee should review current supervisory policies, practices, and expectations to ensure that the quantity and quality of evaluative feedback, both written and oral, is enhanced.

Additional and ongoing training, coaching, and support should be provided to enhance the supervisory practices and evaluative skills of all administrators and evaluators.

Evaluators should serves as instructional coaches/mentors to educators, to provide feedback that is continuous, frequent, and focused on specific professional practice and skills.

The district should support and monitor the skills and practices of all evaluators to ensure that they are providing all staff with high-quality instructional feedback that is timely, informative, instructive, and conducive to professional growth and overall effectiveness.

All administrators should receive ongoing training to observe and to analyze instruction and to provide feedback focused directly on practice, growth, and student achievement.

**B.** In order to implement the requirements of the state educator evaluation regulations, the district is urged to move forward promptly with the development and appropriate use of multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement.

**Benefits**: The state’s Educator Evaluation Framework is designed to provide teachers and administrators with the kinds of evidence-based, growth-oriented feedback and support required to significantly improve professional practice, expand competencies, and improve student achievement. The full and effective implementation of all components of the district’s educator evaluation system will likely promote the professional growth of teachers and leaders---and through the use of multiple measures of student learning---place student learning at the center of all district improvement efforts.

**Recommended resources:**

Educator Evaluation Implementation Surveys for Teachers: ([www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf) ) and Administrators ([www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf)) are designed to provide schools and districts with feedback about the status of their educator evaluation implementation. Information from these surveys can be used to target district resources and supports where most needed to strengthen implementation.

Student Support

***Contextual Background***

Demographics in the Chicopee Public Schools have changed over the last five years. According to ESE data, while total school enrollment has been relatively constant,[[15]](#footnote-15) the white population has decreased steadily from 64 percent in 2012 to 57 percent in 2016, and the Hispanic/Latino population has increased steadily from 29 percent in 2012 to 35 percent in 2016. Hispanic/Latino students now constitute more than one-third of the total district enrollment. Also, many students come to school every day with high programmatic and support needs. For example, 48 percent of Chicopee’s students are economically disadvantaged, compared with 27 percent statewide. The district’s students with disabilities make up 19 percent of enrollment, slightly above the state average of 17 percent.

Chicopee has developed systematic procedures for identifying and addressing the needs of struggling students and students at risk at the elementary- and middle-school levels. Instructional support teams identify students using the Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), locally administered benchmark assessments, teacher referrals, and other indicators. Students are assigned to tiered interventions based on the severity of their needs. Interventions are provided within and outside the general education classroom by general education teachers, intervention teachers, paraprofessionals, and other support personnel. Instructional support teams develop intervention plans for students and evaluate the effectiveness of these plans within six weeks. If students do not make sufficient progress, students are referred for an evaluation. Support services at the high-school level are not organized or administered as a coherent program.

Chicopee does not have a systematic process for analyzing patterns and trends on a range of student performance indicators to determine why certain student subgroups are not making satisfactory progress and to guide the development of districtwide strategies to meet students’ needs. For example, according to the latest available ESE data, district Hispanic/Latino students have low representation on indicators of achievement, including the four-year graduation rate,[[16]](#footnote-16) the MassCore[[17]](#footnote-17) completion rate,[[18]](#footnote-18) and the proportion of Advanced Placement test-takers.[[19]](#footnote-19) Correspondingly, district Hispanic /Latino students have high representation on indicators of need, including dropout,[[20]](#footnote-20) in-school suspension,[[21]](#footnote-21) out-of-school suspension,[[22]](#footnote-22) and chronic absence[[23]](#footnote-23) rates. Chicopee High School’s students with disabilities and Hispanic/Latino students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups, and Chicopee Comprehensive High School’s students with disabilities and high needs students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups. Chicopee Academy and Chicopee Comprehensive High School experience low graduation rates. Chicopee High also has a persistently low graduation rate for students with disabilities.

The district has created or adopted a wide range of academic, behavioral, social-emotional, health, and safety programs at all levels and strong career development and career/vocational technical education programs. In addition, Chicopee has implemented the Second Step social skills program in pre-kindergarten through grade 8 and the Steps to Respect bullying prevention program as a supplement to Second Step in grades 3-6. The district has instituted a peer mediation program at all three high schools and offers the Safe Dates program at both middle schools and the three high schools to prevent physical, psychological, and sexual abuse in dating relationships. Chicopee offers Talking about Touch in kindergarten and grade 1 to help young children keep themselves safe from abuse, and Signs of Suicide districtwide to help students recognize and respond to signs of suicide. The district implements the Michigan Model for Comprehensive School Health Education in all grades to facilitate the learning of health education topics in the disciplines.

The district has not developed a directory to categorize its numerous programs and services by domain, grade level, and school, including the personnel responsible, and applicable entry and exit criteria. It has also not designed a formal procedure for evaluating the effectiveness of its student support programs and services to inform decisions about maintaining, improving, or eliminating them. The district relies primarily upon anecdotal data to make these decisions.

Chicopee has established an attendance office with an attendance supervisor and three attendance liaisons. The attendance office helps school personnel monitor absence and assists them in working with students and families to resolve problems that interfere with regular attendance. Although the district has focused on improving student attendance through early identification of students at risk, increased monitoring, family support, and consistent enforcement of the attendance policy, chronic absence rates remain high. According to ESE data, in 2016 the chronic absence rates at the high-school level were as follows: grade 9, 17.2 percent; grade 10, 26.0 percent; grade 11, 21.4 percent; and grade 12, 25.3 percent.

The district identifies homeless students at registration and provides timely access to programs. Guidance counselors and principals identify families who become homeless, or double up with other families. The district’s homeless coordinator makes educational and transportation provisions for students whose families are living in apartments and in shelters that share living areas. For example, the district arranges transportation for some students to the schools they attended in their former communities of residence. According to district data, the homeless student population in Chicopee declined from 374 in 2014 to 118 in 2016-2017 because of the closing of a number of motels.

**Strength Findings**

**1. The district offers a continuum of specialized programs that address students’ learning, behavioral, and social-emotional needs and enables almost all Chicopee students to attend district schools.**

**A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has developed a continuum of substantially separate programs that serve students with disabilities from the age of 3 through graduation, or turning 22.

1. The continuum includes programs for students with language-related learning disabilities, social-emotional disabilities, moderate to severe intellectual impairments, and autism spectrum disorders.

2. Chicopee also offers a transition program that provides academic and adult life skills instruction, employment counseling and placement, and community experiences for students between the ages of 18 and 22.

3. Teachers and administrators told the review team that these districtwide programs are housed in certain schools at the elementary-, middle-, and high-school levels.

a. The elementary- and middle-school students enrolled are typically included in art, music, library, physical education, and general education core subjects under the provisions of their Individualized Educational Programs. Paraprofessionals and special educators facilitate the integration of these students in general education classes by assisting the teacher in providing appropriate modifications and accommodations.

**B.** In a focus group, parents expressed high satisfaction with district programs.

1. Several parents who identified themselves as the parents of students on the autism spectrum told the review team that the district program for their children was highly effective because the staff communicated frequently and worked closely with parents.

2. Other parents said that district special education programs enabled students to form relationships with peers which continue outside of school and to have a more typical school experience.

3. Some parents expressed the view that families moved to Chicopee because of the district’s reputation for offering high-quality local programs for students with moderate to severe disabilities who need specially designed instruction and support services.

**C.** Although not designed to serve students with disabilities primarily, Chicopee Academy is an alternative high school that provides at-risk students a pathway toward a high school diploma.

1. Chicopee Academy serves students who are not meeting requirements for grade promotion, including: students with unexcused absence; frequently suspended students; students returning to complete school; and students who need a smaller, more predictable school environment because of school phobia, disabling anxiety, or problems with interpersonal relationships.

2. A review of the Academy Program of Studies and classroom observations indicated that Academy courses are equivalent in content and rigor to courses at Chicopee High School and Chicopee Comprehensive High School.

3. The Academy offers credit-recovery opportunities through Edgenuity, an online learning program which offers multimedia content and relevant real-world assignments.

4. Academy students receive job training leading to a certificate in a number of trades and job placement through a partnership with the Westover Job Corps which is located near the school.

5. Students told the review team that they were unable to succeed in a traditional high school program, but were now making effective progress with the personal attention and support that they receive at the Academy.

a. Several students who were juniors said that they entered the Academy in their sophomore year with significant credit gaps and were now on track to graduate.

b. They added that Academy teachers, staff, and administrators demonstrated genuine concern for them in many ways, both during and outside of the school day.

**D.** Administrators told the review team that Chicopee realized cost savings because of its philosophy of educating all students in the community and having the ability to meet the needs of most students.

1. According to 2015 ESE data (the most recent available), only 2.7 percent of the district’s students with disabilities were enrolled in out-of-district programs as compared with the 2015 state rate of 6.9 percent. Administrators told the team that approximately half of the district’s students enrolled in out-of- district programs were enrolled in these programs when their families relocated to Chicopee.

2. Administrators estimated that through the development of internal special education programs the district saves more than half a million dollars annually in out-of-district placement costs. They added that cost savings are an ancillary benefit rather than the primary motivation for creating local programs.

**Impact**: Although private day and residential schools are components of an effective special education delivery system, districts with a full continuum of programs enable most students to be educated in their community schools. All students benefit when placement decisions are made after careful consideration of their home, school, and community relationships in addition to academic and other educational considerations.

**2. The district has developed strong career development and career/vocational technical education programs that prepare students for post-secondary education and the world of work.**

**A.** Thedistrict’s career development education program offers a framework for gaining the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to consider and choose among post-secondary options. The career development approach unfolds in three stages, proceeding from the cognitive to the experiential: career awareness, career exploration, and career immersion.

1. Beginning in middle school, students increase their understanding of careers through the use of Career Cruising, a web-based career exploration and planning tool that provides interest and skills assessments; career profiles which demonstrate the relationships between high school subjects and the world of work; archived interviews with people in various careers; college and apprenticeship information; and an electronic portfolio and resume builder which parents may also access.

2. Beginning in grade 6, students develop individual learning plans which help them to clarify their thinking about college and careers and continuously revise them. In addition, they attend regularly scheduled presentations by guest speakers representing a variety of career fields including medicine, manufacturing, business, and public safety. Students also visit area colleges and employers that offer programs and job opportunities related to their career interests. The career counselor organizes these visits.

3. The career development process culminates with job-shadowing and internship opportunities, primarily for juniors and seniors. Students told the review team said that these activities were especially helpful.

**B.** Chicopee Comprehensive High School offers 11 Chapter 74-approved career and technical education (CTE) programs, including such trades as automotive technology, carpentry, and electricity. Chicopee High School offers 4 non-Chapter 74 electives, including graphics and information technology. Although students are assigned to the high school closest to their home, any student not assigned to the Comprehensive High School may enroll in order to access the Chapter 74-approved CTE courses.

**C**. The Comprehensive High School has entered into articulation agreements with Springfield Technical Community College and Holyoke Community College. Under these agreements students may receive college credit for successful completion of certain high school technical education courses.

**D**. Administrators told the review team that most graduates of Chicopee Comprehensive High School who earn a certificate of proficiency in a trade enroll in a post-secondary program, or are employed in a job associated with that trade.

**Impact**: Career development programs orient students to post-secondary educational opportunities and the world of work and make learning more purposeful. Career/vocational technical education programs motivate students to become involved in their learning by engaging them in problem-solving activities that enable them to construct knowledge and in hands-on activities that enable them to apply knowledge. Career education brings students and adults together in a setting of collaborative learning and offers opportunities for students to interact with community members, potential employers, other students, and teachers who share similar interests.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**3. Academic support services at the high schools are not organized and administered as a coherent program and evaluated for effectiveness. Students with moderate special needs are not typically included in general education core classes.**

**A.** Administrators told the review team that instructional support teams at the high schools typically recommend changes of course level, supplemental reading and writing classes, extra help from the teacher, and summer-school classes for referred students.

1**.** Students confirmed that teachers are available before and after school to provide extra help, and added that peers sometimes serve as tutors. They said that guidance counselors help them to drop courses that are too easy or too difficult.

2. Several students said that paraprofessionals in certain classes helped students “understand what to do.”

**B.** High-school students may elect courses to improve their reading and writing skills, such as READ 180, SIMS Extreme Reading, and Strategic Reading and Writing, although the district does not have a procedure to ensure that students with gaps in skills enroll in these support classes.

1**.** Administrators told the review team that the teachers of the students enrolled in reading and writing support classes are not routinely informed about their progress and needs and consequently do not have information to make targeted modifications and accommodations for them.

**C**. The district offers MCAS preparation classes in English language arts and mathematics for students who have not achieved the competency determination, and summer school classes for students who have credit gaps; however, enrollment is at students’ discretion and the district has not formally analyzed the effectiveness of these classes.

**D**. Administrators told the review team that before- and after-school help is not monitored to ensure that students in danger of failing classes have priority to receive the help they need.

1. The review team was told that teachers often expect students to take the initiative and request help from them. Extra-help sessions are not assessed for impact.

**E**. The review team was told that high-school students with moderate special needs are not typically included in general education classes, and found little differentiation of instruction in most observed high-school classes.

1. Students with moderate special needs are instructed by special education generalists rather than by teachers certified in the disciplines; these students do not have access to a curriculum based on the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks.

2. In most observed high-school classes, all students were engaged in the same tasks and were using the same materials.

**Impact**: When there is not an integrated vision of support services for students, programs operate as a loose collection of strategies and it is difficult to create a supportive environment and promote a culture of high student achievement for all learners. Unless students with disabilities at the high schools are accommodated to the extent possible in general education core classes, the district cannot ensure that they are receiving instruction based on the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks. This has implications for their performance on tests based on mastery of the Frameworks.

**Recommendation**

**1. District leaders, teachers, and staff should work collaboratively to improve and coordinate practices and programs so that they are more effective in supporting and improving learning for all students.**

**A**. Building on practices in place at the elementary- and middle-school levels, the district should put practices in place to ensure that all students are provided with instruction and support that meets their needs.

1. It should use student achievement data to determine additional interventions that are necessary to more directly address students’ needs.

**B.** The district should monitor the proportion of students with moderate special needs in general education classrooms at the high schools so that they receive sufficient attention and support.

**C**. The district should evaluate all support programs and revise them as appropriate.

**D.** The district’s professional development plan should include an emphasis on differentiated instruction to ensure that core instruction addresses the learning styles and readiness levels of all students.

**Benefits:** When a district’s continuum of services supports all students who require help to achieve proficiency, it will ensure that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program and improve their achievement levels.

**Recommended resources:**

* The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* ([www.mass.gov/ese/mtss](http://www.mass.gov/ese/mtss)) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students. The MTSS website includes links to a self-assessment and a variety of helpful resources.
* The *Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/>) includes tools for districts, schools, and educators that are aligned to the MA Educator Evaluation Framework and promote evidence-based best practices for inclusion following the principles of Universal Design for Learning, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and Social and Emotional Learning.

Financial and Asset Management

***Contextual Background***

Interviewees told the team that because of declining enrollment and increased city charges for health insurance and resource officers, proposed funding for the district at the NSS level for fiscal year 2017 would have resulted in a budget of $80.1 million, less than the budget for fiscal year 2016, and drastic personnel cuts (approximately 35 FTE). As a result, the mayor and the city approved a tax rate increase to provide $1.25 million for the fiscal year 2017 school budget, above the required net school spending level.

Budget development is not driven by district and school plans, goals, priorities, or student achievement data.

The district has 15 schools. The city has funded 4 new and renovated school buildings over the past 12 years using its available bonding capacity with MSBA assistance, and together with the district plans additional capital improvements to 4 more schools. The district and city do not have a current long- range capital plan, but the district does have a five-year technology plan.

District finances and assets are managed by a director of budget and human resources, an assistant to the superintendent for telecommunications/technology services, and a director of maintenance, all of whom report directly to the superintendent. The director of budget and human resources is leaving the district and is preparing his assistant director to take over management of the district finances. The district has fully spent its budgets without overspending by making use of accounts such as circuit breaker, school choice, and a prior year account (carrying over surpluses from prior years) to offset any overruns in the school budget. Administrators prepare reports on the financial health of the district, including expenditures to date and projections of surpluses and deficits; these reports are not submitted to the school committee or its finance and budget subcommittee regularly, but are made available to the superintendent and the committee on request. Administrators and city officials reported some recent problems with processing payrolls since they decentralized them and since new personnel came on board; they are working together on improvements. Administrators have used cost-effective measures including collaborative purchasing, partnerships with local agencies, reallocating staff, and instituting in-house special education programs to limit out-of- district tuition and transportation expenses.

School administrators and city officials reported that they work together on net school spending estimates and city charges for education and on purchasing procedures and processing warrants. In its self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit, the district rated its relationship with civic leaders as “Very Well” described by the indicator “District and municipal leaders have positive working relationships.” (Possible responses were Not at All Well, Somewhat Well, Well, and Very Well.)

**Strength Finding**

**1. The district and the city have supported and funded 4 major new school and renovation projects, including 2 high schools, over the past 12 years, and they are preparing for 4 large maintenance projects at other schools. They have made a priority of keeping schools and learning spaces clean, secure, and well maintained, and of keeping technology in good shape and up to date.**

**A.** The district has 15 schools, including 2 high schools, an alternative middle/high school, 2 middle schools, 9 elementary schools, and an early childhood center.

1. The ages of the schools range from 2 to 63. The high schools were built and renovated in 2004 and 2007, an elementary school was renovated in 2012, and a middle school (the former high school) was renovated in 2015, all with assistance from the MSBA.

2. School committee members and city officials voiced support for up-to-date school facilities.

3. The district and city are working with the MSBA to replace roofs at three schools and doors and windows at another.

4. Administrators reported discussions about replacing or renovating other older schools.

**B.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district works to keep school buildings well maintained, secure, and clean.

1. Administrators said that the maintenance staff for the schools includes a plumber, a mason, an HVAC technician, an electrician, and a carpenter, noting that they have generally been able to keep up with work orders. Administrators reported that the custodial staff of 64 is sufficient to keep buildings clean.

2. Security for the schools is a priority in the District Improvement Plan and for the maintenance staff, especially installing and maintaining cameras, secure entry systems, and walkie-talkies for school administrators and security officers.

3. Review team members found the school buildings to be generally secure, clean, and well maintained.

**C.** Much of the district’s technology was purchased when buildings were renovated, and the technology department works to keep it in good repair and replaces it as needed and as funds permit.

1. Schools have interactive white boards and are increasing wireless access. The technology department has technicians who respond to requests by staff and keep computers and infrastructure in good repair.

2. The technology department has a five-year plan to replace out-dated equipment and infrastructure as needed, but administrators reported it is hard to keep up. School committee members voiced support for up-to-date technology, especially for the Career and Technical Education program (CTE). Funding sources include the E-rate program,[[24]](#footnote-24) cable contracts, and the school budget as well as MASBO funds for building renovations.

**Impact**: The up-to-date learning facilities in new and renovated buildings provide appropriate learning environments and are particularly well suited to learning strategies such as small groups, stations, and hands-on learning. Clean, secure, and well-maintained spaces are conducive to student learning. Also helpful to instruction is the availability of technology, providing a useful medium for dynamic instruction, differentiation, and individualized learning.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. The development of the district budget is not driven by district and school plans, goals, priorities, or student achievement data, and budget documents do not contain a summary or narrative highlighting goals or priorities.**

**A.** As noted in the Leadership and Governance standard above, the District Improvement Plan provides limited strategic direction and does not play a significant role in district decision-making including budgetary decisions.

**B.** The development of the budget is based on meeting the net school spending (NSS) requirement rather than improvement plan goals or student achievement data.

1. Administrators and city officials reported, and budget documents confirmed, that when developing the budget they agree on the calculations for required NSS and on approving a school budget to meet that obligation.

a. They also agree on city charges for education used in the calculation of required net school spending, and have made adjustments when appropriate, such as for summer salaries for school resource officers.

**C.** At the beginning of the budget process, principals and administrators verify staffing, propose per-pupil allocations for operations, and submit proposed increases and decreases for program and capital needs. Rationales in documents reviewed by the team generally did not reference plans, priorities, or student achievement data.

1. Budget forms submitted by principals and administrators include a list of current staff, proposed allocations for operations, and proposed increases (or decreases) for staff and capital needs. School budgets for operations (supplies, etc.) are allocated on a per-pupil basis (such as $140 per elementary pupil) rather than based on plans, priorities, or data.

For fiscal year 2017 principals and other administrators were also asked to submit 10 percent and 25 percent reduction plans because of the budget shortfall, and their rationales did not refer to priorities or student achievement data.

**D.** When central office administrators made budget decisions for fiscal year 2017, there was little reference to plan goals, priorities, or student achievement data.

1. Central office administrators reported they compiled submissions by administrators and adjusted staffing and other budgets for projected enrollments and for legal and contractual requirements. Central office administrators made decisions about proposals, reallocations, and reductions.

2. The proposed budget was based on few of the goals and priorities outlined in district and school plans and not on student achievement.

a. District and school goals were not referred to in the budget preparation materials or budget documents, and administrators reported they had to say “no” to most proposals last year. An exception was the $590,000 purchase of a new elementary reading program piloted in 2015–2016; it was funded by contracting for it over 15 months so that its cost could be spread over the budgets for three fiscal years.

School committee members reported that their major concerns about the tight budgets were computers, class size, and personnel layoffs, with no mention of district goals or student achievement data.

**E.** Budget documentation contains detail about trends and outside funds for all budget line items, but there is no summary or narrative that highlights district priorities and goals, changes in programs, or initiatives to improve student achievement.

1. School committee members receive a two-inch-thick budget book at the beginning of budget deliberations detailing budget trends and increases/decreases for each line item, including grants and outside funds.

2. Operations budgets for schools are based on per-pupil allocations and these calculations are clearly presented; they do not reflect goals or needs to improve student achievement.

3. Estimates and calculations of the city’s required net school spending and Chapter 70 aid are included along with calculations of city chargebacks for benefits, resource officers, transportation, the use of city parks, etc.

4. There is no narrative or general description of district or school goals and priorities. Administrators stated that they go over the budget line by line with the school committee.

a. Administrators have prepared PowerPoint presentations to highlight the impact of budget reductions when needed, and they prepare a one-page budget summary for the budget hearing.

b. The PowerPoint presentation summarizing the impacts of budget reductions and of the additional $1.25 million listed personnel cuts and reallocations but did not mention district goals, priorities, or student achievement.

**Impact**: The budget development process has been a lost opportunity for close review of student achievement issues, improvement plans, and resource allocation. The district has not adequately communicated its priorities to the Chicopee community or used the allocation of resources to address the needs of its students.

**Recommendation**

**1. District leaders should**

* **see that the process for budget development is transparent and**
* **ensure that decisions on the allocation of resources are based on student achievement data and strengthened district and school improvement plans.**

**A.** Resources should be allocated in the budget through consideration of students’ needs and strengthened improvement plans (see the Assessment and Leadership and Governance recommendations above).

**B.** The budget document should communicate district and school goals and objectives—and the ways in which the budget is aligned to them—to all stakeholders including the community.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will help the whole community understand the needs in the district that are driving the budget.

**Recommended resources:**

* *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/>) 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/sites/default/files/2017-01/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and real­location.
* *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. Each step includes a link to a specific resource document with relevant principles and policies to consider.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from December 12–15, 2016, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Karla Baehr, leadership and governance
2. Linda Greyser, curriculum and instruction
3. Christine Brandt, assessment, *review team coordinator*
4. Frank Sambuceti, human resources and professional development
5. James McAuliffe, student support
6. George Gearhart, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: the director of budget and human resources and the grants administrator. The team also met with town officials including the mayor, the city treasurer, and the president and vice-president of the city council.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: the vice-chairperson and two members.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: the president, two vice-presidents, the treasurer, the corresponding and recording secretaries, and the grievance chair.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the assistant superintendent for instruction and accountability, the assistant superintendent for student support services, and the director of special education.

The team visited the following schools: Barry (K–5), Belcher (K–2), Bowe (K–5), Bowie (K–5), Lambert-Lavoie (K–5), Litwin K–5), Fairview (K–5), Stefanik (K–5), Streiber (K–5), Bellamy (grades 6–8), Dupont (grades 6–8), Chicopee Academy (grades 6–12), Chicopee Comprehensive (grades 9–12), and Chicopee High (grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 13 principals and focus groups with 9 elementary- school teachers, 38 middle-school teachers, and 28 high-school teachers.

The team observed 80 classes in the district: 39 at the 3 high schools, 21 at the 2 middle schools, and 20 at the 9 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**  12/12/2016 | **Tuesday**  12/13/2016 | **Wednesday**  12/14/2016 | **Thursday**  12/15/2016 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals cancelled because of weather-related delayed opening; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to Chicopee Comprehensive High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Chicopee Comprehensive High School and Chicopee High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Bellamy, Dupont, Chicopee Comprehensive, Chicopee High, Fairview, Barry, and Belcher schools for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Bellamy, Dupont, Lambert-Lavoie, Bowe, Streiber, Litwin, Bowie, and Stefanik schools for classroom observations; district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Chicopee Public Schools**

**2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 235 | 3.0% | 83,481 | 8.8% |
| Asian | 157 | 2.0% | 61,584 | 6.5% |
| Hispanic | 2,690 | 34.9% | 176,873 | 18.6% |
| Native American | 4 | 0.1% | 2,179 | 0.2% |
| White | 4,410 | 57.2% | 597,502 | 62.7% |
| Native Hawaiian | 8 | 0.1% | 888 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 206 | 2.7% | 30,922 | 3.2% |
| **All Students** | 7,710 | 100.0% | 953,429 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2015 | | | | |

**Table B1b Chicopee 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 | 1,460 | 32.4% | 18.9% | 165,559 | 39.4% | 17.2% |
| Econ. Disad. | 3,707 | 82.3% | 48.1% | 260,998 | 62.2% | 27.4% |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 368 | 8.2% | 4.8% | 85,763 | 20.4% | 9.0% |
| All high needs students | 4,504 | 100.0% | 58.2% | 419,764 | 100.0% | 43.5% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2015. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 7,735; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026. | | | | | | |

**Table B2a: Chicopee Public Schools**

**English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS Year** | |  | **PARCC** | | **Gains and Declines** |
| **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| 3 | CPI | 551 | 82.3 | 83.6 | CPI | 84.1 | 86.9 | 2.8 |
| P+ | 551 | 50% | 58% | Lv 4&5 | 52% | 57% | 5 |
| 4 | CPI | 500 | 74.2 | 76.6 | CPI | 79.4 | 81.0 | 1.6 |
| P+ | 500 | 42% | 47% | Lv 4&5 | 55% | 58% | 3 |
| SGP | 451 | 35.0 | 45.0 | SGP | 45.0 | 46.0 | 1.0 |
| 5 | CPI | 519 | 80.2 | 81.5 | CPI | 85.6 | 88.3 | 2.7 |
| P+ | 519 | 55% | 55% | Lv 4&5 | 55% | 58% | 3 |
| SGP | 484 | 45.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 53.0 | 48.0 | -5.0 |
| 6 | CPI | 495 | 81.7 | 80.3 | CPI | 84.6 | 80.0 | -4.6 |
| P+ | 495 | 60% | 54% | Lv 4&5 | 54% | 45% | -9 |
| SGP | 446 | 48.0 | 52.0 | SGP | 56.0 | 40.0 | -16.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 524 | 79.9 | 85.2 | CPI | 82.6 | 83.4 | 0.8 |
| P+ | 524 | 55% | 66% | Lv 4&5 | 50% | 50% | 0 |
| SGP | 477 | 39.5 | 49.0 | SGP | 48.0 | 34.0 | -14.0 |
| 8 | CPI | 513 | 85.5 | 85.8 | CPI | 90.6 | 84.8 | -5.8 |
| P+ | 513 | 66% | 68% | Lv 4&5 | 57% | 39% | -18 |
| SGP | 480 | 41.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 56.5 | 32.0 | -24.5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2b: Chicopee Public Schools**  **English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016[[25]](#footnote-25)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS/Accountability Year** | | | |  | **Gains and Declines** | |
|  | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 10 | CPI | 587 | 94.1 | 92.6 | 94.7 | 95.6 | 96.7 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| P+ | 587 | 85% | 80% | 85% | 88% | 91% | 3% | 3% |
| SGP | 480 | 46.0 | 28.0 | 35.0 | 37.0 | 50.0 | -9 | 2 |
| All | CPI | 3,762 | 82.8 | 83.9 | 86.1 | 85.8 | 87.2 | 3.0 | -0.3 |
| P+ | -- | 59% | 62% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 2,822 | 43.0 | 45.0 | 49.0 | 40.0 | 50.0 | -3.0 | -9.0 |

**Table B2c: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS Year** | |  | **PARCC** | | **Gains and Declines** |
| **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| 3 | CPI | 552 | 85.5 | 85.3 | CPI | 87.4 | 93.1 | 5.7 |
| P+ | 552 | 67% | 68% | Lv 4&5 | 57% | 70% | 13 |
| 4 | CPI | 499 | 76.5 | 78.0 | CPI | 81.4 | 84.1 | 2.7 |
| P+ | 499 | 42% | 48% | Lv 4&5 | 53% | 60% | 7 |
| SGP | 450 | 45.0 | 42.0 | SGP | 59.0 | 53.0 | -6.0 |
| 5 | CPI | 521 | 74.2 | 76.8 | CPI | 81.9 | 85.9 | 4.0 |
| P+ | 521 | 46% | 52% | Lv 4&5 | 47% | 56% | 9 |
| SGP | 485 | 49.0 | 48.0 | SGP | 56.0 | 51.0 | -5.0 |
| 6 | CPI | 496 | 77.3 | 74.7 | CPI | 77.2 | 74.7 | -2.5 |
| P+ | 496 | 53% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | 44% | 40% | -4 |
| SGP | 448 | 58.0 | 56.0 | SGP | 56.5 | 38.0 | -18.5 |
| 7 | CPI | 524 | 62.3 | 65.2 | CPI | 65.3 | 67.1 | 1.8 |
| P+ | 524 | 33% | 39% | Lv 4&5 | 34% | 35% | 1 |
| SGP | 473 | 48.0 | 49.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 37.0 | -10.0 |
| 8 | CPI | 508 | 66.4 | 66.7 | CPI | 77.6 | 73.1 | -4.5 |
| P+ | 508 | 40% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | 51% | 43% | -8 |
| SGP | 474 | 55.0 | 61.0 | SGP | 59.5 | 51.0 | -8.5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2d: Chicopee Public Schools**  **Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016[[26]](#footnote-26)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS/Accountability Year** | | | |  | **Gains and Declines** | |
|  | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 10 | CPI | 580 | 81.3 | 79.7 | 82.9 | 83.6 | 89.7 | 2.3 | 0.7 |
| P+ | 580 | 65% | 59% | 66% | 64% | 78% | -1 | -2 |
| SGP | 478 | 34.5 | 30.0 | 31.0 | 32.0 | 50.0 | -2.5 | 1.0 |
| All | CPI | 3,746 | 74.8 | 75.4 | 79.1 | 80.3 | 81.5 | 5.5 | 1.2 |
| P+ | -- | 50% | 50% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 2,811 | 48.0 | 47.0 | 51.0 | 44.0 | 50.0 | -4.0 | -7.0 |

**Table B2e: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 5 | CPI | 533 | 69.2 | 75.3 | 74.7 | 78.4 | 76.4 | 9.2 | 3.7 |
| P+ | 533 | 32% | 43% | 43% | 49% | 47% | 17 | 6 |
| 8 | CPI | 520 | 54.3 | 59.8 | 63.6 | 65.6 | 71.3 | 11.3 | 2.0 |
| P+ | 520 | 16% | 20% | 27% | 34% | 41% | 18 | 7 |
| 10 | CPI | 547 | 76.9 | 77 | 78.4 | 79.7 | 88.9 | 2.8 | 1.3 |
| P+ | 547 | 50% | 47% | 50% | 53% | 73% | 3 | 3 |
| All | CPI | 1,600 | 66.7 | 70.9 | 72.4 | 74.7 | 78.7 | 8.0 | 2.3 |
| P+ | 1,600 | 33% | 37% | 40% | 45% | 54% | 12 | 5 |
| 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: Chicopee Public Schools**

**English Language Arts (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016[[27]](#footnote-27)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Accountability** | | | | | **2-Year Trend** | **4-Year Trend** |
| **MCAS** | |  | **PARCC** | |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 2,362 | 78.6 | 80.1 | CPI | 81.3 | 80.8 | -0.5 | 2.2 |
| P+ | -- | 51% | 54% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 1,719 | 41.0 | 45.0 | SGP | 48.0 | 38.0 | -10.0 | -3.0 |
| State | CPI | 222,707 | 76.8 | 77.1 | CPI | 76.3 | 77.1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| P+ | -- | 48% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 165,487 | 47.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 47.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ.  Disad. | District | CPI | 2,064 | -- | -- | CPI | 82.9 | 82.1 | -0.8 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 1,506 | -- | -- | SGP | 48.0 | 37.0 | -11.0 | -- |
| State | CPI | 152,877 | -- | -- | CPI | 77.6 | 78.2 | 0.6 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 114,361 | -- | -- | SGP | 46.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 739 | 58.7 | 60.5 | CPI | 66.2 | 67.1 | 0.9 | 8.4 |
| P+ | -- | 19% | 20% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 514 | 36.0 | 40.0 | SGP | 45.5 | 36.0 | -9.5 | 0.0 |
| State | CPI | 91,177 | 66.8 | 66.6 | CPI | 67.4 | 68.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| P+ | -- | 30% | 31% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 66,633 | 43.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 249 | 70.9 | 71.8 | CPI | 74.9 | 70.9 | -4.0 | 0.0 |
| P+ | -- | 39% | 41% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 153 | 47.0 | 55.0 | SGP | 59.0 | 42.0 | -17.0 | -5.0 |
| State | CPI | 52,960 | 67.4 | 67.8 | CPI | 68.9 | 70.7 | 1.8 | 3.3 |
| P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 35,109 | 53.0 | 54.0 | SGP | 53.0 | 54.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 3,762 | 82.8 | 83.9 | CPI | 86.1 | 85.8 | -0.3 | 3.0 |
| P+ | -- | 59% | 62% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 2,822 | 43.0 | 45.0 | SGP | 49.0 | 40.0 | -9.0 | -3.0 |
| State | CPI | 491,267 | 86.8 | 86.7 | CPI | 86.8 | 87.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| P+ | -- | 69% | 69% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 388,999 | 51.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

**Table B3b: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Mathematics (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016[[28]](#footnote-28)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Accountability** | | | | | **2-Year Trend** | **4-Year Trend** |
| **MCAS** | |  | **PARCC** | |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 2,353 | 69.8 | 70.5 | CPI | 73.3 | 74.8 | 1.5 | 5.0 |
| P+ | -- | 42% | 43% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 1,711 | 47.0 | 45.0 | SGP | 49.0 | 44.0 | -5.0 | -3.0 |
| State | CPI | 222,349 | 68.6 | 68.4 | CPI | 67.9 | 68.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| P+ | -- | 40% | 40% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 165,191 | 46.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 46.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ.  Disad. | District | CPI | 2,051 | -- | -- | CPI | 75.4 | 76.2 | 0.8 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 1,496 | -- | -- | SGP | 50.0 | 43.0 | -7.0 | -- |
| State | CPI | 152,560 | -- | -- | CPI | 69.2 | 70.0 | 0.8 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 114,091 | -- | -- | SGP | 46.0 | 45.0 | -1.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 741 | 50.5 | 51.5 | CPI | 55.9 | 60.7 | 4.8 | 10.2 |
| P+ | -- | 15% | 15% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 515 | 42.0 | 41.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 42.0 | -5.0 | 0.0 |
| State | CPI | 91,049 | 57.4 | 57.1 | CPI | 57.3 | 58.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| P+ | -- | 22% | 22% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 66,511 | 42.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 44.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 247 | 64.9 | 65.8 | CPI | 72.4 | 70.3 | -2.1 | 5.4 |
| P+ | -- | 38% | 38% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 150 | 54.0 | 55.0 | SGP | 67.0 | 49.0 | -18.0 | -5.0 |
| State | CPI | 53,048 | 63.9 | 63.8 | CPI | 64.5 | 65.8 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 35,290 | 53.0 | 52.0 | SGP | 51.0 | 50.0 | -1.0 | -3.0 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 3,746 | 74.8 | 75.4 | CPI | 79.1 | 80.3 | 1.2 | 5.5 |
| P+ | -- | 50% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 2,811 | 48.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 51.0 | 44.0 | -7.0 | -4.0 |
| State | CPI | 490,612 | 80.8 | 80.3 | CPI | 80.7 | 81.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| P+ | -- | 61% | 60% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 388,423 | 51.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

**Table B3c: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 983 | 61.1 | 65.2 | 65.3 | 67.8 | 6.7 | 2.5 |
| P+ | 983 | 24% | 28% | 29% | 34% | 10 | 5 |
| State | CPI | 89,857 | 66.4 | 67.3 | 66.3 | 65.4 | -1.0 | -0.9 |
| P+ | 89,857 | 31% | 33% | 32% | 31% | 0 | -1 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 865 | -- | -- | 66.2 | 68.1 | -- | 1.9 |
| P+ | 865 | -- | -- | 30% | 35% | -- | 5 |
| State | CPI | 61,476 | -- | -- | 67.1 | 65.8 | -- | -1.3 |
| P+ | 61,476 | -- | -- | 33.0% | 29% | -- | -4 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 303 | 46.6 | 50.6 | 52.5 | 56.4 | 9.8 | 3.9 |
| P+ | 303 | 6% | 9% | 12% | 15% | 9 | 3 |
| State | CPI | 38,109 | 59.8 | 60.1 | 60.2 | 59.7 | -0.1 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 38,109 | 20% | 22% | 22% | 21% | 1 | -1 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 91 | 46.8 | 53.6 | 54.5 | 53.8 | 7.0 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 91 | 13% | 18% | 20% | 23% | 10 | 3 |
| State | CPI | 18,594 | 54 | 54 | 53.9 | 54.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| P+ | 18,594 | 19% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 0 | 1 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 1,600 | 66.7 | 70.9 | 72.4 | 74.7 | 8.0 | 2.3 |
| P+ | 1,600 | 33% | 37% | 40% | 45% | 12 | 5 |
| State | CPI | 208,262 | 79 | 79.6 | 79.4 | 78.7 | -0.3 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 208,262 | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 | 0 |
| Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE). State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2012–2015** | | **Change 2014–2015** | | **State (2015)** |
| **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High Needs | 5.3% | 5.2% | 5.5% | 5.9% | 0.6 | 11% | 0.4 | 7% | 3.4 |
| Econ. Disad.[[29]](#footnote-29) | 4.8% | 4.6% | 5.7% | 5.3% | 0.5 | 10% | -0.4 | -7% | 3.3 |
| Students w/ disabilities | 7.4% | 7.4% | 7.4% | 6.8% | -0.6 | -8% | -0.6 | -8% | 3.5 |
| ELL | 13.6% | 4.9% | 7.6% | 4.8% | -8.8 | -65% | -2.8 | -37% | 5.7 |
| **All students** | 4.3% | 4.3% | 4.0% | 3.9% | -0.4 | -9% | -0.1 | -3% | 1.9 |
| Notes: The annual drop-out rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Drop outs are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a high school equivalency by the following October 1. Drop-out rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2013–2016** | | **Change 2015–2016** | | **State (2016)** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| All students | 93.3% | 93.5% | 93.4% | 93.8% | 0.5 | 0.5% | 0.4 | 0.4% | 94.9% |
| Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B6: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY14** | | **FY15** | | | **FY16** | |
| **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | | **Estimated** | **Actual** |
| Expenditures | | | | | | | |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  | | | | | | |
| By school committee | $72,084,795 | $76,595,356 | $76,704,919 | | $76,704,920 | $80,243,797 | $80,219,821 |
| By municipality | $19,175,195 | $23,461,110 | $21,982,024 | | $42,499,029 | $22,379,521 | $22,351,477 |
| Total from local appropriations | $91,259,990 | $100,056,466 | $98,686,943 | | $119,203,949 | $102,623,318 | $102,571,298 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $11,820,789 | -- | | $13,470,953 | -- | $113,774,174 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $111,877,255 | -- | | $132,674,902 | -- | $116345,472 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $56,849,615 | -- | | $57,250,917 | -- | $59,511,925 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $28,420,070 | -- | | $29,088,958 | -- | $30,214,682 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $85,269,685 | -- | | $86,339,875 | -- | $89,726,607 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $87,825,772 | -- | | $88,847,313 | -- | $91,940,799 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $2,556,087 | -- | | $2,507,438 | -- | $2,214,192 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 3.0% | -- | | 2.9% | -- | 2.5% |
| \*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.  \*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.  Sources: FY14, FY15, and FY16 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website  Data retrieved 12/13/16 | | | | | | | |

**Table B7: Chicopee Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2013–2015**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |
| Administration | $524 | $560 | $532 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,084 | $1,066 | $1,086 |
| Teachers | $5,129 | $5,114 | $5,378 |
| Other teaching services | $1,055 | $1,111 | $1,113 |
| Professional development | $341 | $300 | $385 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $225 | $255 | $248 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $237 | $261 | $269 |
| Pupil services | $1,439 | $1,567 | $1,515 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,064 | $1,048 | $1,057 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $1,937 | $2,079 | $2,128 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $13,036 | $13,361 | $13,710 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/)  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% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 2.5 |
| **MS** | 0% | 5% | 43% | 52% | 2.5 |
| **HS** | 5% | 26% | 41% | 28% | 1.9 |
| **Total #** | 2 | 11 | 35 | 32 | 2.2 |
| **Total %** | 3% | 14% | 44% | 40% |  |
| 2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson. | **ES** | 10% | 40% | 45% | 5% | 1.5 |
| **MS** | 0% | 10% | 71% | 19% | 2.1 |
| **HS** | 7% | 53% | 40% | 0% | 1.3 |
| **Total #** | 4 | 26 | 36 | 5 | 1.6 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 37% | 51% | 7% |  |
| 3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s). | **ES** | 5% | 20% | 70% | 5% | 1.8 |
| **MS** | 0% | 43% | 43% | 14% | 1.7 |
| **HS** | 10% | 41% | 38% | 10% | 1.5 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 29 | 38 | 8 | 1.6 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 36% | 48% | 10% |  |
| 4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 0% | 15% | 50% | 35% | 2.2 |
| **MS** | 0% | 14% | 62% | 24% | 2.1 |
| **HS** | 10% | 41% | 38% | 10% | 1.5 |
| **Total #** | 4 | 22 | 38 | 16 | 1.8 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 28% | 48% | 20% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **7.9** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **8.4** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **6.2** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **7.2** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 35% | 65% | 2.7 |
| **MS** | 0% | 24% | 48% | 29% | 2.0 |
| **HS** | 13% | 36% | 28% | 23% | 1.6 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 19 | 28 | 28 | 2.0 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 24% | 35% | 35% |  |
| 6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking. | **ES** | 10% | 30% | 60% | 0% | 1.5 |
| **MS** | 0% | 43% | 33% | 24% | 1.8 |
| **HS** | 15% | 36% | 38% | 10% | 1.4 |
| **Total #** | 8 | 29 | 34 | 9 | 1.6 |
| **Total %** | 10% | 36% | 43% | 11% |  |
| 7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | **ES** | 0% | 5% | 30% | 65% | 2.6 |
| **MS** | 0% | 29% | 43% | 29% | 2.0 |
| **HS** | 18% | 46% | 21% | 15% | 1.3 |
| **Total #** | 7 | 25 | 23 | 25 | 1.8 |
| **Total %** | 9% | 31% | 29% | 31% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **6.8** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **5.9** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **4.4** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **5.4** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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** | 20% | 15% | 45% | 20% | 1.7 |
| **MS** | 29% | 38% | 29% | 5% | 1.1 |
| **HS** | 33% | 44% | 15% | 8% | 1.0 |
| **Total #** | 23 | 28 | 21 | 8 | 1.2 |
| **Total %** | 29% | 35% | 26% | 10% |  |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel). | **ES** | 0% | 25% | 55% | 20% | 2.0 |
| **MS** | 10% | 43% | 38% | 10% | 1.5 |
| **HS** | 15% | 51% | 28% | 5% | 1.2 |
| **Total #** | 8 | 34 | 30 | 8 | 1.5 |
| **Total %** | 10% | 43% | 38% | 10% |  |
| 10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 5% | 33% | 62% | 2.6 |
| **HS** | 10% | 21% | 36% | 33% | 1.9 |
| **Total #** | 4 | 9 | 21 | 46 | 2.4 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 11% | 26% | 58% |  |
| 11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students. | **ES** | 0% | 25% | 50% | 25% | 2.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 19% | 57% | 24% | 2.0 |
| **HS** | 10% | 44% | 38% | 8% | 1.4 |
| **Total #** | 4 | 26 | 37 | 13 | 1.7 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 33% | 46% | 16% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **8.6** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **7.2** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **5.6** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **6.8** |

1. The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group; this CPI will serve as a baseline for future years’ CPI targets. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Low income students’ drop-out rates used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged rates. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Low income students’ drop-out rates used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged rates. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The 2015 and 2016 reports are posted on the district’s website at: <http://www.chicopeeps.org/Accountability/StateOfSchools_FY2016_01_11_16%20%20%20final.pdf>

   <http://www.chicopeeps.org/State_of_District_2016.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The TELL MASS Survey is a statewide survey of school based licensed educators to determine if they have the supports necessary for effective teaching. The online survey was administered in Massachusetts every other year. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Moodle stands for "Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment." It is an open source course management system. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The district is committed to its literacy program, which includes interventions, English language development, online multimedia, and point-of-use professional development. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See Appendix C and the second Curriculum and Instruction finding above. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. On Tuesday, February 28, 2017, after collecting public comment since November 2016, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education voted 9-1 to amend the educator evaluation regulations. The most significant change in the regulations is the elimination of a separate student impact rating. Under the [amended regulations](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/FY2017/2017-02/item6.html), evaluators do not have to make a separate judgment about an educator’s impact on student learning. Instead, student learning is embedded as an indicator within one of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework’s four standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. According to ESE data, the district’s enrollment has been stable over the past five years, although from 2015 to 2016 it declined by 131 students, from 7, 841 in 2015 to 7,710 in 2016. In 2015 the district accepted approximately 178 school choice students compared with 129 who choiced out; an additional 164 students attended charter schools. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. In 2015, the four-year graduation rate for district Hispanic/Latino students was 64.8 percent compared with 72.2 percent for their statewide peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The Massachusetts High School Program of Studies (MassCore) is intended to help high school graduates arrive at college or the workplace well prepared and reduce the number of students taking remedial courses in college. MassCore recommends a comprehensive set of subject area courses and units as well as other learning opportunities to complete before graduating from high school. The recommended program of studies includes: four years of English, four years of math, three years of a lab-based science, three years of history, two years of the same foreign language, one year of an arts program and five additional "core" courses such as business education, health, and/or technology. MassCore also includes additional learning opportunities including AP classes, dual enrollment, a senior project, online courses for high school or college credit, and service or work-based learning. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. In 2016, the Mass Core completion rate for district Hispanic/Latino students was 21.8 percent compared with 63.2 percent for their statewide peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. In 2016, although Hispanic/Latino students represent 35 percent of district enrollment, only 17 percent of all district Advanced Placement test-takers were Hispanic/Latino. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. In 2015, the drop-out rate for district Hispanic/Latino students was 5.7 percent compared with 3.9 percent for their statewide peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. In 2016, the in-school suspension rate for district Hispanic/Latino students was 6.9 percent compared with 3.1 percent for their statewide peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. In 2016, the out-of-school suspension rate for district Hispanic/Latino students was 8.2 percent compared with 5.7 percent for their statewide peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. In 2016, 21.7 percent of district Hispanic/Latino students were chronically absent compared with 20.7 percent of their statewide peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. The E-rate program “provides discounted telecommunications, Internet access, and internal connections to eligible schools and libraries….” [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Low income numbers used for economically disadvantaged for 2012, 2013, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-29)