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Executive Summary

Springfield, the second largest public school district in Massachusetts, enrolls 25,633 pupils in 58 schools.[[1]](#footnote-1) As is typical of large, urban districts in the Commonwealth, the diversity of the student population presents opportunities and challenges to educators. In the 2017–2018 school year, 82.7 percent of students are part of the high-needs subgroup because they are in one or more of the following groups: economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English language learners (ELLs) or former ELLs. Many students come to school each day with high programmatic and support needs. For example, students with disabilities in the district represent 21.9 percent of the total student population, compared with 17.7 percent of the state; ELLs make up 15.6 percent of enrollment, compared with 10.2 percent across the state; 27.4 percent of students do not have English as their first language, compared with 20.9 percent of the state; and 77.1 percent of students come from economically disadvantaged households, compared with 32 percent across the state. In addition, according to ESE data, at the time of the onsite in November 2017, 245 evacuees from Puerto Rico as a result of the impact of Hurricane Maria were enrolled in Springfield schools.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The district’s 58 schools reflect a wide range of progress and student achievement results. According to ESE data, some student indicators are improving, for example, dropout rates[[3]](#footnote-3) and graduation rates.  There is also progress in some assessment outcomes: from 2012–2016 median student growth percentiles (SGPs) in grade 10 increased in ELA and math and median SGPs for all students increased in ELA and math.  In addition, the city’s $850 million capital improvement plan includes funding to renovate or replace old school buildings. Also, the district’s WeLearn initiative is providing students and teachers with state-of-the-art technology resources for teaching and learning using 21st century skills. Finally, while the review team was on site, the U.S. Department of Education recognized the White Street Elementary School as a Blue Ribbon School of Excellence.

At the same time, the district had 12 Level 4 schools, including 9 middle schools, and 3 schools classified as Level 3 for low assessment participation, performance, or graduation rates. And the percentages of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the 2017 Next-Generation MCAS assessment or attaining proficient or advanced scores on the 2017 science and grade 10 MCAS assessment were below state averages by double-digit percentages for every tested grade and content area.

To raise student achievement, Springfield’s educators are implementing a number of thoughtful and innovative improvement efforts guided by clear, data-driven priorities. In the Springfield Public Schools, virtually all improvement efforts and accountability revolve around four strategic priorities that define the district’s 2017–2020 strategic plan, *The Springfield Promise*. One distinctive and promising initiative is the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP),[[4]](#footnote-4) negotiated in 2014 between the Springfield Public Schools and the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in collaboration with the Springfield Education Association. The partnership grants operational autonomy and accountability to SEZP to oversee turnaround efforts in nine struggling middle schools. In 2017–2018, the zone added one high school that includes a new honors academy. This report includes more detail about SEZP.

As with the district as a whole, SEZP schools are seeing improvements in student achievement as well as continued challenges. In school year 2016–2017, there were gains in ELA SGPs at almost all SEZP schools and in mathematics SGPs in some SEZP schools. The percentage of students at all SEZP schools meeting or exceeding expectations in the 2017 Next-Generation MCAS assessment fell well below state averages, with the exception of the Chestnut Talented and Gifted Middle School. Although a relatively new initiative, the SEZP has already gained regional and national notice as a potential model to empower local schools to improve. A review of improvement plans for the SEZP schools indicated that each SEZP School Improvement Plan identifies improving instruction as a priority and targets the school’s specific needs.

In each of the four priorities that the district has set for itself in the strategic plan, the review team found evidence of progress as well as areas that require ongoing attention. The district’s first strategic priority is to *coach, develop and evaluate educators with a clear vision of effective, engaging, and personalized instruction*. One definitive step toward meeting this goal is the district’s deployment of instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) at all schools to coach and model best instructional practices. Another is allocating the time for teachers and ILSs to collaborate in regularly scheduled professional learning communities (PLCs). A further success is the district’s comprehensive professional development program based on student achievement data and the needs and interests of all staff. Likewise, the adoption of an educator evaluation system aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework provides additional evidence of progress. However, a review of 101 evaluation documents for teachers and leaders indicated inconsistencies in the quality of formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations and in the effectiveness of the district’s supervisory policies and practices. Although district and school leaders have articulated instructional expectations for student engagement, higher-order thinking, inclusive practices, and a classroom climate that is conducive to teaching and learning, classroom observations conducted by the ten-member review team indicated variation across levels in practices that support these expectations.

The review team observed 305 classes in 48 of the district’s 58 schools: 103 in grades 9 to 12, 61 in grades 6 to 8, and 141 in kindergarten to grade 5. The team observed 122 ELA classes, 102 mathematics classes, and 82 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 15 special education classes, 13 ELL classes, and 3 career/technical education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C. Observations were conducted over five days.

The review team found stronger evidence of student engagement at the elementary schools than at middle schools and the high schools, although there were notable exceptions. While the district’s lesson template requires a specific lesson structure, in observed lessons there was unevenness in both the content and delivery of instruction to promote active learning and engage students. Many students had limited opportunities to demonstrate deep understanding of concepts and content or to apply what they know, can do, and understand to new contexts.

The second strategic priority is to *implement an aligned, rigorous curriculum built on standards and 21st century knowledge and skills*. As a strong point, the district distributes curricular and instructional leadership across district and school levels and systematizes its curriculum review and renewal process.

The WeLearn initiative is a major effort underway to use technology to engage students more in learning, make lessons more rigorous, and develop the skills needed to live and work in the 21st century. First implemented in the 2015–2016 school year, in 2017–2018 WeLearn is moving from an experiment to an expectation. All schools have implemented a one-to-one initiative for students to have their own touchscreen Windows laptops.

*All decisions for students, schools and the district are based on timely, accurate and relevant data* is the district’s third priority. District leaders and principals collect and collaboratively analyze and use data to plan improvement goals and monitor progress in achieving them. Based on ongoing data analysis, principals can adjust improvement plans in real time during the school year using a planning application. Data analyses feed into decisions for allocating resources based on the distinct and often disparate needs of individual schools, particularly the priority schools, and their student populations.

Springfield’s data analyses of a variety of formative, benchmark, and summative assessment results are pivotal in informing instructional decision-making, particularly at the elementary and middle schools. Data is also central to the work of ILSs and teachers in PLCs, not only to analyze assessment results but also to provide clues about where and how to revise curriculum. Data helps identify students at risk of dropping out and informs teachers’ choices for interventions to meet students’ academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs. Leaders and teachers rely on data to help set professional practice goals and monitor and report on progress for the educator evaluation system. Principals and district leaders also use achievement and other data to plan professional development opportunities.

The district’s well-organized information technology and accountability systems and staff help to ensure the accurate and timely collection, analysis, and dissemination of data. The district creates the tools and structures to manage a large store of data, and staff members coach and support teachers and leaders learning to use new tools and adjust to new ways of thinking and working as educators. Looming challenges to the district’s use of data are its growing supply of data as well as the time required to process and apply the lessons that the data teaches. Some staff find that they do not have sufficient time for deep analyses of data in PLCs and struggle to keep the pace prescribed in pacing guides to cover content in unit planning guides and meet instructional pacing and assessment schedules.

In addition, although the district has measurable goals, they are not included in the 2017–2020 strategic plan or in the 2017–2018 School Improvement Plans (SIPs), but rather in the district’s fiscal year 2018 budget document.[[5]](#footnote-5) All schools, as well as the district as a whole, have a set of annual quantitiative goals. The superintendent’s annual presentation to administrators before the start of the school year articulates the goals for the year based on data from the previous school year. Also, while the district tracks quantitative measures[[6]](#footnote-6) to monitor progress toward strategic priorities, the district generally uses limited qualitative methods such as observations, interviews, focus groups, and/or surveys to understand and measure outcomes for strategic plan priorities. For example, district staff collects qualitative data about the quality of classroom instruction but do not analyze that data and develop metrics that can measure the quality of instruction.

The district’s fourth priority, *expand access to social, emotional and academic safety nets for all students and families*, addresses the district’s responsibility to provide support for all students. In responding to this priority, the district has established common processes to identify students struggling with academic and/or social-emotional challenges. Educators use data-driven approaches for early detection and provide a number of regularly vetted interventions to meet the learning needs of English language learners, students with disabilities, and the general student population. In addition, the district uses data to identify students at risk of not graduating and provides supports to ensure high school completion. The district has also created innovative pathways to guide students to post-secondary education and to inform them about work and career opportunities. In addition, it takes advantage of a wide range of external partnerships with agencies, institutions of higher education, and support programs to benefit students’ growth and development.

While the district has in place several initiatives to boost attendance and to create a smoother transition to high school and has seen some improvement in graduation and retention rates,[[7]](#footnote-7) there are continued challenges to improving attendance as well as reducing chronic absence in grades 6–12[[8]](#footnote-8) and retention in grades 9–and 10.[[9]](#footnote-9) A second challenge to supporting students’ success in school relates to establishing a stronger working relationship with parents and families. Although the Parent and Community Engagement Center (PACE) involves parents in several activities and services, the review team found limited evidence of a strong working relationship with students’ families.

To address the challenges highlighted in this summary, the review team has developed a number of recommendations.

*Leadership and Governance*

* District leaders should consider including in the strategic plan measures to strengthen parent and community engagement and to provide quality instruction in district classrooms that is effective, engaging, and personalized.

*Curriculum and Instruction*

* The district should continue to focus on and articulate the district’s vision of high-quality instruction, communicate this to the full educational community, and support teachers in its implementation.  District leaders and teachers should pay particular attention to: higher-order thinking; increasing opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning; implementing inclusive practices that address students’ learning needs; and providing a classroom climate that is conducive to learning.

*Assessment*

* The district should review how instructional time is allocated in school schedules. It should also look at how PLCs use time for data analysis and other collaborative activities. It should consider how it might improve instruction and supports to ensure that all students can learn required topics and standards**.**

*Human Resources and Professional Development*

* The district should improve the overall quality and consistency of educators’ evaluations and the supervisory practices and evaluative skills of all administrators and evaluators.

*Student Support*

* The district should continue its efforts to improve student attendance and retention. The district should consider gathering input from students and families about the reasons for high absence rates and possible way to address the challenges of students missing too much instruction.
* The district should continue to take stock of its current initiatives in relation to current research-based components of effective parent involvement.

*Financial and Asset Management*

* District leaders should consider adding detail to the budget document about the impact of budget reductions and the costs of some initiatives.

Springfield 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. In addition to being a tool that districts can use to inform their own improvement efforts, review reports may be used by ESE to identify technical assistance and other resources to provide to the district.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Springfield Public Schools was conducted from November 13–17, 2017. The site visit included 34.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 171 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, parents, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 6 teacher focus groups: 3 with a total of 34 elementary-school teachers, 2 with a total of 10 middle-school teachers, and 1 with 6 high-school teachers.

A list of the 10 review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, attendance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 305 classrooms in 48 of the district’s 58 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**

Springfield has a mayor-city council form of government and the mayor is the chair of the school committee. The seven members of the school committee typically meet twice a month with subcommittees meeting in working sessions once or twice a month.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2012. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the chief instructional officer, the chief communications officer, the chief finance and operations officer, the chief information officer, the chief of human resources, the chief of parent and community engagement, the executive officer of special education and related services, the executive officer of student services, and chief school officers for zone 1, zone 2, and zone 3.[[10]](#footnote-10) Overall, central office positions have decreased by 65 positions over the past 5 years. The district has 54 principals leading 58 schools (some principals lead more than one school). There are multiple other administrators and specialists, including: a senior administrator of curriculum, instruction, and professional development; a director of ELL; a director of literacy Pre-K–5 and a director of ELA, 6–12; a director of science; a director of social studies; a director of development and wellness; a director of visual and performing arts; a director of language acquisition; a budget director; and a budget manager. There are also 107 instructional leadership specialists, an adult education administrator, and a senior administrator of school redesign and webmaster. The assistant principals are members of the Springfield Administrators Association. In the 2016–2017 school year, there were 2,031.9 FTE teachers in the district.

The SEZP leadership team consists of two co-executive directors who report directly to its seven-member board.[[11]](#footnote-11) One director is responsible for strategy and systems; the other, for school improvement and student success. Other SEZP leadership roles are a chief of instruction, a chief of talent, a director of business operations, and an analytics manager. SEZP’s executive officer for school support acts as a liaison between the SEZP schools and parents as well as between the SEZP schools and the Springfield Public Schools.

In the 2016–2017 school year, 25,633 students were enrolled in the district’s 58 schools:

**Table 1: Springfield Public Schools**

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

| **School**  | **School** **Type** | **Grades****Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Early Childhood Education Center | EES | Pre–K | 144 |
| Margaret C. Ellis School | ES | Pre–K–1 | 219 |
| Edward P. Boland School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 788 |
| Elias Brookings School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 379 |
| Frederick Harris School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 594 |
| German Gerena Community School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 731 |
| Glenwood School  | ES | Pre-K–5 | 301 |
| Indian Orchard Elementary School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 666 |
| Mary A. Dryden Veterans Memorial School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 332 |
| Milton Bradley School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 576 |
| Rebecca M. Johnson School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 775 |
| Sumner Avenue School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 576 |
| Thomas M. Balliet School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 323 |
| Warner School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 279 |
| Washington School | ES | Pre-K–5 | 434 |
| Glickman Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 359 |
| Alice B. Beal School | ES | K–5 | 276 |
| Arthur T. Talmadge School | ES | K–5 | 270 |
| Brightwood School | ES | K–5 | 323 |
| Daniel B. Brunton School  | ES | K–5 | 477 |
| Frank H. Freedman School | ES | K–5 | 315 |
| Hiram L. Dorman School | ES | K–5 | 323 |
| Homer Street School | ES | K–5 | 436 |
| Kensington International School | ES | K–5 | 306 |
| Liberty School | ES | K–5 | 288 |
| Lincoln School | ES | K–5 | 404 |
| Mary M. Lynch School | ES | K–5 | 266 |
| Mary M. Walsh School | ES | K–5 | 308 |
| Mary O. Pottenger School | ES | K–5 | 446 |
| Samuel Bowles School | ES | K-5 | 333 |
| White Street School | ES | K–5 | 449 |
| William N. DeBerry | ES | K–5 | 298 |
| Springfield Public Day Elementary School | ES | 1–5 | 54 |
| Alfred G. Zanetti Montessori Magnet School | ESMS | Pre-K–8 | 411 |
| Balliet Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 46 |
| Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (North) | MS | 6–8 | 298 |
| Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (South) | MS | 6–8 | 317 |
| Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (Talented and Gifted) | MS | 6–8 | 285 |
| Forest Park Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 714 |
| M. Marcus Kiley Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 643 |
|  Van Sickle International Baccalaureate | MS | 6–8 | 365 |
| STEM Middle Academy | MS | 6–8 | 288 |
| South End Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 246 |
| Springfield Public Day Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 56 |
|  John F. Kennedy Middle School | MS  | 6–8 | 435 |
| Van Sickle Academy | MS | 6–8 | 330 |
| Conservatory of the Arts | MSHS | 6–11 | 337 |
| John J. Duggan Middle School | MSHS | 6–11 | 672 |
| The Springfield Renaissance School an Expeditionary Learning School | MSHS | 6–12 | 713 |
| Gateway to College at Holyoke Community College | HS | 9–12 | 27 |
| Gateway to College at Springfield Technical Community College | HS | 9–12 | 48 |
| High School of Commerce, includes the Honors Academy | HS | 9–12 | 1,250 |
| Liberty Preparatory Academy | HS | 9–12 | 13 |
| Roger L. Putnam Vocational Technical Academy | HS | 9–12 | 1,442 |
| Springfield Central High School | HS | 9–12 | 2,055 |
| Springfield High School | HS | 9–12 | 117 |
| Springfield High School of Science and Technology | HS | 9–12 | 1,366 |
| Springfield Public Day High School | HS | 9–12 | 111 |
| **Totals** | **58** | **Pre-K–12** | **25,633** |
| \*As of October 1, 2016School participates in the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP)  |

Between 2013 and 2017 overall student enrollment increased by 350 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners (ELLs and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 11 K–12 districts of similar size (8,000–26,000 students) in fiscal year 2017:  $15,639, compared with $14,343 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing and Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/)).   Actual net school spending has been equal to what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B3 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**Note:** The Next-Generation MCAS assessment is administered to grades 3–8 in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics; it was administered for the first time in 2017. (For more information, see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/parents/results-faq.html>.) The MCAS assessment is administered to grades 5 and 8 in science and to grades 10 in ELA, math, and science. Data from the two assessments are presented separately because the tests are different and cannot be compared.

**The average scaled score on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment for all students was below the state rate by 11.7 points in ELA and below the state rate by 12.9 points in math.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2: Springfield Public Schools****Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Average Scaled Score (SS) by Subgroup Grades 3–8, 2017** |
| **Group** | **N** | **ELA SS** | **State SS** | **N** | **Math SS** | **State SS** |
| High Needs | 9,416 | 485.4 | 488.5 | 9,410 | 484.1 | 488.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 8,985 | 485.6 | 489.2 | 8,983 | 484.2 | 488.1 |
| SWD | 2,402 | 471.4 | 480.0 | 2,396 | 471.9 | 479.8 |
| ELLs | 2,386 | 480.9 | 484.9 | 2,380 | 481.8 | 486.8 |
| All | 10,961 | 487.4 | 499.1 | 10,963 | 485.9 | 498.8 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations |

**The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in grades 3–8 was below the state rate by 23 percentage points in ELA (26 percent compared with 49 percent) and below the state rate by 25 percentage points in math (23 percent compared with 48 percent).**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3: Springfield Public Schools****Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (M/E) by Subgroup Grades 3–8, 2017**  |
| **Group** | **N** | **ELA M/E** | **State M/E** | **Above/Below State** | **N** | **Math M/E** | **State M/E** | **Above/Below State** |
| High Needs | 9,416 | 23% | 27% | -4 | 9,410 | 20% | 27% | -7 |
| Econ. Dis. | 8,985 | 23% | 29% | -6 | 8,983 | 21% | 27% | -6 |
| SWD | 2,402 | 4% | 13% | -9% | 2,396 | 7% | 14% | -7 |
| ELLs | 2,386 | 18% | 23% | -5 | 2,380 | 19% | 26% | -7 |
| All | 10,961 | 26% | 49% | -23 | 10,963 | 23% | 48% | -25 |

**The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment in 10th grade was 18 percentage points below the state rate in ELA and 34 percentage points below the state rate in math.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 4: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10 by Subgroup, 2017** |
| **Group** | **N** | **ELA** | **State** | **Above/Below State** | **N** | **Math** | **State** | **Above/Below State** |
| High Needs | 1,276 | 69% | 79% | -10 | 1,289 | 39% | 58% | -19 |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,182 | 71% | 81% | -10 | 1,193 | 40% | 60% | -20 |
| SWD | 306 | 33% | 68% | -35 | 320 | 12% | 42% | -30 |
| ELLs | 302 | 50% | 59% | -9 | 303 | 25% | 39% | -14 |
| All | 1,576 | 73% | 91% | -18 | 1,591 | 45% | 79% | -34 |

**Between 2014 and 2017, science proficiency improved by 2 percentage points for all students and by 1 to 4 percentage points for high needs students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. In 2017, science proficiency remained below the state rate by 29 percentage points for all students and by 5 to 13 percentage points for high needs students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 5: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grades 5, 8, and 10 by Subgroup, 2014­–2017** |
| **Group** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| High Needs | 4,093 | 19% | 19% | 18% | 20% | 1 | 31% |
| Econ. Dis. | 3,857 | -- | 20% | 19% | 21% | -- | 32% |
| SWD | 1,073 | 6% | 4% | 6% | 8% | 2 | 21% |
| ELLs | 977 | 11% | 12% | 13% | 15% | 4 | 20% |
| All | 4,891 | 22% | 23% | 22% | 24% | 2 | 53% |

**In ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment was 23 percentage points below the state rate in grades 3–8 as a whole and by 18 to 29 percentage point in each tested grade.**

**In math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment was 25 percentage points below the state rate in grades 3–8 as a whole and by 17 to 32 percentage points in each tested grade.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 6: Springfield Public Schools****Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (M/E) in Grades 3–8, 2017** |
| **Grade** | **N** | **ELA M/E** | **State ELA** | **Difference** | **N** | **Math M/E** | **State Math** | **Difference** |
| 3 | 2,091 | 29% | 47% | -18 | 2,107 | 28% | 49% | -21 |
| 4 | 2,000 | 29% | 48% | -19 | 2,004 | 29% | 49% | -20 |
| 5 | 1,839 | 29% | 49% | -20 | 1,841 | 29% | 46% | -17 |
| 6 | 1,702 | 23% | 51% | -28 | 1,702 | 18% | 50% | -32 |
| 7 | 1,698 | 21% | 50% | -29 | 1,691 | 15% | 47% | -32 |
| 8 | 1,631 | 25% | 49% | -24 | 1,618 | 18% | 48% | -30 |
| 3–8 | 10,961 | 26% | 49% | -23 | 10,963 | 23% | 48% | -25 |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in science, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment improved by 2 percentage points in the district as a whole. In 2017, science proficiency was 24 percent, 29 percentage points below the state rate of 53 percent.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 7: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grades 5, 8, and 10, 2014–2017** |
| **Grade** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| 5 | 1,840 | 33% | 34% | 28% | 30% | -3 | 46% |
| 8 | 1,613 | 8% | 9% | 8% | 9% | 1 | 40% |
| 10 | 1,438 | 25% | 26% | 30% | 34% | 9 | 74% |
| All | 4,891 | 22% | 23% | 22% | 24% | 2 | 53% |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in ELA, the median student growth percentile (SGP) improved by 10 points in the 8th grade and by 2 to 8 points in the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 8: Springfield Public Schools****ELA Median Student Growth Percentile, 2014–2017** |
| **Grade** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 1,676 | 40.0 | 36.0 | 45.0 | 44.0 | 4.0 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 1,561 | 49.0 | 44.0 | 57.0 | 51.0 | 2.0 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 1,396 | 29.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 37.0 | 8.0 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 1,386 | 41.0 | 23.5 | 35.0 | 40.0 | -1.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 1,369 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 44.0 | 56.0 | 10.0 | 50.0 |
| 10 | 1,221 | 41.0 | 46.0 | 50.0 | 40.0 | -1.0 | 50.0 |
| Changes in SGP of 10 points or more are considered meaningful. |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in math, the median SGP declined by 2 to 9 percentage points in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 8th grades, and improved by 3 and 4 percentage points in the 7th and 10th grades, respectively.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table9: Springfield Public Schools****Math Median Student Growth Percentile, 2014–2017** |
| **Grade** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 1,656 | 44.0 | 35.0 | 41.0 | 42.0 | -2.0 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 1,546 | 52.0 | 47.0 | 44.0 | 47.0 | -5.0 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 1,382 | 34.0 | 37.0 | 25.0 | 24.5 | -9.5 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 1,365 | 27.0 | 20.0 | 29.0 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 1,292 | 45.0 | 36.0 | 44.0 | 36.0 | -9.0 | 50.0 |
| 10 | 1,218 | 40.0 | 51.0 | 43.0 | 44.0 | 4.0 | 50.0 |
| Changes in SGP of 10 points or more are considered meaningful. |

**In ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment ranged from 6 to 60 percent in the 3rd grade, from 7 to 63 percent in the 4th grade, and from 11 to 52 percent in the 5th grade in elementary schools with reportable data. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 0 to 62 percent in the 6th grade, from 0 to 50 percent in the 7th grade, and from 0 to 58 percent in the 8th grade.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 10: Springfield Public Schools****Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2017** |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Ellis ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield Public Day ES | 9% | 7% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 9% |
| Boland ES | 20% | 21% | 24% | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Balliet ES | 24% | 20% | 25% | -- | -- | -- | 23% |
| Bowles ES | 43% | 24% | 43% | -- | -- | -- | 36% |
| Bradley ES | 12% | 34% | 17% | -- | -- | -- | 20% |
| Brightwood ES | 24% | 22% | 11% | -- | -- | -- | 19% |
| Brookings ES | 14% | 33% | 38% | -- | -- | -- | 27% |
| Brunton ES | 22% | 28% | 52% | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| Deberry ES | 31% | 26% | 29% | -- | -- | -- | 28% |
| Dorman ES | 18% | 19% | 16% | -- | -- | -- | 18% |
| Johnson ES | 51% | 37% | 17% | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| Glenwood ES | 32% | 22% | 28% | -- | -- | -- | 27% |
| Glickman ES | 21% | 19% | 31% | -- | -- | -- | 24% |
| Freedman ES | 25% | 32% | 24% | -- | -- | -- | 27% |
| Harris ES | 41% | 31% | 27% | -- | -- | -- | 33% |
| Homer Street ES | 32% | 35% | 47% | -- | -- | -- | 37% |
| Indian Orchard ES | 18% | 21% | 29% | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Kensington International ES | 36% | 37% | 29% | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| Liberty ES | 33% | 30% | 42% | -- | -- | -- | 35% |
| Lincoln ES | 6% | 18% | 15% | -- | -- | -- | 13% |
| Dryden Veterans Memorial ES | 31% | 31% | 27% | -- | -- | -- | 30% |
| Lynch ES | 31% | 23% | 42% | -- | -- | -- | 32% |
| Pottenger ES | 42% | 41% | 33% | -- | -- | -- | 39% |
| Walsh ES | 22% | 26% | 24% | -- | -- | -- | 24% |
| Sumner Avenue ES | 37% | 35% | 40% | -- | -- | -- | 38% |
| Talmadge ES | 38% | 30% | 25% | -- | -- | -- | 31% |
| Beal ES | 47% | 63% | 30% | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| Warner ES | 58% | 40% | 44% | -- | -- | -- | 48% |
| Washington ES | 35% | 21% | 39% | -- | -- | -- | 32% |
| White Street ES | 43% | 48% | 39% | -- | -- | -- | 44% |
| Gerena Community School ES | 19% | 26% | 23% | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Zanetti ES | 60% | 56% | 33% | 53% | 47% | 58% | 51% |
| Springfield Renaissance School | -- | -- | -- | 46% | 41% | 39% | 42% |
| Duggan MS | -- | -- | -- | 20% | 15% | 35% | 23% |
| Forest Park MS | -- | -- | -- | 30% | 24% | 27% | 27% |
| Kennedy MS | -- | -- | -- | 7% | 14% | 14% | 11% |
| Kiley MS | -- | -- | -- | 26% | 24% | 33% | 27% |
| Springfield Public Day MS | -- | -- | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| STEM Middle Academy | -- | -- | -- | 27% | 42% | 28% | 33% |
| South End MS | -- | -- | -- | 10% | 6% | 19% | 12% |
| Balliet MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (North) | -- | -- | -- | 16% | 8% | 14% | 12% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (South) | -- | -- | -- | 20% | 13% | 35% | 23% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (Talented and Gifted) | -- | -- | -- | 62% | 50% | 44% | 53% |
| Conservatory of the Arts | -- | -- | -- | 12% | 18% | 9% | 13% |
| Van Sickle Academy | -- | -- | -- | 10% | 6% | 15% | 10% |
| District | 29% | 29% | 29% | 23% | 21% | 25% | 26% |
| State | 47% | 48% | 49% | 51% | 50% | 49% | 49% |

**In math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment ranged from 0 to 67 percent in the 3rd grade, from 5 to 62 percent in the 4th grade, and from 13 to 59 percent in the 5th grade in elementary schools with reportable data. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 0 to 75 percent in the 6th grade, from 0 to 45 percent in the 7th grade, and from 0 to 58 percent in the 8th grade.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 11: Springfield Public Schools****Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2017** |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Ellis ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield Public Day ES | 18% | 13% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 20% |
| Boland ES | 14% | 23% | 16% | -- | -- | -- | 18% |
| Balliet ES | 37% | 24% | 22% | -- | -- | -- | 28% |
| Bowles ES | 35% | 33% | 28% | -- | -- | -- | 32% |
| Bradley ES | 20% | 33% | 22% | -- | -- | -- | 24% |
| Brightwood ES | 0% | 33% | 22% | -- | -- | -- | 18% |
| Brookings ES | 19% | 33% | 33% | -- | -- | -- | 28% |
| Brunton ES | 29% | 42% | 34% | -- | -- | -- | 35% |
| Deberry ES | 67% | 48% | 42% | -- | -- | -- | 51% |
| Dorman ES | 19% | 41% | 25% | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Johnson ES | 51% | 62% | 35% | -- | -- | -- | 48% |
| Glenwood ES | 32% | 13% | 20% | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Glickman ES | 20% | 18% | 31% | -- | -- | -- | 23% |
| Freedman ES | 20% | 32% | 27% | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Harris ES | 50% | 41% | 48% | -- | -- | -- | 46% |
| Homer Street ES | 27% | 20% | 42% | -- | -- | -- | 29% |
| Indian Orchard ES | 14% | 11% | 21% | -- | -- | -- | 14% |
| Kensington International | 30% | 46% | 27% | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| Liberty ES | 39% | 30% | 58% | -- | -- | -- | 41% |
| Lincoln ES | 19% | 5% | 13% | -- | -- | -- | 13% |
| Dryden Memorial ES | 36% | 52% | 24% | -- | -- | -- | 39% |
| Lynch ES | 18% | 23% | 27% | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Pottenger ES | 35% | 31% | 21% | -- | -- | -- | 30% |
| Walsh ES | 22% | 20% | 29% | -- | -- | -- | 24% |
| Sumner Avenue ES | 24% | 21% | 44% | -- | -- | -- | 30% |
| Talmadge ES | 29% | 27% | 24% | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Beal ES | 29% | 39% | 30% | -- | -- | -- | 33% |
| Warner ES | 65% | 60% | 59% | -- | -- | -- | 62% |
| Washington ES | 36% | 19% | 27% | -- | -- | -- | 28% |
| White Street ES | 60% | 55% | 52% | -- | -- | -- | 56% |
| Gerena Community School | 28% | 20% | 20% | -- | -- | -- | 23% |
| Zanetti  | 44% | 49% | 33% | 75% | 45% | 58% | 49% |
| Springfield Renaissance SChool | -- | -- | -- | 27% | 28% | 21% | 26% |
| Duggan MS | -- | -- | -- | 17% | 18% | 33% | 22% |
| Forest Park MS | -- | -- | -- | 33% | 18% | 21% | 24% |
| Kennedy MS | -- | -- | -- | 11% | 8% | 23% | 14% |
| Kiley MS | -- | -- | -- | 14% | 16% | 15% | 15% |
| Springfield Public Day MS | -- | -- | -- | 0% | 0% | 6% | 2% |
| STEM Middle Academy | -- | -- | -- | 20% | 33% | 34% | 29% |
| South End MS | -- | -- | -- | 7% | 9% | 18% | 11% |
| Balliet MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (North) | -- | -- | -- | 4% | 3% | 9% | 5% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (South) | -- | -- | -- | 12% | 4% | 8% | 8% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (Talented and Gifted) | -- | -- | -- | 49% | 40% | 39% | 43% |
| Conservatory of the Arts | -- | -- | -- | 4% | 5% | 4% | 4% |
| Van Sickle International Baccalaureate | -- | -- | -- | 6% | 4% | 4% | 5% |
| District | 28% | 29% | 29% | 18% | 15% | 18% | 23% |
| State | 49% | 49% | 46% | 50% | 47% | 48% | 48% |

**In ELA, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the 10th grade MCAS assessment ranged from 27 percent to 100 percent and was below the state rate in 7 of the 8 schools with reportable data**.

**In math, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the 10th grade MCAS assessment ranged from 7 percent to 63 percent and was below the state rate in all the schools with reportable data**.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 12: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10 by School , 2017** |
| **School** | **ELA** | **Math** |
| Conservatory of the Arts | 82% | 33% |
| Gateway to College at Holyoke Community College | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Springfield Technical Community College | 100% | -- |
| High School Of Commerce | 60% | 33% |
| John J. Duggan Middle | 61% | 42% |
| Liberty Preparatory Academy | -- | -- |
| Roger L. Putnam Vocational Technical Academy | 85% | 49% |
| Springfield Central High | 83% | 55% |
| Springfield High School | -- | -- |
| Springfield High School of Science and Technology | 60% | 36% |
| Springfield Public Day High School | 27% | 7% |
| Springfield Renaissance School  | 83% | 63% |
| State | 91% | 79% |

**In science, the percentage of students in the 5th grade scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment ranged from 13 percent at Brightwood and Dorman to 60 percent at Zanetti. In the 8th grade the percentage ranged from 0 percent at Balliet to 58 percent at Zanetti. In the 10th grade, science proficiency ranged from 0 percent at Springfield Public Day to 66 percent at Springfield Renaissance.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 13: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade, 2017** |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Ellis ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield Public Day ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Boland ES | -- | -- | 17% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 17% |
| Balliet ES | -- | -- | 17% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 17% |
| Bowles ES | -- | -- | 50% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 50% |
| Bradley ES | -- | -- | 22% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Brightwood ES | -- | -- | 13% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 13% |
| Brookings ES | -- | -- | 35% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 35% |
| Brunton ES | -- | -- | 55% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 55% |
| Deberry ES | -- | -- | 39% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 39% |
| Dorman ES | -- | -- | 13% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 13% |
| Johnson ES | -- | -- | 25% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 25% |
| Glenwood ES | -- | -- | 33% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 33% |
| Glickman ES | -- | -- | 48% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 48% |
| Freedman ES | -- | -- | 22% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Harris ES | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| Homer Street ES | -- | -- | 44% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 44% |
| Indian Orchard ES | -- | -- | 34% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| Kensington International ES | -- | -- | 31% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 31% |
| Liberty ES | -- | -- | 45% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 45% |
| Lincoln ES | -- | -- | 15% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 15% |
| Dryden Veterans Memorial ES | -- | -- | 36% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 36% |
| Lynch ES | -- | -- | 27% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 27% |
| Pottenger ES | -- | -- | 19% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19% |
| Walsh ES | -- | -- | 31% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 31% |
| Sumner Avenue ES | -- | -- | 36% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 36% |
| Talmadge ES | -- | -- | 33% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 33% |
| Beal ES | -- | -- | 45% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 45% |
| Warner ES | -- | -- | 34% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| Washington ES | -- | -- | 25% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 25% |
| White Street ES | -- | -- | 26% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Gerena Community School | -- | -- | 26% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Zanetti ES | -- | -- | 60% | -- | -- | 58% | -- | 59% |
| Forest Park MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 8% | -- | 8% |
| Kennedy MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10% | -- | 10% |
| Kiley MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5% | -- | 5% |
| Springfield Public Day MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5% | -- | 5% |
| STEM Middle Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 31% | -- | 31% |
| South End MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4% | -- | 4% |
| Balliet MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% | -- | 0% |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (North) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1% | -- | 1% |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (South) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7% | -- | 7% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (Talented and Gifted) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 20% | -- | 20% |
| Van Sickle International Baccalaureate | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1% | -- | 1% |
| Van Sickle Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3% | -- | 3% |
| Conservatory of the Arts | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 8% | 7% | 7% |
| Springfield Renaissance School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19% | 66% | 41% |
| Duggan MS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 9% | 45% | 14% |
| Springfield Central HS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 40% | 40% |
| High School Of Commerce | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 26% | 26% |
| High School of Science and Technology | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 23% | 23% |
| Springfield Public Day HS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% | 0% |
| Liberty Preparatory Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield HS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Holyoke CC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Springfield Technical CC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Putnam Vocational Technical Acad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 37% | 37% |
| District | -- | -- | 30% | -- | -- | 9% | 34% | 24% |
| State | -- | -- | 46% | -- | -- | 40% | 74% | 53% |

**In ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in the district’s schools with grades 3–8 ranged from 0 to 53 percent.**

**In math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in the district’s schools with grades 3–8 ranged from 0 to 62 percent.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 14: Springfield Public Schools****Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Percent Meeting and Exceeding Expectations by School, 2017** |
|  | **ELA** | **Math** |
| **School** | **All** | **High Needs** | **Econ. Dis.** | **SWD** | **ELLs** | **All** | **High Needs** | **Econ. Dis.** | **SWD** | **ELLs** |
| Ells ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield Public Day ES | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% | -- | 20% | 20% | 21% | 20% | -- |
| Boland ES | 22% | 20% | 20% | 6% | 23% | 18% | 15% | 16% | 3% | 11% |
| Balliet ES | 23% | 18% | 17% | 4% | -- | 28% | 16% | 17% | 0% | -- |
| Bowles ES | 36% | 35% | 36% | 11% | 23% | 32% | 27% | 28% | 11% | 31% |
| Bradley ES | 20% | 20% | 20% | 7% | 20% | 24% | 24% | 25% | 5% | 24% |
| Brightwood ES | 19% | 19% | 19% | 3% | 28% | 18% | 18% | 18% | 0% | 23% |
| Brookings ES | 27% | 26% | 26% | 2% | 17% | 28% | 26% | 27% | 2% | 22% |
| Brunton ES | 34% | 28% | 28% | 0% | 18% | 35% | 32% | 32% | 3% | 26% |
| Deberry ES | 28% | 29% | 30% | 12% | 16% | 51% | 48% | 46% | 62% | 41% |
| Dorman ES | 18% | 17% | 17% | 3% | 11% | 26% | 21% | 22% | 5% | 21% |
| Johnson ES | 34% | 35% | 35% | 22% | 35% | 48% | 49% | 49% | 49% | 41% |
| Glenwood ES | 27% | 23% | 24% | 0% | 11% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 12% | 22% |
| Glickman ES | 24% | 16% | 15% | 4% | 16% | 23% | 16% | 17% | 2% | 19% |
| Freedman ES | 27% | 25% | 23% | 27% | 31% | 26% | 22% | 21% | 18% | 25% |
| Harris ES | 33% | 26% | 27% | 5% | 20% | 46% | 37% | 37% | 15% | 33% |
| Homer Street ES | 37% | 37% | 37% | 17% | 41% | 29% | 27% | 28% | 8% | 33% |
| Zanetti ES | 51% | 36% | 37% | 15% | -- | 49% | 36% | 38% | 0% | -- |
| Indian Orchard ES | 22% | 20% | 21% | 0% | 19% | 14% | 12% | 12% | 2% | 16% |
| Kensington International ES | 34% | 32% | 32% | 0% | 30% | 34% | 33% | 33% | 5% | 40% |
| Liberty ES | 35% | 32% | 34% | 0% | 18% | 41% | 40% | 40% | 9% | 34% |
| Lincoln ES | 13% | 11% | 12% | 3% | 8% | 13% | 11% | 12% | 6% | 11% |
| Dryden Veterans Memorial ES | 30% | 20% | 21% | 0% | 20% | 39% | 31% | 29% | 0% | 45% |
| Lynch ES | 32% | 31% | 32% | 0% | 23% | 22% | 21% | 22% | 0% | 31% |
| Pottenger ES | 39% | 34% | 35% | 2% | 17% | 30% | 25% | 25% | 2% | 16% |
| Walsh ES | 24% | 23% | 23% | 5% | 24% | 24% | 17% | 16% | 11% | 17% |
| Sumner Avenue ES | 38% | 35% | 35% | 12% | 33% | 30% | 26% | 27% | 10% | 26% |
| Talmadge ES | 31% | 27% | 27% | 7% | 23% | 26% | 23% | 24% | 11% | 23% |
| Beal ES | 47% | 42% | 43% | 5% | 50% | 33% | 29% | 30% | 5% | 30% |
| Warner ES | 48% | 40% | 39% | 9% | 36% | 62% | 56% | 56% | 18% | 57% |
| Washington ES | 32% | 27% | 24% | 15% | 29% | 28% | 23% | 21% | 8% | 25% |
| White Street ES | 44% | 40% | 40% | 6% | 39% | 56% | 54% | 54% | 23% | 50% |
| Gerena Community School | 22% | 21% | 21% | 3% | 15% | 23% | 20% | 20% | 10% | 14% |
| Springfield Renaissance School | 42% | 31% | 32% | 0% | 36% | 26% | 19% | 18% | 6% | 27% |
| Duggan MS | 23% | 21% | 21% | 4% | 13% | 22% | 20% | 19% | 5% | 19% |
| Forest Park MS | 27% | 25% | 25% | 1% | 15% | 24% | 22% | 23% | 2% | 18% |
| Kennedy MS | 11% | 10% | 10% | 0% | 8% | 14% | 12% | 12% | 5% | 7% |
| Kiley MS | 27% | 25% | 25% | 3% | 18% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 2% | 14% |
| Springfield Public Day MS | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | -- | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | -- |
| STEM Middle Academy | 33% | 31% | 32% | 3% | 40% | 29% | 25% | 25% | 0% | 30% |
| South End MS | 12% | 11% | 11% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 12% | 6% |
| Balliet MS | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | -- |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (North) | 12% | 12% | 12% | 3% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 5% | 1% | 1% |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (South) | 23% | 21% | 22% | 7% | 13% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 3% | 5% |
| Chestnut Accelerated MS (Talented and Gifted) | 53% | 48% | 49% | 6% | 42% | 43% | 39% | 39% | 6% | 37% |
| Conservatory of the Arts | 13% | 12% | 12% | 0% | 9% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% |
| Van Sickle International Baccalaureate | 10% | 9% | 9% | 4% | 3% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 2% | 5% |
| Van Sickle Academy | 15% | 11% | 12% | 1% | 7% | 8% | 7% | 7% | 2% | 5% |
| District | 26% | 23% | 23% | 4% | 18% | 23% | 20% | 21% | 7% | 19% |

**Between 2014 and 2017, ELA proficiency in the 10th grade improved by 2 to 14 percentage points in 3 of the 6 schools with reportable trend data. ELA proficiency ranged from 27 to 100 percent in the 9 schools with reportable 10th grade data.**

**Between 2014 and 2017, math proficiency in the 10th grade improved by 2 to 14 percentage points in 3 of the 6 schools with reportable trend data. Math proficiency ranged from 7 to 63 percent in the 8 schools with reportable 10th grade data.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 15: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10, 2014–2017** |
|  | **ELA** | **Math** |
| **School** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** |
| Liberty Prep. Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield High School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Holyoke CC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Springfield Technical CC | -- | -- | -- | 100% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield Renaissance School | 97% | 98% | 92% | 83% | -14 | 69% | 62% | 68% | 63% | -6 |
| High Needs | 97% | 96% | 86% | 77% | -20 | 62% | 53% | 50% | 54% | -8 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | 98% | 90% | 79% | -- | -- | 55% | 59% | 58% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 90% | -- | 53% | 43% | -47 | 30% | -- | 7% | 10% | -20 |
| Duggan Middle | -- | -- | 76% | 61% | -- | -- | -- | 32% | 42% | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 75% | 61% | -- | -- | -- | 28% | 39% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | -- | 79% | 59% | -- | -- | -- | 28% | 37% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | 31% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 8% | -- |
| Conservatory of the Arts | -- | -- | 78% | 82% | -- | -- | -- | 21% | 33% | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 74% | 77% | -- | -- | -- | 19% | 36% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | -- | 82% | 76% | -- | -- | -- | 22% | 38% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | 20% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% | -- | -- |
| Springfield Central High | 81% | 85% | 86% | 83% | 2 | 53% | 58% | 53% | 55% | 2 |
| High Needs | 78% | 80% | 80% | 79% | 1 | 49% | 50% | 45% | 46% | -3 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | 85% | 83% | 81% | -- | -- | 52% | 47% | 46% | -- |
| ELLs | 34% | 59% | 68% | 68% | 34 | 20% | 41% | 35% | 40% | 20 |
| SWD | 33% | 40% | 50% | 37% | 4 | 13% | 18% | 12% | 18% | 5 |
| High School Of Commerce | 65% | 67% | 65% | 60% | -5 | 39% | 43% | 38% | 33% | -6 |
| High Needs | 63% | 63% | 61% | 58% | -5 | 36% | 39% | 35% | 31% | -5 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | 65% | 65% | 60% | -- | -- | 40% | 38% | 32% | -- |
| ELLs | 28% | 43% | 36% | 30% | 2 | 20% | 18% | 19% | 17% | -3 |
| SWD | 27% | 20% | 31% | 13% | -14 | 13% | 6% | 10% | 2% | -11 |
| High School of Science and Technology | 52% | 58% | 64% | 60% | 8 | 22% | 34% | 23% | 36% | 14 |
| High Needs | 52% | 53% | 61% | 58% | 6 | 23% | 28% | 19% | 35% | 12 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | 59% | 66% | 60% | -- | -- | 30% | 20% | 35% | -- |
| ELLs | 23% | 22% | 44% | 36% | 13 | 15% | 17% | 9% | 21% | 6 |
| SWD | 15% | 15% | 18% | 20% | 5 | 8% | 4% | 6% | 13% | 5 |
| Springfield Public Day High School | 50% | -- | 13% | 27% | -23 | 40% | 18% | 13% | 7% | -33 |
| High Needs | 50% | -- | 13% | 27% | -23 | 40% | 18% | 13% | 7% | -33 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | -- | 15% | 29% | -- | -- | -- | 8% | 8% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 50% | -- | 13% | 27% | -23 | 40% | 18% | 13% | 7% | -33 |
| Putnam Vocational Technical Academy | 78% | 83% | 91% | 85% | 7 | 47% | 51% | 59% | 49% | 2 |
| High Needs | 77% | 80% | 88% | 82% | 5 | 45% | 46% | 54% | 46% | 1 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | 84% | 88% | 83% | -- | -- | 49% | 57% | 47% | -- |
| ELLs | 58% | 62% | 74% | 68% | 10 | 35% | 22% | 32% | 28% | -7 |
| SWD | 36% | 41% | 59% | 53% | 17 | 16% | 12% | 18% | 20% | 4 |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in science, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment improved by 1 to 28 percentage points in 22 of the 44 schools with reportable trend data. Science proficiency did not improve in 3 of the 44 schools, and declined by 1 to 32 percentage points in 19 of the 44 schools with reportable trend data.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 16: Springfield Public Schools****MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Science by School and Subgroup, 2014–2017** |
| **School** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** |
| Ellis ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Liberty Preparatory Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield High School | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Holyoke CC | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gateway to College at Springfield Technical CC | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Springfield Public Day ES | 9 | 0% | -- | 28% | -- | -- |
| High Needs | 9 | 0% | -- | 28% | -- | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 9 | -- | -- | 27% | -- | -- |
| SWD | 9 | 0% | -- | 28% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Boland ES | 92 | 40% | 26% | 47% | 17% | -23 |
| High Needs | 81 | 40% | 25% | 46% | 15% | -25 |
| Econ. Dis. | 73 | -- | 28% | 47% | 16% | -- |
| SWD | 23 | 16% | 7% | 20% | 4% | -12 |
| ELLs | 22 | 50% | 19% | 43% | 5% | -45 |
| Balliet ES | 36 | 24% | 33% | 17% | 17% | -7 |
| High Needs | 24 | 24% | 36% | 11% | 4% | -20 |
| Econ. Dis. | 19 | -- | 33% | 11% | 5% | -- |
| SWD | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Bowles ES | 40 | 22% | 35% | 15% | 50% | 28 |
| High Needs | 27 | 21% | 30% | 15% | 52% | 31 |
| Econ. Dis. | 25 | -- | 31% | 18% | 56% | -- |
| SWD | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Bradley ES | 65 | 21% | 7% | 11% | 22% | 1 |
| High Needs | 65 | 21% | 8% | 11% | 22% | 1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 64 | -- | 8% | 12% | 22% | -- |
| SWD | 16 | 8% | 0% | 7% | 0% | -8 |
| ELLs | 26 | 18% | 13% | 4% | 35% | 17 |
| Brightwood ES | 46 | 22% | 33% | 12% | 13% | -9 |
| High Needs | 44 | 22% | 31% | 12% | 14% | -8 |
| Econ. Dis. | 44 | -- | 32% | 13% | 14% | -- |
| SWD | 14 | -- | 17% | -- | 7% | -- |
| ELLs | 21 | 22% | 18% | 8% | 24% | 2 |
| Brookings ES | 48 | 10% | 10% | 8% | 35% | 25 |
| High Needs | 46 | 10% | 9% | 6% | 33% | 23 |
| Econ. Dis. | 46 | -- | 10% | 7% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 14 | 0% | -- | 0% | 7% | 7 |
| ELLs | 12 | 0% | 6% | -- | 33% | 33 |
| Brunton ES | 67 | 48% | 60% | 51% | 55% | 7 |
| High Needs | 50 | 47% | 50% | 46% | 48% | 1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 47 | -- | 49% | 45% | 49% | -- |
| SWD | 8 | 33% | -- | 7% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 12 | 22% | 46% | 53% | 42% | 20 |
| Deberry ES | 44 | 17% | 23% | 25% | 39% | 22 |
| High Needs | 42 | 17% | 21% | 19% | 36% | 19 |
| Econ. Dis. | 41 | -- | 22% | 19% | 37% | -- |
| SWD | 9 | -- | 0% | 23% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 11 | -- | 10% | 31% | 55% | -- |
| Dorman ES | 55 | 16% | 24% | 14% | 13% | -3 |
| High Needs | 48 | 15% | 24% | 13% | 13% | -2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | -- | 28% | 15% | 14% | -- |
| SWD | 14 | -- | 0% | -- | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Johnson ES | 104 | 46% | 32% | 19% | 25% | -21 |
| High Needs | 94 | 45% | 31% | 19% | 27% | -18 |
| Econ. Dis. | 90 | -- | 34% | 20% | 26% | -- |
| SWD | 33 | 39% | 16% | 26% | 21% | -18 |
| ELLs | 21 | 16% | 25% | 16% | 38% | 22 |
| Glenwood ES | 46 | 39% | 53% | 22% | 33% | -6 |
| High Needs | 38 | 36% | 52% | 19% | 24% | -12 |
| Econ. Dis. | 37 | -- | 52% | 18% | 24% | -- |
| SWDs | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 6 | -- | -- | 17% | -- | -- |
| Glickman ES | 54 | 46% | 32% | 33% | 48% | 2 |
| High Needs | 45 | 44% | 26% | 24% | 40% | -4 |
| Econ. Dis. | 38 | -- | 29% | 29% | 37% | -- |
| SWD | 21 | 15% | 6% | 7% | 14% | -1 |
| ELLs | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Freedman ES | 37 | 54% | 50% | 34% | 22% | -32 |
| High Needs | 28 | 56% | 44% | 34% | 14% | -42 |
| Econ. Dis. | 27 | -- | 41% | 34% | 15% | -- |
| SWD | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Harris ES | 62 | 34% | 56% | 55% | 47% | 13 |
| High Needs | 49 | 30% | 48% | 52% | 39% | 9 |
| Econ. Dis. | 48 | -- | 51% | 51% | 40% | -- |
| SWD | 11 | 6% | 40% | 31% | 18% | 12 |
| ELLs | 13 | 19% | 45% | 67% | 23% | 4% |
| Homer Street ES | 55 | 21% | 35% | 21% | 44% | 23 |
| High Needs | 52 | 20% | 35% | 19% | 40% | 20 |
| Econ. Dis. | 51 | -- | 35% | 20% | 41% | -- |
| SWD | 8 | 5% | 11% | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 15 | 18% | 18% | 10% | 27% | 9 |
| Zanetti ES | 66 | 47% | 52% | 49% | 59% | 12 |
| High Needs | 32 | 36% | 39% | 39% | 50% | 14 |
| Econ. Dis. | 31 | -- | 41% | 38% | 52% | -- |
| SWD | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Indian Orchard ES | 62 | 38% | 22% | 10% | 34% | -4 |
| High Needs | 55 | 38% | 20% | 7% | 33% | -5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 54 | -- | 22% | 8% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 14 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 14 |
| ELLs | 11 | -- | -- | 0% | 45% | -- |
| Kensington International School | 51 | 37% | 43% | 39% | 31% | -6 |
| High Needs | 48 | 35% | 43% | 40% | 29% | -6 |
| Econ. Dis. | 45 | -- | 47% | 40% | 29% | -- |
| SWD | 12 | -- | -- | -- | 8% | -- |
| ELLs | 25 | 50% | 19% | 36% | 20% | -30 |
| Liberty ES | 38 | 31% | 43% | 37% | 45% | 14 |
| High Needs | 29 | 32% | 41% | 33% | 34% | 2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 27 | -- | 42% | 37% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 11 | -- | -- | 18% | 18% | -- |
| Lincoln ES | 47 | 23% | 29% | 2% | 15% | -8 |
| High Needs | 44 | 24% | 28% | 2% | 14% | -10 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | -- | 28% | 3% | 14% | -- |
| SWD | 12 | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | -7 |
| ELLs | 22 | 16% | 18% | 0% | 14% | -2 |
| Dryden Veterans Memorial ES | 33 | 20% | 31% | 14% | 36% | 16 |
| High Needs | 20 | 12% | 29% | 13% | 30% | 18 |
| Econ. Dis. | 20 | -- | 30% | 14% | 30% | -- |
| SWD | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Lynch ES | 33 | 51% | 26% | 47% | 27% | -24 |
| High Needs | 30 | 43% | 25% | 46% | 23% | -20 |
| Econ. Dis. | 29 | -- | 25% | 46% | 24% | -- |
| SWD | 3 | -- | 10% | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Pottenger ES | 58 | 36% | 36% | 24% | 19% | -17 |
| High Needs | 49 | 32% | 35% | 21% | 12% | -20 |
| Econ. Dis. | 44 | -- | 38% | 21% | 11% | -- |
| SWD | 16 | 0% | -- | -- | 0% | 0 |
| ELLs | 10 | 10% | 33% | 30% | 10% | 0 |
| Walsh ES | 42 | 28% | 16% | 15% | 31% | 3 |
| High Needs | 33 | 25% | 16% | 18% | 21% | -4 |
| Econ. Dis. | 32 | -- | 19% | 19% | 19% | -- |
| SWD | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 16 | -- | 21% | -- | 13% | -- |
| Sumner Avenue ES | 77 | 51% | 44% | 36% | 36% | -15 |
| High Needs | 67 | 48% | 40% | 33% | 31% | -17 |
| Econ. Dis. | 66 | -- | 42% | 38% | 32% | -- |
| SWD | 10 | 29% | 15% | 13% | 10% | -19 |
| ELLs | 18 | 44% | 46% | 30% | 22% | -22 |
| Talmadge ES | 51 | 37% | 56% | 20% | 33% | -4 |
| High Needs | 46 | 34% | 46% | 15% | 30% | -4 |
| Econ. Dis. | 45 | -- | 48% | 17% | 31% | -- |
| SWD | 15 | -- | -- | 0% | 20% | -- |
| ELLs | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Beal ES | 40 | 70% | 70% | 72% | 45% | -25 |
| High Needs | 33 | 67% | 59% | 68% | 42% | -25 |
| Econ. Dis. | 30 | -- | 62% | 71% | 43% | -- |
| SWD | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Warner ES | 32 | 33% | 36% | 16% | 34% | 1 |
| High Needs | 27 | 31% | 29% | 10% | 33% | 2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 24 | -- | 31% | 11% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Washington ES | 59 | 51% | 34% | 38% | 25% | -26 |
| High Needs | 51 | 50% | 34% | 36% | 22% | -28 |
| Econ. Dis. | 48 | -- | 32% | 37% | 23% | -- |
| SWD | 8 | -- | -- | 23% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 22 | 43% | 36% | 25% | 14% | -29 |
| White Street ES | 61 | 19% | 45% | 37% | 26% | 7 |
| High Needs | 53 | 19% | 46% | 33% | 25% | 6 |
| Econ. Dis. | 50 | -- | 44% | 33% | 24% | -- |
| SWD | 14 | 0% | -- | -- | 7% | 7 |
| ELLs | 17 | 15% | 45% | 32% | 24% | 9 |
| Gerena Community School | 88 | 30% | 24% | 32% | 26% | -4 |
| High Needs | 80 | 28% | 15% | 26% | 21% | -7 |
| Econ. Dis. | 76 | -- | 16% | 27% | 22% | -- |
| SWD | 16 | 5% | 0% | 7% | 0% | -5 |
| ELLs | 28 | 24% | 9% | 21% | 21% | -3 |
| Springfield Renaissance School | 182 | 40% | 43% | 39% | 41% | 1 |
| High Needs | 108 | 32% | 30% | 28% | 31% | -1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 98 | -- | 32% | 30% | 32% | -- |
| SWD | 30 | 13% | 5% | 12% | 13% | 0 |
| ELLs | 6 | -- | -- | 0% | -- | -- |
| Duggan MS | 190 | 6% | 4% | 6% | 14% | 8 |
| High Needs | 149 | 6% | 6% | 5% | 11% | 5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 139 | -- | 6% | 5% | 12% | -- |
| SWD | 52 | 0% | 3% | 0% | 4% | 4 |
| ELLs | 23 | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0 |
| Forest Park MS | 226 | 9% | 7% | 12% | 8% | -1 |
| High Needs | 198 | 8% | 7% | 11% | 7% | -1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 189 | -- | 8% | 11% | 7% | -- |
| SWD | 44 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 |
| ELLs | 56 | 4% | 2% | 12% | 4% | 0 |
| Kennedy MS | 122 | 1% | 6% | 0% | 10% | 9 |
| High Needs | 107 | 1% | 4% | 0% | 7% | 6 |
| Econ. Dis. | 103 | -- | 4% | 0% | 8% | -- |
| SWD | 27 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 |
| ELLs | 19 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 5 |
| Kiley MS | 204 | 5% | 6% | 8% | 5% | 0 |
| High Needs | 176 | 4% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 0 |
| Econ. Dis. | 167 | -- | 6% | 6% | 4% | -- |
| SWD | 50 | 3% | 0% | 2% | 0% | -3 |
| ELLs | 25 | 3% | 3% | 0% | 0% | -3 |
| Springfield Public Day MS | 19 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 5 |
| High Needs | 19 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 17 | -- | 0% | 0% | 6% | -- |
| SWD | 19 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 5 |
| ELLs | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| STEM Middle Academy | 88 | 25% | 27% | 28% | 31% | 6 |
| High Needs | 70 | 22% | 18% | 23% | 27% | 5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 65 | -- | 19% | 25% | 28% | -- |
| SWD | 6 | 0% | -- | 10% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 10 | -- | 8% | -- | 20% | -- |
| South End MS | 78 | 8% | 5% | 2% | 4% | -4 |
| High Needs | 73 | 7% | 5% | 2% | 3% | -4 |
| Econ. Dis. | 70 | -- | 5% | 2% | 3% | -- |
| SWD | 17 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 |
| ELLs | 19 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 |
| Balliet MS | 25 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 |
| High Needs | 25 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 |
| Econ. Dis. | 24 | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% | -- |
| SWD | 12 | -- | -- | -- | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (North) | 98 | -- | 0% | 0% | 1% | -- |
| High Needs | 91 | -- | 0% | 0% | 1% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 89 | -- | 0% | 0% | 1% | -- |
| SWD | 25 | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 29 | -- | 0% | 0% | 3% | -- |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (South) | 96 | -- | 1% | 4% | 7% | -- |
| High Needs | 93 | -- | 2% | 3% | 8% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 88 | -- | 2% | 3% | 7% | -- |
| SWD | 17 | -- | 0% | 0% | 12% | -- |
| ELLs | 44 | -- | 0% | 0% | 5% | -- |
| Chestnut Accelerated Academy MS (Talented and Gifted) | 69 | -- | 37% | 22% | 20% | -- |
| High Needs | 58 | -- | 30% | 19% | 14% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 56 | -- | 33% | 21% | 14% | -- |
| SWD | 26 | -- | 0% | 0% | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Conservatory of the Arts | 94 | -- | -- | 8% | 7% | -- |
| High Needs | 69 | -- | -- | 8% | 6% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 66 | -- | -- | 9% | 6% | -- |
| SWD | 9 | -- | -- | 0% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Van Sickle International Baccalaureate | 101 | -- | -- | 2% | 1% | -- |
| High Needs | 88 | -- | -- | 2% | 1% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 87 | -- | -- | 2% | 1% | -- |
| SWD | 24 | -- | -- | 4% | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 17 | -- | -- | 0% | 0% | -- |
| Van Sickle Academy | 131 | -- | -- | 9% | 3% |  |
| High Needs | 111 | -- | -- | 5% | 3% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 99 | -- | -- | 5% | 2% | -- |
| SWD | 38 | -- | -- | 4% | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 23 | -- | -- | 3% | 4% | -- |
| Springfield Central High School | 448 | 40% | 36% | 36% | 40% | 0 |
| High Needs | 325 | 40% | 36% | 36% | 40% | 0 |
| Econ. Dis. | 301 | 40% | 36% | 36% | 40% | 0 |
| SWD | 59 | 40% | 36% | 36% | 40% | 0 |
| ELLs | 59 | 40% | 36% | 36% | 40% | 0 |
| High School Of Commerce | 157 | 7% | 17% | 15% | 26% | 19 |
| High Needs | 143 | 5% | 16% | 14% | 24% | 19 |
| Econ. Dis. | 137 | -- | 16% | 15% | 25% | -- |
| SWD | 29 | 0% | 2% | 4% | 7% | 7 |
| ELLs | 33 | 3% | 5% | 6% | 9% | 6 |
| High School of Science and Technology | 267 | 8% | 9% | 19% | 23% | 15 |
| High Needs | 232 | 8% | 6% | 16% | 22% | 14 |
| Econ. Dis. | 214 | -- | 7% | 18% | 24% | -- |
| SWD | 51 | 9% | 2% | 4% | 6% | -3 |
| ELLs | 67 | 2% | 1% | 8% | 12% | 10 |
| Springfield Public Day High School | 10 | -- | 0% | 10% | 0% | -- |
| High Needs | 10 | -- | 0% | 10% | 0% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 10 | -- | 0% | 10% | 0% | -- |
| ELLs | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Putnam Vocational Technical Academy | 327 | 19% | 26% | 46% | 37% | 18 |
| High Needs | 265 | 17% | 23% | 42% | 33% | 16 |
| Econ. Dis. | 245 | -- | 26% | 43% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 57 | 4% | 1% | 19% | 19% | 15 |
| ELLs | 74 | 2% | 7% | 20% | 15% | 13 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, the district’s four-year cohort graduation rate improved by 13.9 percentage points for all students and improved by 9.8 to 27.6 percentage points for each subgroup except Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 17: Springfield Public Schools****Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2013–2016** |
| **Group** | **N** **(2016)** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2016)** |
| High needs | 1,612 | 53.3% | 60.4% | 65.4% | 67.8% | 14.5 | 79.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 1,585 | 53.9% | 60.8% | 65.6% | 68.1% | 14.2 | 78.4% |
| ELLs | 278 | 30.3% | 43.0% | 49.7% | 57.9% | 27.6 | 64.1% |
| SWD | 394 | 34.8% | 35.9% | 36.6% | 45.9% | 11.1 | 71.8% |
| African American/Black | 361 | 63.1% | 69.8% | 54.3% | 72.9% | 9.8 | 78.9% |
| Asian | 41 | 75.5% | 79.2% | 82.9% | 85.4% | 9.9 | 92.7% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,087 | 47.0% | 55.4% | 66.8% | 65.4% | 18.4 | 72.7% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 16 | 77.4% | 80.0% | 83.3% | 68.8% | -8.6 | 84.3% |
| White | 233 | 63.1% | 67.6% | 75.1% | 75.5% | 12.4 | 91.9% |
| All  | 1,739 | 54.9% | 61.6% | 66.7% | 68.8% | 13.9 | 87.5% |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income families used for 2013, 2014, and 2015 rates. |

**Between 2012 and 2015, the district’s five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 9.4 percentage points for all students, and improved by 0.4 to 17.3 percentage points for each subgroup except African American/Black students.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 18: Springfield Public Schools****Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2012–2015** |
| **Group** | **N** **(2015)** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2015)** |
| High needs | 1,680 | 58.2% | 58.1% | 63.3% | 67.9% | 9.7 | 82.0% |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 1,653 | 58.7% | 58.8% | 63.7% | 68.1% | 9.4 | 81.6% |
| ELLs | 286 | 38.9% | 34.8% | 45.6% | 52.4% | 13.5 | 70.2% |
| SWD | 429 | 40.2% | 38.1% | 38.9% | 40.6% | 0.4 | 74.5% |
| African American/Black | 254 | 67.3% | 68.0% | 72.7% | 57.9% | -9.4 | 82.3% |
| Asian | 41 | 82.5% | 81.6% | 84.9% | 87.8% | 5.3 | 94.1% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,278 | 51.8% | 52.0% | 58.1% | 69.1% | 17.3 | 75.8% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 6 | 72.7% | 79.0% | 84.4% | 83.3% | 10.6 | 88.0% |
| White | 257 | 70.1% | 66.2% | 69.6% | 77.8% | 7.7 | 93.1% |
| All  | 1,837 | 59.8% | 59.5% | 64.4% | 69.2% | 9.4 | 89.4% |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income families used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 rates. |

**Between 2013 and 2016, in-school suspension rates declined by 2.6 percentage points for all students, and for each subgroup with reportable data, except Asian students. In 2016, the in-school suspension rate was 4.5 percent for all students, more than twice the state rate of 1.9 percent and above the state rate for each subgroup.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 19: Springfield Public Schools****In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup, 2013–2016** |
| **Group** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | 7.2% | 6.8% | 3.3% | 4.7% | -2.5 | 2.9% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | 3.3% | 4.8% | -- | 3.2% |
| ELLs | 5.4% | 5.4% | 3.2% | 3.7% | -1.7 | 1.9% |
| SWD | 8.5% | 8.0% | 3.9% | 5.4% | -3.1 | 3.5% |
| African American/Black | 9.7% | 9.1% | 3.1% | 6.3% | -3.4 | 3.7% |
| Asian | 1.7% | 2.0% | 0.5% | 2.2% | 0.5 | 0.6% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 6.8% | 6.4% | 3.4% | 4.4% | -2.4 | 3.1% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 9.8% | 7.6% | 3.5% | 4.2% | -5.6 | 2.1% |
| White | 5.1% | 4.9% | 2.0% | 3.1% | -2.0 | 1.4% |
| All  | 7.1% | 6.7% | 3.2% | 4.5% | -2.6 | 1.9% |

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

**Between 2013 and 2016, out-of-school suspension rates declined by 2.5 percentage points for all students and for each subgroup with reportable data. In 2016, the out-of-school suspension rate was 8.0 percent for all students, more than twice the state rate of 2.9 percent, and above the state rate for each subgroup.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 20: Springfield Public Schools****Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup, 2013–2016** |
| **Group** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | 10.9% | 9.9% | 9.4% | 8.7% | -2.2 | 4.9% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | 9.3% | 8.8% | -- | 5.6% |
| ELLs | 10.2% | 8.4% | 7.9% | 7.2% | -3.0 | 4.0% |
| SWD | 15.4% | 14.3% | 12.8% | 12.8% | -2.6 | 5.9% |
| African American/Black | 12.9% | 11.7% | 9.2% | 9.0% | -3.9 | 6.9% |
| Asian | 1.7% | 1.3% | 1.4% | 1.3% | -0.4 | 0.8% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 10.9% | 9.6% | 9.3% | 8.3% | -2.6 | 5.7% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 10.5% | 9.6% | 8.1% | 5.7% | -4.8 | 3.4% |
| White | 6.5% | 6.6% | 5.4% | 6.4% | -0.1 | 1.7% |
| All  | 10.5% | 9.5% | 8.7% | 8.0% | -2.5 | 2.9% |

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

**In 2016, the district’s dropout rate for all students was 4.9 percent, more than twice the state rate of 1.9 percent, and above the state rate for each subgroup.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 21: Springfield Public Schools****Dropout Rates by Subgroup, 2013–2016** |
| **Group** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | 6.6% | 7.0% | 5.6% | 5.9% | -0.7 | 3.7% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | 4.7% | 6.0% | -- | 4.1% |
| ELLs | 10.7% | 10.4% | 6.6% | 7.0% | -3.7 | 6.6% |
| SWD | 11.2% | 13.1% | 9.9% | 9.0% | -2.2 | 3.1% |
| African American/Black | 5.0% | 6.1% | 3.2% | 3.5% | -1.5 | 3.2% |
| Asian | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.9% | 1.0% | 0.5 | 0.7% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7.7% | 8.4% | 6.4% | 5.9% | -1.8 | 4.5% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 1.5% | 3.8% | 0.5% | 7.7% | 6.2 | 2.4% |
| White | 6.4% | 5.3% | 4.2% | 3.4% | -3.0 | 1.1% |
| All  | 6.5% | 7.2% | 5.1% | 4.9% | -1.6 | 1.9% |
| \*Dropout rates for students from low income families used for 2013 and 2014 rates. |

Leadership and Governance

***Contextual Background***

The guiding vision for the Springfield Public Schools’ strategic plan is to develop “a culture of equity and proficiency” that “raises the bar” while also closing achievement gaps. The superintendent, a collaborative leader, works to ensure that staff across the district share responsibility for achieving the district’s vision for teaching and learning. He consistently uses the district’s strategic plan to focus and coordinate staff time and resources to improve instruction and student learning. As district staff carry out a variety of complex tasks—such as revising curriculum, differentiating instruction, developing budgets, and composing school improvement plans—they regularly receive professional development, coaching, and technical assistance. When budgeting and allocating resources, the superintendent and district leaders employ equitable practices so that schools serving the students with the highest needs receive commensurate supports and resources. The superintendent’s leadership style is both firm and flexible: firm on defining district goals and flexible on the means for attaining those goals.

A cogent example of the district leadership’s commitment to equity and flexibility is developing and implementing the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP), which includes nine low performing middle schools and one high school. The mayor, another school committee member, and the superintendent are members of the SEZP’s board of directors. While SEZP’s 10 schools are part of Springfield’s public school system, they operate with a unique and separate contract with the Springfield Education Association and added autonomies relative to curriculum, instruction, and professional development.

The district’s 2017–2020 strategic plan, *The Springfield Promise,* contains four broad strategic priorities, each accompanied by 6 to 7 outcomes. For example, strategic priority #3 is“All decisions for students, schools, and the district are based on timely, accurate and relevant data.” The third outcome under that priority reads: “Providing ongoing professional development and coaching to all staff on the effective use of data and technology to improve instruction.” The plan identifies the quantitative measures[[12]](#footnote-12) that the district will track to monitor the plan’s desired outcomes, and the district as a whole and each school have a set of annual, quantitative goals. The superintendent’s annual presentation to administrators before the start of the school year articulates the goals for the year based on data from the previous school year. The superintendent said that when reporting on progress toward achieving the strategic plan’s priorites, the district develops and displays many data charts in presentations to the community, noting that much analysis and discussion of trends in the charted data takes place in these presentations.

***Strength Findings***

1. **The superintendent, school committee members, and district leaders have established a culture of collaboration, accountability, and shared responsibility for improving student learning in the district.**
2. School committee members and the superintendent model collaboration for the district and the broader community.

1. School committee members cited the camaraderie and mutual respect among school committee members and their harmonious working relationship with the superintendent.

2. District leaders and city officials said that while their past relationships were “adversarial,” they now enjoy positive and productive working relationships, especially with regard to budgeting and financial management activities. The mayor, who by charter serves as chair of the school committee and the city council, encourages municipal collaboration. He stated his belief that “give and take and mutual respect can get the job done.”

3. The Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) provides an example of productive school committee and superintendent collaboration. The mayor, one other committee member, and the superintendent are members of the SEZP board, which oversees turnaround operations in the 10 SEZP schools.

* + - * 1. A review of SEZP board meeting minutes indicated that district leaders have worked closely with SEZP staff to develop and implement the detailed memorandum of understanding that covers the financial and operational supports that the district provides to the SEZP schools.
1. The superintendent and central office leaders foster school-based leadership.

1. The district provides staff (instructional learning specialists or ILSs and effective educator coaches or EECs), structures (professional learning communities or PLCs) and time (common planning time) to increase teacher leadership and collaboration.

* 1. In order to strengthen school culture, the district surveys staff annually, keeping responses confidential, and prepares a report for each school based on these confidential responses. Each Organizational Health Individualized (OHI) Report measures the school’s internal dynamics and helps principals “maintain and/or build leadership capacity” in their schools. Each OHI report provides feedback and suggestions for increasing performance on 10 dimensions of organizational health. Principals and teachers decide on the areas to address.
1. Interviews and a document review indicated that to meet its goals the district is managing systems and procedures for increasing academic and social-emotional outcomes, designing and monitoring the progress of improvement plans, and evaluating and compensating district leaders.

1. Using quantitative summative data, district staff tracks a list of multi-year measurable goals for academic performance in ELA, math, and science for all students, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

2. The district also tracks trends in attendance, truancy, out-of-school suspensions, graduation rates, and dropout rates. The district publicly reports to the school committee and the community on its progress.

3. At the time of the onsite in November 2017, the district was in the process of developing its 2017–2018 goals.

4. The district administers formative assessments such as teacher-created common assessments and the Achievement Network (ANet) assessment. By analyzing formative assessment results, teachers identify the skills and standards students must master to become proficient learners as measured by MCAS assessments.

a. Daily, weekly, monthly or quarterly (depending on the type of data), the district generates data that teachers can readily access through timely reports located in the district’s data warehouse.

5. District staff uses assessment data (e.g., ANet results) to design and apply appropriate interventions to improve academic performance on state-prescribed accountability measures such as MCAS.

6. The superintendent stated that the district uses goals to inform procedures for improvement planning, performance evaluation, and setting compensation.

7. District staff use the district’s goals when designing and evaluating both the strategic plan and the school improvement plans (SIPs).

8. The district uses school or district goals when evaluating and compensating principals, assistant principals, and directors. They can earn annual salary increases of up to five percent by meeting goals.

**Impact:** Districts likelyincrease collaboration among staff by focusing on goals and outcomes and by providing timely data, structured data-analysis time, and support staff. A sustained, goals-based process likely deepens staff members’ shared responsibility and resolve for achieving desired academic and social-emotional outcomes.

1. **The district has developed and continues to implement a system for efficiently managing the development of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and monitoring progress toward SIP goals.**
2. The superintendent told the review team that he wanted school improvement plans (SIPs) to be “living documents” that staff could regularly monitor.
3. The first priority in the 2017–2020 strategic plan identifies the following activity, “Monitoring progress using a performance management system aligned with the school improvement plans.” The district’s SIP application is the cited performance management system.
4. The district’s information technology staff developed a SIP application and an 11-page user’s manual.
5. The SIPs are connected to the district’s strategic plan; SIPs address the strategic plan’s four priorities.
6. Principals use the application to design their annual SIPs, monitor progress toward their SIP goals monthly, modify action step activities, assess the consistency and impact of implemented activities, and provide end-of-the-year annual reflections on SIP achievements.

1. Chief school officers (CSOs) review and approve the original SIPs and monitor principals’ monthly updates and annual reflections.

2. The district also provides an Annual SIP Data Warehouse report to principals and CSOs.

1. At the time of the onsite in November 2017, principals were using the SIP application to develop 2017–2018 SIPs. SIP development begins after ESE releases MCAS results in the fall.

**Impact:** The district’s SIP process helps staff manage the complex tasks of developing, monitoring, revising, and evaluating planning documents. The technology provides staff easy access to SIPs so that they can guide, assess, and adjust their schools’ multiple improvement activities.

**3. District leaders promote equity by assessing the academic and social-emotional needs of individual schools’ populations and allocating resources to the schools and students with greater needs. In addition, the district provides supplemental monitoring and intensive improvement supports to its lowest achieving schools.**

**A**. The district is focused on equity, as indicated in the title of its 2017–2020 Strategic Plan: “The Springfield Promise: A Culture of Equity and Proficiency.”

**B.** The district implements several formal procedures that provide equitable funding for English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities.

1. Since 2010, district budgeting practices have allocated more funds directly to the schools and students with greater needs (e.g., increased per-pupil allocations and Title I funding). At the same time, principals’ discretion for using the funds has been increased in order to better focus resources to address students’ needs.

2. Interviews and a document review indicated that allocations are based on students’ needs. Schools with more high-needs students receive more funding.

a. Principals and teachers expressed the view that the district’s formula-based funding was equitable and fair.

b. During the development of the 2018 district budget, one of the superintendent’s guidelineswas that principals could not cut special education teachers or English language learner teachers.

c. The district allocates $2.5 million to its general fund intervention fund. Schools receive these funds based on their level in the state’s accountability system. Schools with lower levels receive more per-pupil funding. Schools use these intervention funds to hire tutors and intervention specialists.

**C.** Through the district’s academic support process (ASP) and the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP), the district provides its lowest achieving and struggling schools with more intensive supports for improvement.

1. Annually in the fall, the district activates the ASP to support several struggling schools. In 2017–2018, the district declared eight district schools “Priority Plan” schools. After conducting observations in all classrooms in each priority school, ASP team members develop a comprehensive report of findings and a written agreement listing the services the district will provide to the priority schools, and meet with principals to plan how to address identified challenges.

a. To support the school staff, ASP members provide technical assistance in areas such as curriculum development, instruction, and data analysis.

2. SEZP has mobilized internal and external resources, targeted funding, and restructured time and working conditions in order to turn around the district’s nine struggling middle schools and one high school.

**Impact**: An equitable funding process provides needs-responsive resource allocation and ensures the budget’s effectiveness in supporting improved achievement for all students. Differentiated support to schools makes it more likely that the district will effectively meet students’ needs.

Curriculum and Instruction

***Contextual Background***

The district has established a coherent approach to curriculum practices and provides sufficient leadership at the district and school levels to oversee and direct curriculum and instruction. The chief instructional officer (CIO), who is new to the role, is responsible for overall leadership and ensures that curricular, instructional, and assessment practices are aligned with the current Frameworks. Academic directors for each content area, supervisors, and 107 instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) work under the CIO’s leadership to provide content and instructional support to teachers. At the classroom level, the ILSs model lessons and coach teachers in ELA, math and—to a limited extent—science.

The K–5 schools follow a balanced literacy approach and use standards-based, district-developed unit planning guides (UPGs) and pacing guides to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment. The district uses *Lead21* as its primary literacy resource, but units can include a range of additional resources. For K–5 math, teachers follow district-developed UPGs and use *enVision* mathematics as a primary resource. K–12 curriculum writing teams composed of teachers and leaders develop the UPGs for ELA, math, and science. Teachers have easy online access to curriculum resources including assessments aligned with the UPGs and a wide range of curriculum documents.

For the 10 schools in the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP), one of the co-executive directors oversees curriculum and instruction and reports to the seven-member SEZP board of directors, and the chief of instructional improvement works under her leadership. The superintendent sits on the SEZP board. In the SEZP schools, a rubric detailing 39 practices of school operations including curriculum and instruction defines expectations for principals and teachers.

SEZP schools have autonomy to make decisions about what curriculum they will follow in all content areas. They have adopted the *Expeditionary Learning* ELA curriculum and *Eureka Math* (also known as *EngageNY*) in most of their schools. Instructional leadership teams (ILTs) at each school are responsible for updating curriculum to the 2017 Massachusetts ELA/Literacy and Math Frameworks. A review of improvement plans for the SEZP schools indicated that each SEZP School Improvement Plan identifies improving instruction as a priority and focuses on the school’s specific needs.

Also of note in the district is the WeLearn technology initiative, in its third year of implementation at the time of the onsite in November 2017. The initiative seeks to increase use of technology in teaching and learning and to provide one-to-one access to laptops for all students to improve student engagement and increase rigor in lessons.

At the time of the review, the district had updated some curriculum documents for the 2017–2018 school year to reflect the 2017 ELA/Literacy and Math Frameworks. Every student in the district was receiving instruction based on the current frameworks. In addition, the district had delayed aligning the science curriculum in some grades with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework pending changes to the Science, Technology, and Engineering MCAS assessment. This work was slated for completion in 2019.

The district’s definition of high-quality instruction is proficiency on the Massachusetts educator evaluation teacher rubric. The district has narrowed this to a focus on four priority rubric elements: subject matter knowledge, wel-structured lessons, variety of assessment methods, and student engagement.

An overarching challenge facing the district is consistently meeting its articulated instructional expectations for student engagement, higher-order thinking, inclusive practices, and a classroom climate that is conducive to learning in all schools. Lesson observations indicated variation across levels in practices that support these expectations. In some observed classrooms, students participated in purposeful, active learning opportunities that stretched their thinking and encouraged skill development. In others, students did not actively participate and teachers’ voices dominated lessons. In some instances, the team observed disruptive behavior in classrooms.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The district has established a collaborative system for curricular and instructional leadership.**

**A.** The district has a distributed model for curricular and instructional leadership that includes the district level, the zones, and the schools.

1. The team was told that at the district level, the chief instructional officer (CIO) oversees curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices and ensures alignment. Along with the CIO, there are three chief school officers (CSOs), one for each of the three zones covering elementary, middle, and high schools. For example, the CSO for zone 1 oversees 16 elementary principals whose schools are within zone 1. The three CSOs provide support to principals during weekly meetings.

a. The superintendent meets twice monthly with the CIO and the three CSOs to ensure that he has close ties to district leaders in charge of curriculum and instruction who are also linked to the principals responsible for curriculum and instruction in schools.

b. Principals stated that the role of the CSOs was important because it provides mentoring and support. The CSOs work with principals to identify strategies that they can use to address their schools’ needs.

 2. For the 10 secondary schools within the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP), one of the two co-executive directors oversees curriculum and instruction and works directly with principals. SEZP schools have autonomy over curriculum decisions and ensuring that curriculum is aligned with current Frameworks.

a. SEZP schools have identified high performing teachers to provide instructional coaching and the larger schools have instructional coaches in ELA and math. Others have teachers in an advanced teacher track, deans of curriculum, or consultants to provide coaching.

3. Interviews and a document review indicated that K–12 academic directors for curriculum and instruction in all content areas report to the CIO and meet with her weekly.[[13]](#footnote-13)

a. Academic directors told the team that they are responsible for pacing guides (scope and sequence) and standards-based unit planning guides.

b. They also oversee and provide professional development (PD) to support their content areas and to ensure that teachers know the skills embedded in the standards.

c. Academic directors in math and ELA supervise the district’s ELA and math instructional leadership specialists (ILSs). At the time of the review in November 2017, there were 107 ILSs in the district. Each school has an ELA ILS and a math ILS with the larger schools having two of each. The ILSs meet weekly with principals and academic directors. ILSs offer training, support, and coaching to teachers to implement curriculum, instruction, and assessments.

d. District and school leaders described some of the ways academic directors interact with principals, including making curriculum changes based on assessments, conducting side-by-side observations in their content areas, participating in learning walks, and helping plan school-based PD. Academic directors can evaluate teachers.

4. The team was told that some content supervisors work closely with the academic directors and fulfill some of the same roles as directors. Although content supervisors observe teachers and support their content expertise, they do not evaluate them.

**Impact:** By establishing clear and collaborative leadership and an effective approach to overseeing curriculum and instructional practices, the district increases the likelihood that its curricula and instruction support student learning and foster higher levels of student achievement.

**2.** **The district has established structures, practices, and resources to ensure the consistent use, alignment, and delivery of curricula.**

**A.** Districtwide teachers have varied opportunities to collaborate weekly to implement curriculum, to define best instructional practices, and to analyze assessment results.

1. District leaders stated that professional learning communities (PLCs) have agendas focused on student performance data and other information and are directed by the school’s leadership team.

2. Elementary teachers told the team that instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) lead PLCs and focus on curriculum mapping and lesson planning using the district’s unit planning guides (UPGs). Elementary schools also have common prep time, which teachers can use as grade-level common planning time. A number of elementary schools have common planning time separate from personal prep time.

 3. Teachers from non-Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) middle schools described opportunities for teacher collaboration that can vary across schools. In grade-level common planning time, in content-specific department meetings, and during PLC time, teachers can meet with their ILSs to look at student work, focus on book discussions, or work on content.

1. High-school teachers told the team that collaborative opportunities varied across the district and included common planning periods, professional learning communities, common prep time, and department meetings.
2. Interviews and a document review indicated that teachers in the SEZP schools have common planning time in addition to daily personal planning time. At each school, principals work closely with a teacher leadership team (TLT) to make decisions about curriculum, instruction, and assessments.

 **B.** The district’s curriculum practices facilitate horizontal and vertical curriculum alignment.

* + 1. When asked how the district ensures that the taught curriculum is aligned with state standards, district and school leaders said that teachers have three formal observations a year and that frequent informal learning walks monitor curriculum implementation.
			1. Content supervisors in ELA and math also monitor curriculum implementation in classrooms to ensure horizontal and vertical curriculum alignment.
		2. At the elementary level, grade-level teams meet across the district three times during the school year and in August to ensure horizontal alignment of curriculum. In addition, grade-level teams co-plan with ILSs to ensure vertical alignment. Interviewees reported that teachers follow vertically aligned UPGs to map their curriculum.
		3. Teachers reported that at middle-school department meetings, they vertically review the district’s priority standards, Achievement Network (ANet) assessment results, and unit assessment results.
		4. High-school math teachers stated that they collaborate with the academic director and with teachers from other high schools on curriculum revision teams to review changes to standards and update pacing guides, UPGs, and unit assessments.
		5. District leaders stated that all unit assessments and ANet assessments are aligned with the standards. For example, district instructional leaders meet to review K–12 math assessments and ensure that they are aligned with the standards.
		6. District leaders stated that they work as a team with school leaders to monitor and provide professional development on changes in standards.

**Impact:** By providing teachers with regular opportunities to collaborate along with practices that facilitate alignment of curriculum and instruction, the district is using research-based practices that can improve student achievement.

**3. The district is incrementally implementing a districtwide instructional technology initiative known as WeLearnto enrich teaching and enhance learning.**

1. The district’s strategic plan for 2017—2020 focuses on building a culture of equity and proficiency. To that end, at the time of the onsite in November 2017 the district was in year three of WeLearn, a technology initiative to bring greater use of technology in instruction and one-to-one access to laptops for all students in order to improve student engagement and rigor in lessons.

The superintendent’s message to all stakeholders in the strategic plan states that WeLearn is the district’s strategy for “accelerating our core work of teaching and learning in every classroom,” providing access to laptop computers for all students, and personalizing instruction to each student, “creating engaging and challenging work that pushes our students to innovate and experiment.”

b. In addition, the superintendent’s message states that the WeLearn initiative ensures students access to the 21st century “learning experience that prepares them for tomorrow’s world.”

The review team was told that the district informed all stakeholders about the goals of the WeLearn initiative. For example, school leaders stated that they understood that WeLearn was a district priority. They described the intent to make learning more effective and the digital transformation as rigorous and engaging for students.

District leaders stated that all Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) schools are part of the WeLearn initiative; however, given their autonomy in curriculum and professional development, the SEZP schools do not participate in the district’s technology training. Therefore, the SEZP schools may use technology differently than other schools in the district.

1. The district has been deliberate in how it has rolled out the initiative and ensured that the technology infrastructure was in place to support it.

School leaders reported that the district set a sequential roll out for WeLearn. The district has moved from having teachers experimenting with technology in the first year or so, to the current expectation for using technology in 2017–2018 with the goal of using technology districtwide “in the teaching and learning cycle.”

 a. Principals stated that the information and technology group provided needed support and training for both teachers and principals to experiment with technology in the early stages of the WeLearninitiative.

The superintendent, school leaders, and teachers told the team that in grades 3–12, there is a touch-screen laptop for each student. For kindergarten and grades 1 and 2, there is one laptop for every two students.

School leaders stated that the plan is that by 2020 all students will take laptops home. At the time of the review in November 2017, several schools had implemented take-home policies consistent with a take home policy adopted by the School Committee.

District leaders reported that the district allocated resources to ensure that the technology infrastructure was in place to support the initiative and greatly increased its bandwidth and Internet speed.

 **C.** The district has provided ongoing training and support to build teachers’ capacity to implement the WeLearn initiative and reach its goals.

 1. For example, for the two years before the review, in August, the district provided two days of training in technology to all teachers and administrators.

 2. In October 2016, principals had professional development (PD) for WeLearn to help them set expectations for the use of technology in lessons. In several SIPs, principals noted a strong need for PD for teachers in the use of technology and that some teachers themselves were challenged to use technology every day.

 3. In addition, in November 2017, the district sponsored a symposium on technology with the expectation that those attending would use the district’s train-the-trainer model to build teachers’ capacity.

1. District leaders stated that the training in technology is extensive, builds on basic skills, and is “getting deeper and deeper.”

b. For example, elementary teachers reported training on integrating technology, differentiation, and reinforcing the 2016 Science and Technology/Engineering standards.

 4. The district provides ongoing Saturday technical training to teachers covering topics such as the use of the district’s Brightspaceplatform, Office 365*,* and applications such as DiscoveryEd.

 5. In an interview that included technology staff, the review team was told that the digital learning staff meets with groups of teachers weekly to discuss how technology can be used for teaching and learning.

 6. In observed classrooms, the review team saw elementary students using ThinkPads in center work. In middle- and high schools, team members observed students using ThinkPads individually for assignments and in groups for programs and assessments such as i-Ready, ANet*,* and Read180.

 **D.** Teachers reported the positive impact of the increased use of technology on classroom instruction. The district plans to gather data from WeLearnlearning walks about the impact of technology on teaching and learning.

Teachers and district and school leaders cited the many benefits of the WeLearninitiative. For example, technology use facilitates MCAS administration, increases student engagement, builds student’s technology skills, supports literacy and problem solving, and provides access to the Brightspace platform.

At the time of the review in November 2017, the district had developed and was ready to use a learning walk checklist to gather data about technology in instruction and how students were using technology.

**Impact**: By implementing a technology initiative and providing ongoing training and support for administrators, teachers, and students, the district is poised to realize its goals of raising student achievement and providing students with 21st century skills for college and careers.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**4. Although district and school leaders and teachers identified student engagement and higher-order thinking as districtwide instructional goals, in observed classrooms the review team found that these were among the least well-developed characteristics of effective instruction. The team noted stronger evidence of student engagement at the elementary level than at the middle- and high-school levels. At all levels, higher-order thinking tasks were not consistently incorporated into lessons.**

**A.** The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that students had multiple opportunities to assume responsibility for learning and were engaged in the lesson (characteristic # 5) in 73 percent of observed elementary classes, in 62 percent of middle-school classes, and in 57 percent of high-school classes.

1. At the elementary level, the team noted that lessons were often structured in centers and focused on common goals. This gave students more opportunities to actively participate in activities and to be responsible for their own learning.

2. At the middle- and high-school levels, many teacher-directed lessons limited students’ opportunities to engage in and apply lesson skills and concepts.

a. For example, in a grade 8 ELA class, the teacher did most of the talking by asking students questions and accepting short-answer responses.

b. At the high-school level, the review team noted many lessons consisting of lectures interspersed with questions and answers. For example, in one class, the teacher lectured for the entire observation period while students took notes. In a grade 11 math class, students copied from the board while the teacher presented the lesson; the teacher did not give students opportunities to discuss the problems, ask or answer any questions, or to be fully and actively engaged in the lesson.

**B.** The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that students were engaged in higher-order thinking tasks (characteristic # 6) in 52 percent of observed elementary classes, in 54 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 41 percent of high-school classes.

1. For example, grade 5 math students were collaboratively solving number-line problems and sharing their strategies with classmates, grade 7 science students were working in small groups to gather evidence about ecosystems and using the scientific method to make comparisons, and grade 10 ELA students were collaborating in small groups making inferences about an author from evidence in the text.

 2. The review team noted multiple examples of missed opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking tasks. For example, in a grade 4 math lesson, the emphasis was on the process of multiplying by 10 rather than on reinforcing the concept of 10s. A focus on procedural knowledge over conceptual knowledge was a pattern the team saw throughout classroom observations at all levels.

3. Teacher-dominated lessons at the middle and high schools also limited students’ opportunities to analyze, synthesize, solve problems, or evaluate. The team noted limited effective questioning techniques or tasks to promote higher-order thinking at all levels. For example, teachers often asked “What” questions requiring short recall answers instead of “Why” or “Why not” questions that would require students to explain their thinking and analyze ideas.

4. At the middle- and high-school levels, the team noted examples of classroom climates that prevented students from engaging in complex tasks. For example, in one high-school algebra 1 class, a disruptive classroom environment prevented a student from explaining his thinking.

**Impact:** When students do not have consistent opportunities to take responsibility for their learning, and to engage in higher-order thinking, they are not developing and using the skills they will need to succeed in college and in the workplace.

**5. While the district identified inclusive practices and classroom climate as instructional priorities**, **classroom observations indicated variation across levels in practices that support these goals. In addition, many observed high-school classes did not have classroom environments conducive to teaching and learning.**

 **A.** The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that students were engaging in challenging tasks regardless of their learning needs (characteristic #9) in 65 percent of elementary classes, in 56 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 45 percent of high-school classes.

1. At the elementary level, lessons addressed students’ varied learning needs through center work when teachers differentiated instruction and designed activities based on students’ needs and styles, through technology where students could work on math or ELA using interventions programmed to their needs, and through support personnel such as paraprofessionals, English language learner teachers, and special education teachers.

2. At the middle-school level, the team noted fewer examples of additional personnel to support students’ learning. While the team cited examples of lessons designed with multiple modalities or for differentiated small-group work, a reliance on direct instruction often prevented students from receiving the consistent supports needed to facilitate learning.

3. At the high-school level, the review team frequently observed examples of disruptive behavior that had a negative impact on learning.

a. Disorderly classroom behavior impeded students’ ability to engage in challenging tasks, regardless of learning needs.

b. The review team noted that support for students’ diverse learning needs could not be provided in classes where students talked continually and were generally inattentive. In these classes limited classroom management hampered almost all teaching and learning.

 **B.** In 83 percent of elementary classes, in 77 percent of middle-school classes, and in 66 percent of high-school classes, the team found sufficient and compelling evidence of classroom routines and positive supports that ensured students behaved appropriately (characteristic #11).

1. The team reported that most elementary teachers used routines and rituals to get students’ attention and positive reinforcement to redirect students when needed. Students transitioned to activities seamlessly and classrooms were well organized.

2. In a majority of middle-school classes observed, the team saw positive behavior and classrooms were calm and organized. In these classes, teachers positively redirected students. However, in some observed middle-school classes, the team found that routines and positive supports were not in place to limit disruptions and redirect students to more positive behaviors.

3. While the team found that a majority of observed high-school classes were ordered and respectful with clear expectations for the use of headphones and cell phones as well as general behavior, some classes had little structure. Teachers did not establish and reinforce expectations for student behavior. Students looked at cell phones or used headphones during class. Teachers talked over students who continually chatted throughout the entire observation. Instruction did not run bell to bell. Students came late to class, and some left class without permission. In these classes, routines and positive supports were not in place to limit disruptions and little teaching or learning took place.

**C.** The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that classroom climate was conducive to teaching and learning (characteristic #12) in 76 percent of elementary classes, in 74 percent of middle-school classes, and in 57 percent of high-school classes observed.

1. The review team characterized a strong majority of observed elementary and middle-school classes as having a respectful climate with teachers and students showing an easy rapport and constructive interactions that support a positive learning environment.

2. At the high-school level, while a majority of observed classes reflected respectful relationships between teachers and students, in many classes, there was a general absence of civil discourse. Students spoke continually over the teacher. This took place even during quizzes. Students used disrespectful language directed at classmates, threw objects at classmates, and interrupted classmates when they attempted to speak in class. Review team members characterized these classrooms as chaotic.

**Impact:** When lessons are not designed to address all students’ individual or group learning needs, students are not provided maximum opportunities to learn. Not having positive, supportive learning environments in all the district’s schools characterized by respectful behaviors, routines, tone, and discourse hinders the implementation of effective instructional practices and compromises student learning and understanding.

***Recommendations***

**1. The district should continue to focus on the district’s vision of high-quality instruction, communicate this to the full educational community, and support teachers in its implementation.**

**A.** Administrators should continue to share the district’s instructional expectations with staff.

Using professional development days, faculty meetings, grade-level meetings, department meetings, professional learning communities, and/or common planning time, the district is encouraged to continue to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional expectations.

1. The district should build on its practice of conducting learning walks to include teachers along with principals and instructional leadership specialists, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers.
2. Educators should consider whether their practices ensure that students are engaged in rigorous, challenging tasks appropriate to their grade levels.

 **B.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement instructional expectations.

Professional development should focus on expected characteristics of effective instruction, and especially higher-order thinking, multiple opportunities for students to be responsible for the thinking in the classroom, student engagement, inclusive practices that address students’ learning needs, and skills associated with classroom management and establishing a classroom environment conducive to teaching and learning.

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

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

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

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* ***(Updated August 2017)*** (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/observation/>) describe what observers should expect to see in a classroom at a particular grade level in a specific subject area. This includes the knowledge and skills students should be learning and using (as reflected in state learning standards) and best practices related to classroom curriculum, instruction, and assessment for each subject area. The guides are not designed to replace any evaluation system or tools districts currently use, but are a resource to help classroom observers efficiently identify what teachers and students should be experiencing in specific subjects and grade levels.
* ESE’s Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/dart/walkthrough/implementation-guide.pdf>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

Assessment

***Contextual Background***

The district has established data-driven practices and a data-literate culture. Leaders and teachers have easy access to data that is timely, user friendly, and relevant. Demographic and achievement data provide useful information about the district and its diverse student population. The pervasive use of student assessment results, local benchmarks, and other pertinent, mostly quantitative, data characterize all aspects of decision-making at the district, school, and classroom levels. This includes decisions about policy development and implementation, improvement planning, instructional improvement, curriculum revision and development, assessment development and analysis of results, educator evaluation and supervision, professional development, student support and interventions, and operations and budgeting. To support this expansive data based practice, the district provides professional staff to collaborate with teachers and technical staff to lead and manage its technology infrastructure.

The district has created and implements a well-developed, balanced assessment system that provides leaders, teachers, and students with multiple formative, benchmark, and summative assessments throughout the school year to monitor progress and measure achievement. In addition to the many teacher-developed formative and summative assessments, the district administers Achievement Network (ANet) assessments three times a year to measure student progress and achievement in meeting standards. Alternatively, the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) schools use Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments to track student progress and achievement. In response to teachers and leaders reporting that they are a bit “overwhelmed” with the number of assessments and the volume of data—some estimated that the district allots 45 days a year to assessment—the district has recently begun to reduce the number of formative assessments.

To use assessment data to guide decisions relevant to teaching and learning, the district deploys 107 instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) who work with grade-level and content-level teacher teams during regularly scheduled professional learning community (PLC) meetings each week. The ILSs assigned to each school support mainly ELA/Literacy and math teachers in analyzing data and making instructional and curricular decisions that help students work toward mastering skills in state standards. In literally hundreds of meetings each week, team conversations about data lead to decisions that affect, for example, how to group students for reading, how to revise questions on teacher-developed assessments, and what instructional strategies can best address the needs of English language learners.

The effective and efficient use of time is a challenge in some district schools. Teachers have limited time in PLC meetings to analyze multiple sets of data and struggle to pace instruction to cover content and meet instructional pacing and assessment schedules. Ultimately, the success and usefulness of the district’s data analyses depends on every school’s ability to implement more effective instructional strategies, more relevant learning experiences that meet students’ learning needs, more productive assessments, and more equitable opportunities for students to learn.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The use of data is pervasive in the district. The district has well-organized systems to collect, disseminate, analyze, and use multiple sets of quantitative data to guide improvement, monitor progress in a timely way, and inform all aspects of decision-making related to teaching and learning.**

**A.** Interviews and a document review provided examples of how the collaborative analysis of student achievement data and other information helps set and monitor district and school improvement goals.

1. The superintendent, who has set districtwide expectations for accountability and models data-driven leadership, described to the review team the collaborative process that district and school leaders used to develop the strategic plan. This was confirmed in interviews with other district leaders.

2. The strategic plan identifies multiple measures to systematically assess progress and achievement in its four strategic priorities. These include evidence of student support and persistence (i.e., the dropout rate), student attendance, college and career readiness, MCAS achievement and growth percentiles, measures of teacher quality, and indicators of school climate and culture. The district regularly tracks these metrics in a trend analysis.

 3. District principals stated that they align their School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals with the district’s four strategic priorities and use the same metrics to monitor progress and measure success. They also review data to assess how well they have met school-specific goals.

 4. In 2017–2018, improvement plans for the 10 Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) schools aligned each school’s state-required turnaround plan with best practices delineated in the SEZP’s standards-of-practice rubric.

a. The rubric details 39 expectations for principals, teachers, or students and relates to all components of SEZP operations, including curriculum, instruction, and learning opportunities. Leaders measure results using both quantitative and qualitative data. The SEZP schools use the same rubric to evaluate principals.

5. The district uses data to identify a group of priority schools that receive added support and resources and tracks their progress and improvement.

 **B.** District and school leaders and teachers rely on the collaborative analysis of multiple forms of achievement data in curriculum development and instructional improvement.

* + 1. By analyzing MCAS results, ANet assessments, MAP assessments at the SEZP schools, PSAT and SAT results, common unit assessments, writing prompts, and other formative assessments, district and school leaders and teachers can judge how well students are mastering the skills in the state frameworks. They use this information to develop and revise unit planning guides and pacing guides, the district’s key curricular documents.
		2. The district’s 107 ILSs support grade-level and content-level teams in regularly scheduled professional learning community (PLC) meetings to analyze achievement data and improve teaching strategies to better address students’ learning needs.[[14]](#footnote-14)
		3. Coaches from ANet have also met with teacher teams at every school level to help them learn to use ANet results to formulate teaching plans and make instructional improvement decisions for students. More ANet coaching is provided to schools most in need. In addition, the ANet coaches meet with instructional leadership teams and PLCs as needed to address ANet assessment issues.

**C.** The assessment system is robust and comprehensive. It provides a broad range of useful data that leaders and teachers use to improve all aspects of their work.

1. The assessments administered in the district include Pre-K–12 summative, formative and benchmark assessments in ELA, math and science; most are administered more than once.[[15]](#footnote-15)

2. District and school leaders as well as teachers noted the availability of multiple forms of data to use at various planning and team meetings. These data sets help inform decision-making for planning, educator evaluation, curricular and instructional improvement, re-teaching, remediation, and interventions.

3. Teachers noted the district’s strong emphasis on data, stating that “data is collected regularly on everything.”

4. The district provided sample data reports to the review team that showed the depth and breadth of data analyses that district and school leaders as well as teachers can access.

* + - 1. ANet reports help teachers understand student performance over time and identify trends and focus areas. Teachers can disaggregate ANet data by subject, grade, teachers, student, standard, and network (which includes other schools that also use ANet).
			2. Sample screenshots from the district’s data warehouse show the capacity of the district’s information system to generate nested student achievement information (i.e., district, schools, grade levels, classrooms, and students). This includes, for example, MCAS results, ANet results, common unit assessments, and attendance and graduation rates as well as discipline, grading, and budget data—all aggregated or disaggregated.
			3. Weekly and monthly student teacher assistance team (STAT) reports provide current and trend analyses on data from individual schools, the priority schools, and the district as a whole. District and school leaders described how they use these reports to monitor progress on strategic priorities from the district office to the classroom level.

5. All 10 SEZP schools administer MAP tests 3 times a year. SEZP leaders and teachers also triangulate MCAS results and student growth percentiles (SGPs) with MAP results. They use the analysis to monitor and measure student progress as well as to provide information to adjust instruction and revise curriculum.

 6. District leaders and school-based STAT teams use health information and a thorough analysis of achievement and behavioral data to identify academic and behavioral-emotional supports and interventions for struggling students.

a. High School Dropout Early Warning reports (DEWs) provide data on attendance, grades, suspensions, and discipline for at-risk students. Educators use DEWs in weekly meetings to identify the students with the highest needs and provide appropriate supports and interventions.

**D.** The district’s educator evaluation system is supported by data in every aspect. The district expects all staff to use achievement data to set professional practice and student learning goals, to measure and monitor progress in achieving those goals, to help define next steps, and to track the implementation of the educator evaluation system.

 1. The district uses multiple sources of evidence in the evaluation process. In addition to products of practice, which include both artifacts and direct observations of instruction, reviewers confirmed that extensive student performance data is a key component of the evaluations of both teachers and administrators.

2. District and school leaders as well as teachers noted that data analysis determines which performance goals to set and provides evidence to measure progress and attainment.

3. Weekly SEEDS[[16]](#footnote-16) Status Reports track progress at each school in implementing the educator evaluation system. The superintendent, chief school officers, and the principals review the reports each week to help set the schedule for staff evaluations.

4. Educator evaluations provide data to district leaders to help determine what professional development is needed overall and to meet the needs of individual staff members.

 **E.** The district’s participation in the City Connects initiative has yielded a data-driven approach to identifying students and families in need of special support in the 15 schools that participate. City Connects staff conducts a whole-class review using data provided by the teacher and then develops a student support plan that matches students and families in need with outside partners and groups.

**Impact:**  When data-driven systems are comprehensive, well developed, and well managed, they can provide information and support for both staff and students to improve their work and reach higher levels of achievement. Well-tuned, data-driven systems can help ensure effective, efficient, and equitable administration of a district’s complex personnel and management systems.

**2. The district’s information system and technology infrastructure and systems are well-developed, strategic, and continually improving. They accommodate the needs of multiple constituencies and support educational and operational systems and practices.**

**A.**  The district provides leadership and sufficient professional staff to manage the information system and its infrastructure.

1. The chief information officer (CIO) leads the information technology and accountability group and is a member of the superintendent’s cabinet. Consequently, the CIO is consistently informed about district priorities and improvement goals for the teaching and learning cycle as well as for other district and school-based operations.

2. The 39-member information technology and accountability staff has the responsibility for handling technology operations, digital learning and assessment, information management, systems engineering, systems analysis, data analysis, computer technology, management, systems coordination, administration, and support.

**B.** The group ensures that the information system’s infrastructure nimbly responds to the needs of various constituencies: district and school leaders, classroom teachers and specialists, English language learner and special education personnel, student services personnel, parent and community engagement staff, human resources staff, finance and operations professionals, and district communications staff.

1. The district’s information system infrastructure provides multiple synchronized platforms to plan for instruction and analyze student performance data.

1. PowerSchool and the data warehouse are login platforms that mainly support teaching and learning.

a. In PowerSchool, teachers can record and review attendance and grades.

b. The data warehouse houses MCAS, Achievement Network (ANet), and other assessment data that teachers use to plan instruction, group students, and revise unit planning and pacing guides.

c. Both platforms provide nested access to data. Teachers can only see data for their students, while principals can access all data for their schools as well as ANet results across schools. District leaders and instructional language specialists (ILSs) have access to all district data.

2. Brightspace is the district’s recently implemented online learning management system. Although most staff members have not been fully trained to use it, some know its components and use them in their work.

a. In Brightspace, teachers can develop and share unit planning guides, pacing guides, lesson plans and common assessments*.*

b. In Brightspace*,* teachers can administer assessments and analyze and report on assessment results.

c. Teachers and leaders can access Brightspace’s classroom data dashboards to review student progress and develop aggregated or disaggregated achievement reports.

The district uses the web-based platformEllevation to support educators who work with English language learners (ELLs).

a. Using Ellevation*,* educators can review ACCESS data and link to Can Do descriptors and set learning goals for individuals or groups of students and track student progress.

b. Ellevation also provides data dashboards where teachers can access data to view trends and to group students for instruction.

4. The district uses Easy-IEP to design and monitor Individualized Education Programs for students with disabilities. All individuals who work with students with disabilities have access to all their achievement data and other pertinent information.

a. Special educators conduct roll-call meetings to review student achievement and other student data, and a weekly discussion of district dropout early warning reports (DEWs) about at-risk students.

5. Struggling students use web-based interventions and remedial programs such as Read 180, i-Ready, and System 44. Unique Learning helps students with disabilities access the general education curriculum. Edgenuity provides MCAS support and online credit recovery programs for students missing credits for graduation. ELLs at some schools have access to Imagine Learning.

1. The WeLearn initiative focuses on how technology can make teaching and learning more engaging to students and teachers and helps students gain 21st century skills to prepare them for study and work after high school (see the Strength finding in the Curriculum and Instruction standard above).

**Impact**: When a district establishes well-organized systems to collect, analyze, and use multiple sources of data to improve all aspects of decision-making, it fosters a data-literate culture and ensures more effective systems and practices. These likely strengthen teaching and learning and improved student achievement.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**3. In a number of district schools, there are challenges to using PLC time effectively and instructional time efficiently to maximize the benefits of data analysis in order to improve instruction and raise student achievement.**

* 1. Professional learning communities (PLCs) at the elementary level meet once a week. At the secondary level pairs of teachers may meet weekly but full teacher teams meet only monthly. Some interviewees and statements in School Improvement Plans (SIPs) identified insufficient time to accomplish all that teachers and instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) want and are required to do when analyzing and using data for improvement.

1. Some interviewees agreed that often there is not enough time to “go deep” in data analyses at PLC meetings and sometimes there is difficulty meeting in complete grade-level teams. At the high-school level, the schedule can prevent full teacher teams from convening.

2. With only one PLC meeting each month for each subject at the secondary level, interviewees stated that several weeks might go by before teams can formally continue a conversation on data or other topics with their ILSs.

3. Statements in SIPs addressed time as a challenge. For example, some SIPs listed issues such as effectively analyzing data in a timely manner, using data regularly to monitor progress and inform instruction daily, using data to target students and next steps, and using all data to effectively plan interventions in a timely manner.

4. Interviewees stated that the PLC calendar is “jam-packed.” With the analyses of assessment data and open-response writing prompts, they said there was not enough time to have needed, important conversations on classroom environment and attendance.

5. Leaders told the review team that at the high schools, time for PLCs varied and at one high school, PLC time was not as “deep” because of the schedule. In one high school teachers in grades 9 and 10 were just starting to implement PLCs.

6. High-school teachers stated that PLCs were just beginning in some schools.

* 1. The time available to pace teaching to cover content is sometimes insufficient.

1. Teachers told the review team that district expectations for coverage of standards are often difficult to meet. They said that it takes some students a longer time to master material than the time allotted in pacing guides.

2. Leaders said that, given the different learning needs of students, some teachers struggled to keep the required pace prescribed in pacing guides to cover the content in unit planning guides and meet instructional pacing and assessment schedules.

3. SIPs identified several challenges related to pacing lessons appropriately. For example, they noted that allotting sufficient time for students’ learning needs sometimes prevented the quick completion of material. They also noted that teachers had to adjust curriculum to meet the needs of students with gaps in foundational skills and bring them up to grade level.

**Impact:** Time is a complex variable in ensuring that improvement can take hold in schools. When PLC time is insufficient, teachers and ILSs are challenged to effectively address learning and teaching needs. When the time allocated to cover content does not match the time that students need to master content, learning and teaching are compromised.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should review how instructional time is allocated and how PLCs use time for data analysis and other collaborative activities.**

 **A.** The districtshould analyze how well the length of the school day/year, the length and number of classes, the allotted time for preparation and professional development, and other time-related considerations foster deep learning, and consider adjustments, as necessary.

**B.** The district should review how PLCs use time for the analysis and discussion of assessment data and student work and plan the use of meeting time carefully.

**C.** The district should look at how it might improve instruction and supports to ensure that students can learn according to unit planning guides and pacing guides.

 More effective instruction, especially in the areas of student engagement, higher-order thinking, inclusive practices, and overall classroom climate, might help address the issue of students not having the time they need to learn what they need to.

**Benefits:** By implementing this recommendation, the district will ensure that teachers have more sufficient time to engage in collaborative conversations about students’ progress and instructional improvement in all core content areas. In addition, they will develop a clearer understanding of assessment data to help guide them in planning for instruction, curriculum revisions, and assessments. Also, students will have more adequate time to engage in the curriculum, will benefit from its learning experiences, and will be better prepared for periodic formative and summative assessments.

**Recommended resources:**

* *Time for Deeper Learning: Lessons from Five High Schools*(<http://www.timeandlearning.org/publications/time-deeper-learning>), from Mass2020, examines how schools that prioritize deeper learning are using whatever time they have available—whether through an expanded day or during a traditional school schedule—to reach their educational goals.
* *Time for Teachers:* *Leveraging Time to Strengthen Instruction & Empower Teachers* (<http://www.timeandlearning.org/sites/default/files/resources/timeforteachers.pdf>) describes the systems and practices implemented at 17 schools to provide students with more time for learning and teachers with more time to collaborate, reflect, and plan.
* *Time Well Spent* (<https://timeandlearning.org/school-resources/time-well-spent>) offers an in-depth examination of 30 expanded-time schools serving high-poverty populations with impressive track records of student success, and demonstrates how these schools leverage their additional time in order to implement other critical reforms.
* The National Center on Time and Learning’s *School Case Studies* (<http://www.timeandlearning.org/publications/school-case-studies>) describes the effective practices that schools with expanded learning time have implemented.

Human Resources and Professional Development

***Contextual Background***

The district’s 2017–2020 strategic plan identifies four priorities that “collectively will raise student achievement.” The first priority is to “Coach, develop, and evaluate educators with a clear vision of effective, engaging and personalized instruction.” The plan identifies the expansion of job-embedded professional development (PD) and the implementation of the district’s educator evaluation system with fidelity as two of the key strategies for achieving this priority.

The district has committed significant resources in support of these two strategies. The district demonstrates a clear commitment to sustaining a comprehensive and coordinated PD program based on district goals, staff needs, student achievement data, and assessments of instructional programs and practices. District PD programs and services are job- embedded, differentiated, and made available through a variety of collaborative structures. Overall, these structures provide opportunities for regular, frequent grade-level and/or department-wide planning and meeting time that is used to improve curriculum and instructional practices.

Although the district has made a genuine effort to fully and effectively advance the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework, the results of its efforts have been inconsistent and uneven. The district should improve the overall quality of formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations, as well as its supervisory policies and practices and evaluative skills of all administrators. Also, the district should collect, analyze, and use student and staff feedback as evidence in the educator evaluation process. These enhancements are essential if the district’s educator evaluation system to effectively support classroom teachers, improve instruction, and advance the professional competencies of its educators and educational leaders.

The district’s 2017–2020 Strategic Plan states that the “Springfield Promise includes attracting knowledgeable, highly effective, diverse educators and staff who want to work in a high performing district.” Interviews and documents confirmed that the district has done much to achieve this goal and that measurable progress has been achieved. The district has established clear and consistent policies, practices, and timelines to secure certified teachers and administrators who are qualified to meet student needs and contribute to a professional learning community. The district has a properly supported human resources director with well defined responsibilities.

Interviewees described district hiring policies and procedures that result in timely and effective recruitment, selection, and assignment of qualified staff. Positions are advertised on the radio and posted on the district’s website and on various recruitment websites, including SchoolSpring and LinkedIn. In addition, administrators visit local colleges, including Westfield State, Springfield College, American International College, Elms College, and UMass Amherst to meet with potential candidates and participate in recruitment events/fairs. District and school administrators stated that the district makes a deliberate effort to attract and hire candidates who reflect the district’s racial and ethnic makeup. For example, the district has ongoing, formal recruitment outreach programs at black colleges and universities.

Recruitment efforts also include partnerships with a number of area colleges which encourage and support student teaching within the Springfield Schools. These include the: UMass “180 Day Program,” Springfield College “S Cubed Program,” and the Westfield State College “Reach to Teach Program”. Students who complete their Springfield student teaching practicum are given priority for teaching positions.

Interviewees reported that school principals are provided the authority and support needed to make staffing decisions based on their School Improvement Plans and data about students’ learning needs.

In his report to the school committee in September 2017, the superintendent noted improvements in hiring and filling vacancies in the 2017–2018 school year.[[17]](#footnote-17) He cited improvements in school climate, retention of teachers, and enhanced recruitment efforts as factors contributing to these positive trends.

Interviewees reported that significant recent increases in teacher salaries have positioned the district to be more competitive than in the past. Administrators said that the district’s more competitive compensation and its comprehensive mentoring program and effective professional development programs and services do much to attract and retain qualified staff.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The district has adopted an educator evaluation system that is aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework, and is making its implementation a strategic priority.**

**A.** Among the four priorities stated in the district’s strategic plan is to “Coach, develop, and evaluate educators with a clear vision of effective, engaging and personalized instruction.” This focus on implementing with fidelity the Springfield Effective Educator Development System (SEEDS) is reiterated and reinforced in the improvement plans of all the district’s schools.

1. District administrators and school principals reported that the district regularly provides extensive and ongoing training and support to all evaluators to enhance their capacity to employ effective, evidence-based supervisory practices and processes.

* + - 1. Consistent with the district’s first 2016–2017 professional practice goal, the “100% implementation of SEEDS with an emphasis on providing actionable and effective feedback to improve teaching and learning,” evaluators continue to receive training on relevant topics, including evidence collection best practices, rubrics for effective feedback, and inter-rater calibration.

2. Interviewees said that ongoing SEEDS-based training is provided annually to all professional staff. Educators new to the district receive two and one-half hours of educator evaluation training as part of their August orientation program, as well as additional instruction during their mentoring program. In addition, principals routinely address a SEEDS-related component in their monthly faculty meetings.

3. The district has developed systems, practices, and procedures to monitor and manage the implementation of SEEDS to ensure consistency and fairness across the district.

 a. It uses an online platform, “Performance Matters,” which facilitates and supports the efforts of both administrators and teachers to meet their respective SEEDS targets and responsibilities.

 b. Comprehensive SEEDS reports are produced regularly throughout the year and the superintendent and a designated team of district administrators closely oversees the process to ensure that all evaluation benchmarks and program components are met in a timely manner by principals and staff in every school.

* + 1. A review by the team of both weekly and end-of-year SEEDS status reports confirmed the timely completion of announced and unannounced classroom observations and districtwide submission of all evaluative documentation including self-assessments, educator plans, SMART goals, and formative assessments/evaluations and summative assessments.
		2. A review of the 2016–2017 formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations of 45 teachers randomly selected across the district indicated that they included extensive student performance data as a key evaluative element.
		3. The superintendent told the team that the compensation and continued employment of principals is directly linked to evidence of effectiveness, as determined by improvement in academic achievement and other relevant school and student data.

**Impact:** By embracing the principles articulated in the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework, the district has demonstrated its commitment to using educator evaluation as the primary mechanism to systematically improve the competencies and practices of educators and expand the capacity of educational leaders. This can provide greatly increased learning opportunities and academic outcomes for all students.

1. **The district’s comprehensive professional development program effectively supports educators; is based on district and school priorities; and is informed by student achievement data and the needs and interests of staff.**

**A.** The district’s professional development (PD) program is well developed, planned, and supported. It seeks to promote adult learning through timely and targeted programming and supports and effective communication, and it emphasizes a shared responsibility for student achievement.

1. The district’s instructional leadership team directs PD across the district. The team meets regularly, and is composed of the chief instructional officer and all content area directors. Their priorities and planning create the framework with which school-based PD teams align and coordinate their PD programming.

a. School-based PD teams include the principal, instructional leadership specialists, and several teacher representatives.

b. District and school leaders stated that the chief instructional officer and her leadership team develop, review, and approve the annual PD plans, goals and schedules for districtwide, school-level, and content-based PD programming.

c. The PD plans are subsequently communicated to and made accessible to all professional staff in both printed form and through the district’s intranet, the MySPS platform.

**B.** The district’s PD programming reflects clear goals that are directly aligned with district improvement plan priorities and appropriately support the improvement objectives of the schools and individual educators.

1. Interviewees asserted that the district’s PD programming is designed so that it is aligned with, , and advances the district’s strategic priorities and goals---as articulated in the district strategic plan---and with the needs and objectives of individual schools, as identified in their School Improvement Plans.

2. Although PD programming is directly aligned with district priorities, leaders said that PD programming is appropriately flexible and differentiated to meet the diverse needs, professional goals, and skill and experience levels of teachers, including leadership opportunities for qualified staff.

a. Interviews and a document review confirmed that a broad variety of targeted PD programs and workshops are provided for teachers, administrators, specialists, and paraprofessional staff throughout the year.

3. Interviewees described and provided extensive supporting documentation for the district’s comprehensive three-year induction and mentoring program for all new staff. The program includes formal orientation, a structured curriculum, ongoing support from trained mentors, coaching, and individualized supports consistent with ESE’s guidelines for induction and mentoring programs. They further noted that the district provides all new principals with a highly qualified mentor who works with them for as long as the principal and district believe is needed.

**C.** The district makes effective use of data to plan and improve its PD programming. It systematically collects and analyzes a broad range of student and staff data and regularly assesses PD to ensure that it meets objectives.

District and school leaders told the team that the collection and analysis of student performance data inform PD planning and prioritizing. This includes MCAS and PARCC results,[[18]](#footnote-18) ELL assessments, a variety of standardized assessments in math and ELA, and district-developed, grade-level, and content-based common assessments.

Interviewees stated that the district also compiles survey data for planning and evaluating PD programs.

a. To plan PD, the district distributes an interest inventory annually to teachers and the Springfield Education Association. In addition, the needs and interests of administrators, specialists, and paraprofessionals are compiled and analyzed as part of the planning process.

b. To evaluate PD, the district uses feedback surveys to ensure that PD programming meets its intended objectives. Teachers must complete these online evaluations to receive PDPs.

The district has made a substantial commitment of resources, including time, funding, and expertise, to provide the sustained support needed to attain its stated PD goals and objectives.

The superintendent expressed his commitment to “invest heavily” in support of PD. In separate interviews district and school leaders agreed that PD programming receives substantial district support. The superintendent further indicated that the district was in the process of establishing a PD center to enhance the coordination and communication of programs and services.

The district has embedded considerable PD time into its calendar and offers a variety of opportunities for teachers to learn and grow both individually and collaboratively. School and district leaders said that the district provides seven full PD days and a broad range of additional vehicles and structures to deliver PD.

a. Although they vary according to school and grade level, these opportunities include professional learning communities (PLCs), common planning time, department and faculty meetings, release programs and workshops available during the school day, and contractually designated bi-weekly after-school meeting time.

Interviewees made particular note of the broad range of personnel in every school whose primary role is to provide direct services and continuous support for professional staff. These include instructional leadership specialists, academic coaches in math and ELA, effective educator coaches, academic directors at all grade levels, department heads, and the instructional leadership teams in each school.

**Impact**: If sustained, the district’s commitment to providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate in purposeful and structured ways will likely continue to create a culture of continuous professional learning and growth and an increased recognition of the shared responsibility among educators and educational leaders for student learning. Ultimately, this could contribute to significant and lasting improvements in classroom instruction, professional competencies, curriculum, and learning opportunities and academic outcomes for all students.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

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

**A.** The district’s goal of “100% implementation of SEEDS with an emphasis on providing actionable and effective evaluative feedback to improve teaching and learning” remains incomplete.[[19]](#footnote-19)

1. The team reviewed the 2016–2017 formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations of 45 teachers randomly selected from across the district. Evaluations were generally informative[[20]](#footnote-20) in that they were evidence-based and addressed the teachers’ performance in the four Massachusetts standards of effective teaching practice. However, less than half of those evaluations were instructive or growth oriented; they did not include clear and actionable feedback and specific recommendations with the capacity to improve classroom instruction or contribute to professional growth.

* 1. Some teachers’ evaluations contained constructive feedback and concrete, actionable recommendations for improved classroom practice, using language such as, “Moving forward…” or “Next steps should include….” However, many did not contain pedagogical suggestions or included generic and imprecise feedback, such as, “Continue to…” or “Maintain…,” so had limited value for improving teaching or learning. Feedback frequently consisted of restatements or paraphrasing of the performance indicators and rubrics. The wording of some evaluations was identical.

c. Teachers expressed diverse opinions about the quality and value of the written and verbal feedback they received from evaluators subsequent to unannounced and announced classroom observations.

i. Some teachers indicated that they received “all kinds of feedback,” that it was “timely and relevant,” and that it “pointed out areas in need of improvement.”

ii. Other teachers, however, stated that the frequency of classroom visits varied as did the quality of the feedback. They noted that when feedback was provided it often seemed to be more negative than constructive in nature and/or was general and “taken from the rubric” rather than specific to the class observed.

1. The team also reviewed the 2016–2017 formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations of 46 principals and 10 district administrators. In general they mirrored teachers’ evaluations in that they were timely, informative, and included extensive student performance data. As was the case with teacher evaluations, administrators’ evaluations reflected a generic quality. Evaluations were seldom instructive and rarely contained specific, actionable feedback or concrete, growth-oriented recommendations with the capacity to contribute in a meaningful way to professional improvement, overall effectiveness, or leadership capacity.

3. Based on the classroom observations conducted by the review team and numerous challenge statements included in many School Improvement Plans, the district’s target of three observations per teacher in a school year appears to provide inadequate support to achieve the district’s strategic goal to coach and develop educators to ensure that “effective, rigorous, instruction occurs in every class every day.”

a. While the district has identified student engagement, higher-order thinking, inclusive practice, and classroom culture as instructional priorities, in the 305 observed classrooms review team members saw a wide variation across levels in practices that support these goals.

b. The concerns cited in a number of SIP challenge statements included: the need to consistently “implement rigorous instruction in all classrooms”; increase “teachers’ capacity to reflect on their practice and reformulate new teaching strategies to promote student growth”; and meet the needs of young staff who “do not consistently have the tools and experience to address instructional, behavioral, social, emotional, and other needs that our diverse population brings to school.”

**Impact**: Without ensuring that all evaluations are effective and that classroom observations and evaluative feedback are of sufficient quantity and quality, the district cannot properly advance its strategic goal, the implementation of an evidence- based, student-centered evaluative process that effectively supports the continuous professional growth of all educators and educational leaders and improves teaching and learning.

***Recommendation***

**The district should improve the overall quality and consistency of educators’ evaluations as well as the supervisory practices and evaluative skills of all administrators and evaluators.**

**A.** The district should strengthen the quantity and quality of evaluative feedback, both written and verbal.

1. Additional and ongoing professional development (PD), coaching, and support should be provided to improve the supervisory practices and evaluative skills of all administrators and evaluators.

2. The district should ensure that PD takes into account all educators’ needs, including those identified by evaluators.

**B.** The district should consider providing more frequent classroom observations, support, and evaluative feedback.

1. The district should consider widening the pool of supervisors as one means of ensuring that all educators receive timely support and focused feedback.

 **C.** The district should continue to provide systematic and formal training for evaluators in calibrating feedback, using tools such as the observation calibration video library on ESE’s website and related calibration protocols and activities, and should assess observer calibration to determine what additional activities might be beneficial.

 **D.** In order to implement the requirements of the state’s educator evaluation regulations, the district should move forward promptly with the remaining components of the educator evaluation system.

 1. The district should collect, analyze, and use student and staff feedback.

 2. The district should develop and implement a plan for the development and appropriate use of multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement.

**Benefits**: Implementing this recommendation will help to improve instruction, strengthen learning, and increase academic achievement for all students.

**Recommended resources:**

* Educator Evaluation Implementation Surveys for Teachers (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf>) and Administrators (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf>) are designed to provide schools and districts with information about the status of their educator evaluation implementation. Information from these surveys can be used to target district resources and supports where most needed to strengthen implementation.
* *On Track with Evaluator Capacity* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/pln/OnTrack-EvaluatorCapacity.pdf>) is an interactive document that provides specific strategies, lessons learned, and links to district-created resources. It was produced by eight districts that were part of a Professional Learning Network for Supporting Evaluator Capacity.
* *Quick Reference Guide: Opportunities to Streamline the Evaluation Process* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Streamline.pdf>) is designed to help districts reflect on and continuously improve their evaluation systems:
	+ What’s working? What are the bright spots?
	+ How can we streamline the process to stay focused on professional growth and development?
	+ What do we need to adjust to ensure our system is valuable to educators and students?

Student Support

***Contextual Background***

The district wrestles with a number of student support challenges common to large urban districts: raising student achievement, increasing attendance, improving graduation rates, and decreasing dropout and retention rates.

The district has initiated several programs to improve support for students, including establishing the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership—an affiliation of nine middle schools and one high school that operates with a separate governing board and leadership structure as well as autonomy for educational systems and budgeting. In addition, the district identifies a number of priority schools each year to receive targeted support and resources. Through City Connects the district matches the needs of students from 15 selected schools to resources from outside partners and groups— over 90 partners alone in 2016. In addition to City Connects, the district has nurtured partnerships with several neighboring colleges and universities to support student’s high school completion and readiness for college and careers.

Student teacher assistance teams (STATs) meet regularly at all schools to address students' academic and social-emotional needs. Across the district 107 instructional specialists are deployed to support teachers in analyzing data and helping to implement appropriate strategies to meet students’ diverse learning needs. A variety of interventions are in place including extended day, Saturday school, built-in intervention blocks, and self-paced software programs.

While the district has a Parent and Community Engagement Center (PACE) and structures in place to involve students’ families in the schools, the team found limited evidence of a strong working relationship with students’ families. A review of the district’s school improvement plans indicated that the district also recognizes this challenge.

The district provides many programs to support high-school graduation and guide students to post-secondary education and careers. Although the district has in place several initiatives to improve attendance and strengthen students’ transition to high school, high chronic absence, especially in grades 6–12, and high retention rates in grades 9 and 10 continue to be of concern.

Student attendance has been uneven over time. The attendance rate fluctuated from 91.8 percent in 2011–2012 to 93.5 percent in 2015–2016, to a recent downturn to 92.7 percent in 2016–2017, compared with a state rate of 94.6 percent. In 2011–2012 the chronic absence rate was 27.8 percent and by 2015–2016, it had decreased to 21.4 percent. However, in 2016–2017, chronic absence had increased to 24.0 percent, with high rates in grades 6–12, ranging from 23.1 percent to 35.4 percent. The number of retentions for all grades has declined in recent years, but the number remains high for grades 9 and 10 (see Table 22 below).

***Strength Findings***

**1. The district has a common process in all its schools for identifying students who are struggling academically or who face social-emotional challenges. The process includes a data-driven approach to early identification and a range of interventions for diverse students’ needs.**

**A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district uses student teacher assistance teams (STATs) to address the needs of students who are struggling.

1. Interviewees, including district leaders and teachers, reported that every school has a STAT that includes an administrator, an instructional leadership specialist (ILS), coaches, an English language learner teacher, a special education teacher, nurses, counselors, and referring teachers. The team was told that parents are invited to STAT meetings and students are invited, when appropriate.
	1. The district provided the team with a brochure developed for parents and family members that describes what STAT does and how it can help children quickly.
	2. The district had recent PD for teachers on STATs to address the goals, who is involved, the role of parents, and the benefits of STATs.
2. Documents provided by the district indicate that teachers and parents can refer students to the STAT for learning and behavioral concerns. Referral forms require recent quizzes or test scores, sample classroom or homework and an extensive description of the concern and what strategies or interventions have already been tried.
3. Interviews and a document review indicated that the STAT team develops a plan of action to assist teachers. These plans, called Academic Behavioral Instructional Strategies (ABIS), are monitored and after six to eight weeks the STAT discusses progress made. Teachers may add strategies to the ABIS or they may refer students for further testing.

**B.** Interventions and supports for academic and non-academic needs are data-driven.

1. District leaders reported that student performance data is used to determine students’ strengths and the need for interventions. Interviewees reported that teachers use formative assessments to identify at-risk students. The assessment results drive the recommended intervention(s) and the ILSs help determine the appropriate intervention(s).

2. In addition to academic data, other data used to select interventions include attendance, behavioral referrals, suspensions, and dropout early warning indicators reports (DEWs) for high-school students.

3. Documents reviewed by the team and interviews with district leaders and principals confirmed that the City Connects coordinator meets with each teacher in the 15 City Connects schools to review every student’s academic and non-academic strengths and needs. Each student is then linked to a set of services and enrichment opportunities in the school or with community partners.

**C.** A range of interventions is used at each level in schools across the district.

1. Elementary teachers said all teachers do some interventions in the classroom. School leaders agreed and noted that a typical math class has time for instruction, independent work, and small-group time for the teacher to meet with students with similar needs. Other interviewees reported that a comparable structure is in place for ELA where teachers use Fountas and Pinnell data to group students with like needs for small-group instruction.

2. Additional interventions at some elementary schools include extended day, 30-minute intervention blocks, and i-Ready, an online diagnostic program that individualizes instruction based on students’ skill levels.

3. At the high-school level, students can use Read 180 and System 44, online self-paced reading interventions. One school serving middle- and high-school students has academic interventions scheduled every morning for 30 minutes.

4. The Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) middle schools run empowerment academies during February and April school vacations. This gives students 35 additional hours of math instruction. SEZP also schedules one or two intervention blocks in its schools.

5. High-school students told the team that they get help through several channels including Saturday school, after-school tutoring, Crew (an advisory group that stays together throughout the student’s time in some secondary schools), and Springfield Scholar Athlete, a scheduled class where students can get extra help.

**D.** Interventions are in place to address the unique needs of students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs).

1. The team was told that instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) are key in helping teachers work effectively with students with disabilities. They review data and make recommendations for small-group in-class instruction. The district also uses *Unique Learning*, an online standards-based curriculum specifically designed so that students with disabilities can access the general education curriculum.
2. Leaders reported that Ellevation, a data dashboard with data related to ELLs, is available for all educators to view. The Ellevation platform provides Can Do descriptors that teachers can use to modify learning goals and instruction.
3. In several focus groups teachers reported that all teachers are endorsed as Sheltered English Instruction (SEI) teachers; others reported that anyone who works with ELLs is SEI endorsed.
4. Review team members observed a Read180 class with ELLs. Interviewees also reported that Imagine Learning*,* a literacy software program, provides interventions for ELLs.
5. The review team was told that the SEZP schools are starting Saturday school for ELLs to help improve ACCESS scores.

**Impact**: A districtwide process to help educators address the needs of students helps ensure that teachers have appropriate resources and students are provided with appropriate interventions. Maintaining a data-driven identification process and ongoing interventions likely ensures that students get the help that they need to improve achievement and to be prepared for college and career.

**2. District leaders identify students at­ risk of dropping out of school and provide support for high school completion. Leaders have created pathways to guide students to post-secondary education and careers.**

1. The district uses information from student teacher assistance teams (STATs) and dropout early warning reports (DEWs) to identify struggling students and students at risk of dropping out of school.
2. STATs at each school review academic and non-academic concerns and engage in collaborative problem solving to address teachers’ concerns.
3. At the high-school level, DEWs provide information about attendance and grades for every student at risk of not graduating.

**B.** Several interventions are in place for students at risk of not graduating.

1. A document review indicated that there are many initiatives in place to support successful high school completion, including graduation coaches, 9th and 10th grade academies, a 9th grade transition course at every high school, a high school completion program at the alternative schools, online credit recovery, summer school, and night school.
2. Interviewees reported and documents described the Y-AIM initiative, a program with the goal of providing talented, underachieving at-risk youth entering middle school with support throughout middle and high school to ensure graduation.

**C.** The district has created multiple pathways to encourage and guide students to post-secondary education and meaningful careers.

1. The district shared with the team a month-by-month guide to College and Career Awareness Activities for Springfield Public Schools Pre-K–12. The guide lists suggested activities by grade level.
2. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district uses Naviance to guide college and career planning for students in grades 6–12. Naviance has a series of activities designed to help students develop plans for college and career in collaboration with parents and/or guardians.
3. Interviewees reported that FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) fellows work with students and families to help them apply for financial aid for college.
4. District leaders said and a document review confirmed that the district, in partnership with several colleges, created 100 Males to College, a program designed to prepare young men to attend college. Interviewees said that currently more than 100 male students participate in this program that includes youth development and embraces culture and identity. Students have an opportunity to connect with college students and visit campuses.
5. Interviewees reported and documents on the district’s website described two gateway programs for high-school students at local colleges. Gateway to College at Holyoke Community College aims to make college more accessible by helping students to achieve proficiency on the MCAS assessment and explore potential careers through internships. Gateway to College at Springfield Technical Community College enables students to obtain high-school diplomas and earn college credits at the same time.
6. Interviews and a document review indicated that Job Corps is in place to help students who have dropped out return to graduate and get on track for meaningful work. Students receive instruction for half the day and on-site career training for the other half day.
7. Interviewees reported that the Springfield Employment Program provides students with opportunities to participate in real-life work experience at local companies. In 2016–2017, 373 students participated; the district expects that number to rise in 2017–2018.
8. The team was told and observed in schools that students are given information about military choices after graduation and participate in exercises through Junior ROTC programs.
9. Interviewees reported that at least 300–400 students participate in dual-enrollment opportunities across the district.
10. Interviews and a document review indicated that schools have career pathways built into their overall program.
	1. At Putnam Vocational Technical Academy, students develop academic and technical skills required to continue their education and gain employment upon graduation. Students reported that the work is rigorous and they are scheduled for alternate weeks of academic and vocational classes. Students in grades 11 and 12 participate in internships and some advanced students are paid during their internships. The school offers 21 different vocational programs.
	2. All high Sschools in the district include college preparation as part of the core program.

**Impact**: As the district continues to proactively identify at-risk students and provide flexible and alternative paths to graduation, it likely will continue to see decreasing dropout rates and increasing graduation rates. Continuing guidance to students about options for post-secondary education and careers likely improves students’ college and career choices.

1. **The district maintains a broad range of partnerships to help support student’s growth and development.**
2. Interviews and a document review indicated that City Connects is a district-supported program that connects students with services from partners. In 2016–2017 City Connects was implemented in 15 schools and coordinated support from 93 different partners.
3. Through the work of the coordinator, City Connects cultivates partnerships with community agencies and serves as a point of contact for the school.
4. Leaders reported that the City Connects coordinator meets with each teacher to discuss student’s academic, social-emotional, and health needs. Teachers said that City Connects conducts a whole-school review to determine the gaps in services, and then reaches out to organizations that can help.
5. City Connects’ services include enrichment and prevention, early intervention, and intensive or crisis intervention. Partners include Springfield College-AmeriCorps Volunteers, Gear Up, the Springfield Police Department, Reader to Reader, Inc., the Community Music School, Westfield State University, Springfield Museums, the Latino Education Institute, and Sunrise Behavioral Health Clinic.
6. A document review by the team indicated that Springfield School Volunteers provide a menu of programs and services for the district’s students. Review team members saw a display at one school with information about what volunteers do and a form for anyone interested in volunteering or getting more information.
7. Volunteers provide services such as mentoring, academic support with a focus on one-on-one support, small group instruction, and re-teaching.
8. Springfield School Volunteers also support early literacy with a goal of 80 to 100 percent proficiency on the kindergarten reading assessment and offer a read-aloud program to model fluent reading and expand classroom libraries.
9. The district has many partnerships with higher education.
10. The district maintains two College Gateway Programs, one at Holyoke Community College and one at Springfield Technical Community College.
11. Westfield State College has a program for students with cognitive impairment called ICE (Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment) which enables students to attend classes; they do not earn credit.
12. The University of Massachusetts–Springfield Center hosts a program called College Matters for U*,* which is designed to spark interest in careers in science, technology, engineering, math, and the arts.
13. The Reader to Reader Program for grade 5 students from Beal Elementary School is a partnership with Amherst College. Ellis Elementary School partners with American International College and Springfield College.
14. The superintendent reported that Westfield State University and the district have a program designed to encourage teaching as a profession*.* Reach to Teach guarantees a Springfield graduate who attends Westfield State a job in the Springfield Public Schools upon graduation.

**Impact**: Nurturing meaningful partnerships linked to students’ growth and development likely helps ensure that supports are in place and students’ needs are met both in school and after high-school graduation.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**4. The district’s policies and practices are not sufficiently improving high chronic absence in grades 6–12 and high retention rates in grades 9 and 10.**

1. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has several initiatives to improve attendance.
2. Attendance officers make home visits to students with excessive unexcused absences.
3. There is a practice of making phone calls immediately and sending letters home to parents and families when students are absent. There is also a pilot program that includes sending text messages and reminder texts to families of students with attendance issues.
4. The district encourages schools to create attendance incentives such as awards, celebrations, gifts, and PA announcements for recognition of regular attendance.
5. Students can buy back time by attending Saturday school or after-school tutoring.
6. In partnership with the United Way of Pioneer Valley, the district printed a brochure for parents and families which outlines the importance of coming to school.
7. Attendance rates in grades 6–12 need improvement.[[21]](#footnote-21)
8. Attendance rates have fluctuated in recent years. According to ESE data, in 2011–2012, the attendance rate was 91.8 percent and by 2015–2016, it had increased to 93.3 percent. However, by 2016–2017 the attendance rate had decreased to 92.7 percent, compared with a state rate of 94.6 percent.
9. Chronic absence is defined as the percentage of students who were absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. In 2011–2012 the chronic absence rate was 27.8 percent and by 2015–2016, it had decreased to 21.4 percent. However, in 2016–2017, chronic absence had increased to 24.0 percent, with high rates in grades 6–12, ranging from 23.1 percent to 35.4 percent.

**C**. A review of the 2016–2017 School Improvement Plans for all district schools indicated that only one SIP included specific action steps for improving student attendance.

**D.** District and school leaders reported that they were “very concerned with grade 9 retention.” There are several programs designed to create a smoother transition to high school.

1. Practices and programs to reduce retention in grade 9 include grade 9 academies in all high schools, credit recovery, and special programs to support academic needs.
2. Students and staff told the review team that students enrolled in Expeditionary Learning schools are assigned to a group known as Crew. Crew is an advisory group that provides students with a home base for support and additional instructional time.
3. The number of retentions for all grades has declined in recent years, but the number remains high for grades 9 and 10 (See Table 22).

**Table 22: Springfield Public Schools**

**Total Retentions and Retention Rates for All Grades and for Grades 9 and 10, 2014–2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Total Retentions for all grades | 1,379 | 1,104 | 900 | 837 |
| District Retention Rate | 6.2% | 5.0% | 4.0% | 3.8% |
| Grade 9 Retentions  | 504 | 361 | 316 | 333 |
| Grade 10 Retentions | 231 | 173 | 150 | 138 |
|  Grade 9 Retention Rate | 20.7% | 15.6% | 14.3% | 15.2% |
| Grade 10 Retention Rate | 12.9% | 9.4% | 7.8% | 7.7% |

 Source: MA ESE School and District Profile Data

**Impact:** In a district with low student attendance rates and high chronic absence rates, a meaningful number of students lose critical instructional time. Teachers constantly need to re-teach, the pace of lessons is slowed for all students, and low-attending students likely experience gaps in their learning and low achievement. Students who are not on track to move ahead to the next grade with their class are at risk of not completing high school.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should continue its efforts to improve student attendance and retention.**

**A.** The district should conduct a study of attendance data.

1. The district should consider gathering input from students and families about the reasons for high absence rates and possible ways to address the challenge of students missing too much instruction.

**B.** The district should review its initiatives to improve attendance and adjust efforts as needed.

1. The district should collaborate with similar districts to identify successes and determine the extent to which they can be replicated.

 **C.** The district should consider that addressing attendance issues may also involve a variety of wider initiatives such as: improving instruction and its relevance to post-graduation goals; strengthening school climate; and building relationships with students’ families.

**Benefits:** Engaging students and families in identifying the causes of student absence and retention and in suggesting ways to improve attendance and lower retention likely will help raise attendance, decrease retention, and improve student achievement. Students will know that their families, parents, and schools are working together toward their growth and development.

**Recommended resources:**

* *Parents’ Guides to Student* *Success* (<http://pta.org/parents/content.cfm?ItemNumber=2583> ) are grade-specific guides from the National PTA (available in English and Spanish) with specific descriptions for parents of what children should be learning once Common Core standards are fully implemented, along with suggestions for helping students at home and communicating with teachers.
* *Family, School, and Community Partnership Fundamentals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/fscp-fundamentals.docx>) provide a framework for family engagement, along with a self-assessment tool.
* ESE’s Title I Program Design web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/titlei/part-a/program-design.html>) includes links to policies, toolkits, research, presentations, and other resources related to family engagement.
* ESE’s *Family and Community Involvement* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/FamComm/f_involvement.html>) provides several resources, including ESE’s *Guide to Parent, Family, and Community Involvement*.
* Massachusetts Executive Office of Education’s Parent Engagement and Family Support web page (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/birth-grade-12/early-education-and-care/parent-and-family-support/>) provides links to resources for families related to education and learning, food and diet, and health and safety, as well as parent and family support publications.
* *Every Student, Every Day: A Community Toolkit to Address and Eliminate Chronic Absenteeism* (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/chronicabsenteeism/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of Action Guides that provide information and resources to help ensure that all young people are in school every day and benefitting from coordinated systems of support.

Financial and Asset Management

***Contextual Background***

 In fiscal years 2014–2017 the district met its net school spending requirement. The district has had to reduce some services as many increasing costs, such as out-of-district tuitions and transportation and health insurance, have strained already lean budgets. The district has made these reductions strategically, limiting reductions in classroom and school services.

The Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) was formed in 2015 to turn around several underperforming district schools. Part of SEZP’s strategy is to grant substantial budget and hiring autonomy to each school to create and improve appropriate learning programs for its students, and its board and schools have full control over their share of the district’s budget.

The district’s chief finance and operations officer oversees all management of finances and buildings. His staff also handles food services, transportation, and grants management. The district shares several services with the city, such as district payroll and building maintenance services used by the city and city procurement, legal, and human resource services used by the district; each entity pays the other for services it uses. The district budget process is collaborative, with stakeholders working together to prepare a budget that meets net school spending requirements. An active finance subcommittee of the school committee and a budget advisory committee are consulted during the development and approval of the budget, and the full school committee receives updates before its budget hearing and approval for submission to the city council.

The district’s budget document is comprehensive and has won awards from professional organizations for eight years. The fiscal year 2018 budget document includes budget and staffing summaries, trends, projections, and breakdowns for departments and schools along with substantial information about district and school programs and student achievement data. The document highlights the proposed reduction below a level-service budget ($12.4 million for fiscal year 2018) and cost increases such as health insurance, but does not highlight the impact of some budget reductions or the costs of some initiatives.

The district and the city have an aggressive building renovation program, making use of funding from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) whose website lists 46 building projects for Springfield. The city has used its bonding capacity to fund its share without the need for debt exclusions. Technology is also a priority of the district, funded in part by E-Rate grants at 90 percent reimbursements, a $5 million annual budget, and a recent $2.3 million bond for infrastructure. The district is implementing a one-to-one initiative for laptops for students in grades 3–12, is piloting a take-home program for students who wish to take their computers home, and has upgraded infrastructure and cable capacity for improved wireless access in the schools.

***Strength Findings***

**1. District budget development is participatory and is driven by student data. The district provides autonomy for school administrators to make some allocation decisions. Systems are in place to monitor school and district expenditures.**

**A.** Students’ needs and achievement data drive the proposed budget.

1. The superintendent, administrators, and school committee members reported that they give additional support to the schools with greater needs.

 a. For example, the superintendent told the review team that the district allocates additional funding for coaching to the Level 4 schools.

2. In preparing the preliminary budget, administrators use formulas for staffing and operations based on each school’s enrollment and proportion of economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. The district allocates additional resources to its eight priority schools (identified by state accountability levels and student achievement).

3. Principals reported that they have found the budgeting process and allocation of funds equitable and fair.

4. Administrators make decisions about funding to meet school improvement goals.

 a. Administrators reported that they try to protect funding and resources for classrooms. For example, when the district had to make $12.4 million in cuts for fiscal year 2018, administrators cut 10 percent from administrative expenses, compared with 3 percent from school budgets.

* + - 1. Administrators have conducted detailed analyses of certain cost centers, such as special education and central office budgets, to determine trends and areas where they had not spent allocations. This enabled them to make cuts with limited impact on students.

5. To promote transparency, all grants and outside funding are included and considered in the budget process and the budget document.

 6. Under the district agreement with the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP), which manages nine middle schools and one high school,[[22]](#footnote-22) the zone is given at least 83.5 percent of the district’s per-pupil net school spending. The district keeps up to 16.5 percent to cover non-discretionary expenses such as building maintenance, financial schools may management, student assignment services, core HR services, and IT infrastructure. SEZP schools may purchase additional services and programs such as professional development from the district.

a. SEZP also receives Federal ESSA grant funding such as Title I and IDEA allocated on a per-pupil basis for economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. It also receives grant funding from proposals SEZP submits, including turnaround grant funds.

b. SEZP has autonomy over budgets, including school staffing, collective bargaining, and programs. They use their district and grant funding for zone-wide school support initiatives to improve teaching and learning, additional supports for Commerce High School, and other expenses.

**B.** Principals and other administrators can modify some of their budgets within the total to meet student and school needs. District budget analysts assist principals and other administrators to develop budgets and spending plans aligned with their improvement plans.

1. Although principals cannot reduce some areas such as special education and English language learner staffing, they have some autonomy to trade other positions such as clerical staff or assistant principals for instructional staff, or to reallocate operations funding such as textbook allocations. The degree of autonomy is based on performance and adjustments are subject to approval by their chief school officer.

a. Chief school officers provide budget oversight and approval to principals and they analyze school budget and expenditure needs.

**C.** Stakeholders are involved in the development and approval of the budget.

1. A review of budget documents indicated that the superintendent’s budget advisory committee, made up of administrators, city officials, and union representatives, solicits input about priorities and cuts.

2. Administrators reported that they hold hearings with principals and other district administrators, noting that budget analysts meet with each of them to help prepare budgets and prioritize potential cuts.

3. The district polls residents and parents about budget needs early in the process, and the public hearing in April is an opportunity for parents and other members of the public to ask questions and comment about the proposed budget.

4. They reported that the school committee receives a preliminary budget in February and a balanced budget in March or April. The budget advisory committee and the school committee finance subcommittee review the budget proposals, and school committee members can ask questions about details such as school budgets.

5. The school committee votes on the budget in April or May and submits it for approval to the mayor and city council.

**D.** Ongoing monitoring of school and department budgets is important in the district, involving regular reports and meetings with budget analysts.

1. Administrators reported that central office administrators and principals receive bimonthly reports on expenditures and they meet with budget analysts who monitor their spending plans to ensure that they spend available district and grant funds. Together, they look at expenditure data and how each school’s resources are allocated in order to save money and to ensure that the expenditure of funds is effective and efficient.
2. Reports and updates on the status of the budget also go to the school committee.

**Impact**: Using a transparent allocation process based on student data and defined priorities helps ensure equitable allocation of funds and promotes agreement among stakeholder groups during the budget process. Basing budgets on data and students’ needs helps schools and the district align spending to meet improvement plan goals. Giving school administrators some autonomy to modify how they use their allocation enables them to determine how to meet improvement goals based on their schools’ unique contexts.

**2. District leaders and city officials agree on the allocation of city expenditures for education and work together to fund budgets that meet net school spending requirements. They share services and collaborate on capital improvement planning and projects.**

**A.** District and city personnel meet together frequently to collaborate on financial and school building issues and understand each other’s points of view.

1. Both district and city officials described an adversarial relationship in the past that is now much improved.

 a.The mayor stated that proposed budgets are much improved over previous documentation.

 b. City and school officials reported that the problems before fiscal year 2014 were the result of accounting and spending inefficiencies that have since been corrected.

 2. Both the city and district use MUNIS financial accounting software, enabling both to access and share up-to-date information about budget, payroll, and procurement data.

 3. The city has helped the district cover budget overruns in areas such as such as transportation and utilities.

4. City and school administrators estimate Chapter 70 state aid and required net school spending separately and go back and forth with each other to agree on the proposed amount. The city’s chief administrative and financial officer (CAFO) has experience working for the schools, and the school financial officer used to work for the city, so they understand each other’s perspective and communicate frequently.

6. The city’s CAFO attends the superintendent’s monthly cabinet meetings and serves on his budget advisory committee.

 7. City and school administrators reported that they have agreed to charge city administrative costs to the district using the state’s per-pupil estimates. Each organization does requisitions for maintenance, legal, and other services that they provide for each other.

**B.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the city has an $850 million five-year capital plan which is updated annually; the plan includes prioritized major building repairs and school renovations.

City and district leaders stated that the city has renovated many district schools over the past several years, noting that they submit statements of interest to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) every year, including six in fiscal year 2017.

1. Current school projects (fiscal years 2017 and 2018) include feasibility studies for 2 school renovations or replacements, accelerated repairs (windows, doors, and roofs) at 10 schools, and a new culinary and nutrition center.
2. The district rebuilt 2 schools after damages from the 2011 tornado with 100 percent reimbursement from federal and state sources.

 c. City and district administrators reported that the city has provided funding for non-MSBA reimbursed projects such as boilers, flooring, cooling towers, pumps, athletic fields, fire alarm systems, and auditorium repairs.

Reviewers found that schools were generally clean and---with a few exceptions in the older buildings---were well maintained and conducive to learning.

The city has supported technology initiatives such as a $2.3 million bond for a wireless Internet system.

**Impact**: The collaboration between the district and the city on capital and building projects has helped develop consistent support from the city and the MSBA. Effective and collaborative management of services and money streamline the effort to run this large district and enable educators to focus on teaching and learning.

**3. The district has developed an award-winning budget document that provides a comprehensive picture of the district budget and other district aspects. It includes priorities of the proposed budget, three- to five-year trends, grants and outside funding, summary budget data for each school and cost center, and a description of the budget development process.**

* 1. In his introductory letter in the budget document, the superintendent highlighted a deficit of $12.4 million and continued reductions in central office personnel (61.4 positions since 2015) in order to preserve school services and programs.

1. He also described in the letter the autonomy given principals in the district to make staffing and operations cuts and other changes in their discretionary budgets.

 2. The superintendent noted major cost increases including out-of-district tuitions, health insurance, and the collective bargaining agreement.

**B.** The budget document includes: the district’s mission, goals, and recent achievements; a summary of revenues and expenditures; breakdowns by divisions and by school; and special revenues including grants and staffing by division and by school.

 1. The budget’s executive summary details district priorities and initiatives funded by the budget, such as maintaining budget levels for classroom materials (at $100 per pupil), home visits, the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement, and the Springfield Promise Program (to assist students applying to college).

 2. In addition, the budget document lists outside revenues and grants and their funded staffing along with financial summaries.

 **C.** The budget document describes the budget development process clearly and in detail and includes a calendar of activities, the roles of various district and city leaders, the allocation of state aid and other revenues, and the allocation to the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership.

 **D.** The budget document also describes district programs, characteristics, capital projects, contextual information about the district, data for comparable communities and state averages, city history and demographics, taxation information, and the results of surveys about the budget.

**Impact**: The comprehensive and transparent nature of the budget document with its clear links to district priorities and initiatives supports the effective use of funds to support students’ needs, adds to the credibility of the district and its budget proposals, and contributes to support from the public and city officials for schools.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**4. The budget document does not clearly highlight the impact of some budget reductions and the costs of some initiatives.**

**A.** The superintendent’s opening letter and other summaries in the budget document describe the $12.4 million deficit and needed reductions, but do not highlight the impact of the reductions.

 1. For example, administrators said that the number of central office personnel was reduced, including a cut in payroll positions, by using an automated payroll system and a reorganization of grants management, but the budget document does not include this information.

2. Also, the budget document itemizes the reduction of the special education budget by 8.5 percent and the loss of 12.8 positions, but the budget document’s accompanying narrative and the executive summary do not describe the reduced positions or how the district will continue to meet students’ needs.

 a. Teachers described the loss of special education services in their schools, notably co-teachers in inclusion classrooms.

b. Administrators described their analysis of departmental spending for special education, including places where money was allocated but not spent and their actual student numbers.

**B.** The budget document does not specify the costs of home visits, the breakfast program, the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement, the Springfield Promise Program (to assist students in completing college and financial aid applications), the Conservatory of the Arts School, and the Duggan Middle School.

**Impact**: A proposed budget without the details of specific budget reductions and the costs of some initiatives does not communicate the district’s budget decisions to the community so that stakeholders can fully understand challenging budget decisions.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should add detail to the budget document about the specifics and the impact of budget reductions and the cost of some initiatives.**

**A.** The budget document should describe the impact of major budget reductions in the executive summary or in the relevant section of the document.

1. For example, the budget document could explain the details of administrative personnel reductions and efficiencies such as the use of automated payroll and the reorganization of grants management.
2. The budget document could briefly describe reductions in programs and how the district will continue to meet students’ needs.

**B.** The costs of initiatives such as the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement or the breakfast program could be included.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will improve transparency and help the whole community understand the difficult trade-offs and the challenging budget decisions that the district needs to make.

**Recommended resource:**

* *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. See especially pp. 65–66.

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

Review Team Members

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

1. Jim Caradonio, Ed. D., Leadership and Governance
2. Suzanne Kelly, Curriculum and Instruction
3. Linda L. Greyser, Ed. D., Assessment and *review team coordinator*
4. Frank Sambuceti, Ph. D., Human Resources and Professional Development
5. Lenora Jennings, Student Support
6. George Gearhart, Ed. D., Financial and Asset Management
7. William Contreras, Ed. D., classroom observations only
8. Laurie Keating, Ed. D., classroom observations only
9. Peter McGinn, Ed. D., classroom observations only
10. Mary Jo Santoro, classroom observations only

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: chief financial and operations manager, budget director, city chief administrative and financial officer, city comptroller, and city budget director.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: mayor/chairman, and four school committee members.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: president, vice-president, professional relations associate, and one other representative.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent; assistant superintendent; chief communications officer; chief schools officers for zone 1, zone 2, and zone 3; chief information officer; executive officer of student services; chief instructional officer; chief finance and operations officer; chief of human resources; chief of parent and community engagement; executive officer of special education and related services; assistant executive officer of special education and related services; director of secondary ELA; supervisor of ELA; director of literacy (Pre-K—5); director of secondary ELA; director of math; director of science; director of ELL; co-director of Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership; Title I director; director of development and wellness; senior administrator of curriculum, instruction and development; director of language acquisition; supervisor of clinical and behavioral services; supervisor of math; supervisor of middle school special education; senior administrator of digital learning and assessment; director of parks, buildings and recreation; budget director; director of capital asset construction; director of facilities; senior administrator for attendance; director of information management; PACE center administrator; student assignment services manager; supervisor of PBIS and City Connects; director of safety and security; senior administrator of grants; and information and benefits administrator. The team also interviewed the three instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) with districtwide responsibilities for ELA, math, and science and several elementary- and middle-school ILSs.

The team visited the following schools:

Pre-K–5: Edward P. Boland School, Elias Brookings School, Frederick Harris School, German Gerena Community School, Glenwood School, Indian Orchard Elementary School, Mary A. Dryden Veterans Memorial School, Milton Bradley School, Rebecca M. Johnson School, Sumner Avenue School, Thomas M. Bailliet School, Warner School, and Washington School.

K–5: Alfred Glickman Elementary School, Alice B. Beal Elementary School, Arthur T. Talmadge School, Brightwood School, Daniel B. Brunton School, Frank H. Freedman School, Hiram L. Dorman School, Homer Street School, Kensington International School, Liberty School, Lincoln School, Mary M. Lynch School, Mary M. Walsh School, Mary O. Pottenger School, Samuel Bowles School, White Street School, and William N. DeBerry School.

Pre-K–8: Alfred G. Zanetti Montessori Magnet School.

Grades 6–8: Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (North), Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (South), Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (Talented and Gifted), Forest Park Middle School, M. Marcus Kiley Middle School, Van Sickle International Baccalaureate, STEM Middle Academy, South End Middle School, John F. Kennedy Middle School, and Van Sickle Academy.

Grades 6–11: Conservatory of the Arts and John J. Duggan Middle School.

Grades 6–12: The Springfield Renaissance School an Expeditionary Learning School.

Grades 9–12: High School of Commerce, including the Honors Academy, Roger L. Putnam Vocational Technical Academy, Springfield Central High School, Springfield High School, and Springfield High School of Science and Technology.

The team conducted 6 teacher focus groups: 3 with a total of 34 elementary-school teachers, 2 with a total of 10 middle-school teachers, and 1 with 6 high-school teachers.

The team observed 305 classes in the district. The 103 observations of grades 9–12 were conducted at 4 high schools, 2 schools with grades 6–11 and 1 school with grades 6–12. The 61 observations of grades 6–8 were conducted at 10 middle schools with grades 6–8, 2 schools with grades 6–11, and 1 school with grades 6–12. The 141 observations of K–5 were conducted at 12 elementary schools and 1 Pre-K–8 school.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monday**11/13/2017 | **Tuesday**11/14/2017 | **Wednesday**11/15/2017 | **Thursday**11/16/2017 | **Friday**11/17/2017 |
| Orientation with district leaders; interviews with district and school staff and principals; document reviews and review of personnel files; interview with teachers’ association; interview with school committee members; and visits to Edward P. Boland School, Glenwood School, Homer Street School, Alice B. Beal School, Rebecca M. Johnson School, Alfred G. Zanetti Montessori Magnet School, Sumner Avenue School, Warner School, Thomas M. Baillet School, Lincoln School, Kensington International School, and Samuel Bowles School for classroom observations. | Interviews with district staff, district leaders and principals; review of personnel files; student focus group; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; school committee interview, and visits to High School of Science and Technology, White Street School, Milton Bradley School, High School of Commerce, Brightwood School, Mary A. Dryden Veterans Memorial School, M. Marcus Kiley Middle School, Alfred M. Glickman School, Forest Park Middle School, John F. Kennedy Middle School, Mary M. Lynch School, Daniel B. Brunton School, Elias Brookings School, and Indian Orchard School for classroom observations. | Interviews with district and school staff, district leaders and principals; school committee interview; teacher focus groups, visits to High School of Science and Technology, Central High School, John J. Duggan Middle School, South End Middle School, STEM Middle Academy, Springfield High School Alternative Campus, Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (North), Chestnut Accelerated Middle School North, Roger L. Putnam Vocational-Technical Academy, Van Sickle International Baccalaureate, Arthur T. Talmadge School, Chestnut Accelerated Middle School (Talented and Gifted), Frederick Harris School, Van Sickle Academy, Hiram L. Dorman School, Edward P. Boland School, German Garena Community School, and Liberty School for classroom observations. | Interviews with city personnel; interviews with district leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Central High School, High School of Commerce, Frank H. Freedman School, William N. DeBerry School, Springfield Renaissance School an Expeditionary Learning School, Mary O. Pottenger School, Washington School, Mary M. Walsh School for classroom observations; district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent. | Visits to Central High School, Roger L. Putnam VocationalTechnical Academy, High School of Commerce, High School of Science and Technology, Forest Park Middle School, and Rebecca M. Johnson Elementary School for classroom observations. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Springfield Public Schools**

**2016–2017 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | **Percent****of Total** | **State** | **Percent of****Total** |
| African-American | 4,992 | 19.5% | 84,996 | 8.9% |
| Asian | 608 | 2.4% | 63,690 | 6.7% |
| Hispanic | 16,613 | 64.8% | 184,782 | 19.4% |
| Native American | 18 | 0.1% | 2,125 | 0.2% |
| White | 3,022 | 11.8% | 584,665 | 61.3% |
| Native Hawaiian | 11 | 0.0% | 855 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic  | 369 | 1.4% | 32,635 | 3.4% |
| All | 25,633 | 100.0% | 953,748 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2016 |

**Table B1b: Springfield Public Schools**

**2016–2017 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | **State** |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 5,384 | 25.5% | 20.8% | 167,530 | 38.4% | 17.4% |
| Econ. Dis. | 19,035 | 90.3% | 74.3% | 288,465 | 66.1% | 30.2% |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 4,007 | 19.0% | 15.6% | 90,204 | 20.7% | 9.5% |
| All high needs students | 21,076 | 100.0% | 81.5% | 436,416 | 100.0% | 45.2% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2016. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 25,858; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,514. |

**Table B2: Springfield Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2014–2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| High Needs | 22,293 | 92.4 | 92.4 | 92.8 | 92.2 | -0.2 | 93.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 20,425 | -- | 92.4 | 92.7 | 92.1 | -- | 92.6 |
| ELLs | 4,684 | 92.4 | 92.5 | 92.6 | 92.2 | -0.2 | 93.5 |
| SWD | 6,017 | 90.6 | 90.7 | 91.4 | 90.9 | 0.3 | 93.0 |
| African American | 5,495 | 93.7 | 94.0 | 94.4 | 94.1 | 0.4 | 94.0 |
| Asian | 663 | 96.5 | 96.4 | 96.5 | 96.2 | -0.3 | 96.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 18,029 | 91.9 | 92.4 | 92.6 | 92.0 | 0.1 | 92.8 |
| Multi-Race | 404 | 93.8 | 93.7 | 94.3 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 94.5 |
| White | 3,323 | 93.9 | 93.8 | 94.0 | 93.6 | -0.3 | 95.1 |
| All  | 27,951 | 92.7 | 92.9 | 93.3 | 92.7 | 0.0 | 94.6 |
| 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 B3: Springfield Public Schools**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2015–2017**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **FY15** | **FY16** | **FY17** |
|   | **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** |
| Expenditures |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  |
| By school committee | $369,413,119 | $368,917,550 | $378,730,282 | $379,605,343 | $391,176,970 | $391,876,652 |
| By municipality | $28,727,064 | $64,893,341 | $27,026,024 | $34,005,273 | $24,065,805 | $28,486,696 |
| Total from local appropriations | $398,140,183 | $433,810,891 | $405,756,306 | $413,610,616 | 415,242,775 | $420,363,348 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $67,663,954 | -- | $74,136,660 | -- | 69,446,274 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $501,474,845 | -- | $487,747,276 | -- | $489,809,623 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $301,586,519 | -- | $309,186,094 | -- | $319,871,030 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $36,066,908 | -- | $36,405,937 | -- | $36,682,622 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $337,653,427 | -- | $345,592,031 | -- | $356,553,652 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $337,702,942 | -- | $345,651,495 | -- | $356,533,651 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $49,515 | -- | $59,464 | -- | -$1 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 0.0% | -- | 0.0% | -- | 0.0% |
| \*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: FY15, FY16, and FY17 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE websiteData retrieved 12/13/17, 1/22/18, 5/15/18 |

**Table B4: Springfield Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| Administration | $677 | $596 | $580 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,245 | $1,208 | $1,282 |
| Teachers | $4,823 | $4,963 | $5,196 |
| Other teaching services | $1,086 | $1,150 | $1,135 |
| Professional development | $332 | $348 | $321 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $1,402 | $893 | $1,055 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $405 | $408 | $389 |
| Pupil services | $1,852 | $1,985 | $2,078 |
| Operations and maintenance | $997 | $1,121 | $1,027 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $2,496 | $2,467 | $2,566 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $15,315 | $15,139 | $15,629 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/ppx.html)Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Expectations** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | AverageNumber of points |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter. | **ES** | 6% | 18% | 53% | 22% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 3% | 18% | 52% | 26% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 7% | 28% | 48% | 17% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 18 | 66 | 156 | 65 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 22% | 51% | 21% |  |
| 2. The teacher ensures that students understand what they should be learning in the lesson and why. | **ES** | 5% | 32% | 41% | 22% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 7% | 30% | 48% | 16% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 7% | 34% | 46% | 14% | 2.7 |
| **Total #** | 18 | 98 | 134 | 55 | 2.7 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 32% | 44% | 18% |  |
| 3. The teacher uses appropriate classroom activities well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 4% | 20% | 49% | 27% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 8% | 15% | 44% | 33% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 9% | 31% | 44% | 17% | 2.7 |
| **Total #** | 20 | 69 | 141 | 75 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 7% | 23% | 46% | 25% |  |
| 4. The teacher conducts frequent checks for student understanding, provides feedback, and adjusts instruction. | **ES** | 5% | 32% | 38% | 25% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 5% | 25% | 36% | 34% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 9% | 27% | 43% | 21% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 19 | 88 | 120 | 78 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 29% | 39% | 26% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 11.8 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 10.9 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 11.4 |

Note: Because of rounding, percentages do not consistently sum to 100 percent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Higher-Order Thinking** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Average Number of points |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 5. Students assume responsibility to learn and are engaged in the lesson. | **ES** | 4% | 23% | 47% | 26% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 8% | 30% | 44% | 18% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 16% | 28% | 41% | 16% | 2.6 |
| **Total #** | 27 | 79 | 135 | 64 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 9% | 26% | 44% | 21% |  |
| 6. Students engage in higher-order thinking. | **ES** | 9% | 40% | 43% | 9% | 2.5 |
| **MS** | 10% | 36% | 41% | 13% | 2.6 |
| **HS** | 19% | 40% | 30% | 11% | 2.3 |
| **Total #** | 38 | 119 | 116 | 32 | 2.5 |
| **Total %** | 12% | 39% | 38% | 10% |  |
| 7. Students communicate their ideas and thinking with each other. | **ES** | 7% | 40% | 46% | 7% | 2.5 |
| **MS** | 10% | 39% | 44% | 7% | 2.5 |
| **HS** | 26% | 40% | 24% | 10% | 2.2 |
| **Total #** | 43 | 121 | 117 | 24 | 2.4 |
| **Total %** | 14% | 40% | 38% | 8% |  |
| 8. Students engage with meaningful, real-world tasks. | **ES** | 13% | 33% | 35% | 18% | 2.6 |
| **MS** | 15% | 31% | 38% | 16% | 2.6 |
| **HS** | 23% | 28% | 38% | 11% | 2.4 |
| **Total #** | 52 | 95 | 112 | 46 | 2.5 |
| **Total %** | 17% | 31% | 37% | 15% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 10.6 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 10.3 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 9.4 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 10.1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area #3: Inclusive Practice & Classroom Culture** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Average Number of points |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 9. The teacher ensures that students are engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs. | **ES** | 6% | 29% | 45% | 20% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 8% | 36% | 33% | 23% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 25% | 30% | 30% | 15% | 2.3 |
| **Total #** | 39 | 94 | 115 | 57 | 2.6 |
| **Total %** | 13% | 31% | 38% | 19% |  |
| 10. The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies. | **ES** | 5% | 28% | 52% | 15% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 8% | 36% | 46% | 10% | 2.6 |
| **HS** | 21% | 40% | 28% | 11% | 2.3 |
| **Total #** | 34 | 103 | 130 | 38 | 2.6 |
| **Total %** | 11% | 34% | 43% | 12% |  |
| 11. Classroom routines and positive supports are in place to ensure that students behave appropriately. | **ES** | 10% | 6% | 40% | 43% | 3.2 |
| **MS** | 18% | 5% | 28% | 49% | 3.1 |
| **HS** | 15% | 19% | 37% | 29% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 40 | 32 | 112 | 121 | 3.0 |
| **Total %** | 13% | 10% | 37% | 40% |  |
| 12. The classroom climate is conducive to teaching and learning. | **ES** | 8% | 16% | 43% | 33% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 18% | 8% | 41% | 33% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 15% | 28% | 38% | 19% | 2.6 |
| **Total #** | 37 | 56 | 125 | 87 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 12% | 18% | 41% | 29% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 11.8 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 11.2 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 10.0 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 11.1 |

1. As of October 1, 2016, the latest certified enrollment data. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. On March 2, 2018, the district reported 640 displaced students: 639 from Puerto Rico and 1 from the U. S. Virgin Islands. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In recent years, the dropout rate for all Springfield students has fluctuated with an overall decline, from 6.5 percent in 2013 to 7.2 percent in 2014 to 5.1 percent in 2015 to 4.9 percent in 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Information about SEZP schools derived from on–site interviews, ESE’s data warehouse, and two documents provided to the review team by ESE and the Office for District Reviews and Monitoring: Jochim and Opalka, *The “City of Firsts” Charts a New Path on Turnaround,* CRPE, 2017, and Schnurer, *The Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership*, Progressive Policy Institute, January 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For example, pages 172–173 of the fiscal year 2018 budget include principals’ measurable goals for: student attendance, ELA composite performance index (CPI), math CPI, science CPI, ELA student growth percentile (SGP), and math SGP. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The quantitative measures include results from standardized tests (Advanced Placement and MCAS) and statistics (frequencies, averages and/or percentages) for students and staff attendance, truancy, graduates, dropouts, SAT participation, suspensions, arrests, and incidents of bullying. The 2017–2020 strategic plan's 21 metrics do not include measures for two of the plan's priority areas/outcomes:strengthening parent and community engagement and providing quality instruction in district classrooms that is effective, engaging, and personalized. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The four-year graduation rate for all students has improved steadily from 61.6 percent in 2014 to 66.7 percent in 2015 to 68.8 percent in 2016. The district’s retention rate has steadily declined from 6.2 in 2014 to 5.0 in 2015 to 4.0 in 2016 to 3.8 in 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In 2017, the chronic absence rates for grades 6–12 ranged from 23.1 percent to 35.4 percent. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In 2017, the retention rates for grades 9 and 10 were 15.2 and 7.7, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The three zones cover elementary, middle, and high schools, respectively. For example, the district’s 16 elementary schools are in zone 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Springfield superintendent of schools, the school committee chair/mayor, and one other school committee member sit on the SEZP board. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Quantitative measures include results from standardized tests (Advanced Placement and MCAS) and statistics (frequencies, averages and/or percentages) for student and staff attendance, truancy, graduates, dropouts, SAT participation, suspensions, arrests, and incidents of bullying. The 2017–2020 strategic plan's 21 metrics do not include measures for two of the plan's priority areas/outcomes:strengthening parent and community engagement and providing quality instruction in district classrooms that is effective, engaging, and personalized. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Academic directors oversee ELL, literacy, mathematics, ELA and libraries, science, social studies, development and wellness, visual and performing arts, and language acquisition. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Each school typically has one ILS for ELA and one for math. The larger schools have more than one. Sometimes there is an ILS for science. There is also one district ILS for ELA, one for math, and one for science. They work with the ILS team and engage at the school level. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. For example, these include K–12 common unit assessments for ELA, math, and science designed by teachers, writing prompts, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Literacy Assessments, and pre- and post-tests in science and math. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. SEEDS stands for Springfield Effective Educator Development System. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The district provided data that demonstrated teacher vacancies in 2017–2018 had been reduced from 455 to 206 and that teacher daily attendance rates were showing slow, steady improvement. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. PARCC was last administered in 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. SEEDS stands for Springfield Effective Educator Development System. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. 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-20)
21. Attendance rate equals the average number of students present each day divided by the average number of students enrolled each day. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. At the time of the onsite in November 2017, these schools enrolled a total of 5,309 students. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)