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## Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a targeted review of Littleton Public Schools (hereafter, Littleton) in November 2023. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews and focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on three of the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness: Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management.

In addition, five observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Littleton during the week of November 13, 2023, to collect data on instructional practices. The observers conducted 82 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[1]](#footnote-2) guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest mixed evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, student engagement (Grades 4-5), and rigorous instructional support. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, student engagement, and rigorous instructional support. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, student engagement, and rigorous instructional support.

### [Leadership and Governance](#_Leadership_and_Governance)

Dr. Kelly R. Clenchy has served as the superintendent of Littleton since 2011. He leads a district office composed of a director of teaching and learning, director of student services, business manager, instructional technology coordinator, technology systems coordinator, accounts payable manager, student services liaison, and school payroll coordinator. These officials collaborate closely with the elected school committee members, five individuals who serve three-year terms.

The school committee’s primary responsibilities include long-range planning and addressing immediate concerns to optimize educational achievement for students. The committee evaluates the superintendent annually and oversees the district’s budget. The school committee meets regularly, and meeting minutes and School Committee Agenda Packets are publicly accessible on the district’s website.

Littleton’s newest strategic plan for 2023-2028 encompasses five standards with associated goals, elements, and success indicators. Each of the four schools within the district aligns their school improvement plans to the broader district strategic plan, outlining action steps, success indicators, responsible individuals, timelines, and required resources. Each school in the district has a school council. School councils include school leadership, parents, and teachers. Some councils include members of the community, and the school council at the high school includes students. These councils actively contribute to the creation and annual review of school improvement plans.

Littleton has several strengths related to leadership and governance, including that the school committee and the superintendent have a positive working relationship; district leadership and the school committee maintain a collaborative relationship with the local teacher’s association; the district has systems in place to facilitate collaboration between school and district leaders; school improvement plans are aligned to the district improvement plan; and the district maintains strong family engagement by actively working to engage all stakeholders, including historically underserved families. Additional strengths include strong alignment between the district strategic plan and school improvement plans, a well-defined, transparent process for budget development that includes a wide range of stakeholders, and the superintendent clearly communicates annual budgetary priorities and concerns formally to the school committee.

Areas for growth include expanding families’ visibility into district and school decisionmaking, engaging broader participation from families and educators who do not serve on school councils to contribute to district and school improvement planning efforts, effectively communicating with stakeholders regarding progress toward improvement goals, and providing a more explicit connection between the district and school improvement plans and the budget process to show the connection of budgetary decisions to closing existing gaps.

### [Human Resources and Professional Development](#_Human_Resources_and)

Littleton maintains a stable teacher workforce, with a 2023 teacher retention rate of 87.9%, surpassing the state’s retention rate of 84.6%. The district faces more challenges in recruiting teaching assistants and special education teachers compared with general education teachers. The hiring process for school-based positions occurs primarily at the school level; the superintendent grants final approval. The district has implemented systems in place to verify that candidates possess the necessary licensure.

Professional development is a key focus area outlined in the district’s strategic plan. Throughout the academic year, the district schedules 10 half day professional development days, including one full-day cross-district professional development. School or district staff lead five of these professional development days. In addition, the district encourages teachers to pursue professional development outside of the district in a specific area of personal interest, and each teacher has access to $2,000 annually to reimburse professional development costs.

Strengths of the district include that the district and town work together to support human resources functions, the district and town sharing responsibility in the hiring process with clearly defined roles, the district’s multifaceted approach to orienting new teachers to the district, additional funds provided to teachers to seek professional development opportunities, the district provides teachers with numerous leadership opportunities, and the district uses a variety of awards to recognize excellence across the district. Areas for growth include conducting systematic reviews of scheduling and staffing across schools, providing consistent opportunities for classroom observation and feedback, completing all elements of educator evaluations, and providing feedback to administrative district staff that includes areas for improvement.

### [Financial and Asset Management](#_Financial_and_Asset)

District leaders, school leaders, and town officials collaborate to formulate a budget aligned with the district’s strategic plan and school improvement plans. The majority of participants in focus groups expressed consensus that the budget effectively addresses the district’s needs. The business office assumes the responsibility of budget oversight, furnishing routine reports to the superintendent, principals, and school committee. Moreover, School Committee Agenda Packets and budget subcommittee meetings make these reports accessible to the public.

The district has a comprehensive 10-year capital plan, subject to review by the superintendent, business manager, school committee, and school leaders. Subsequently, the town’s finance committee and select board members review the plan. District leaders regularly conduct school building walkthroughs to ensure access to clean, safe, and well-maintained buildings. In addition, the district adheres to a written maintenance plan.

Littleton’s strengths include transparency around the status of the budget; a collective commitment of the school community to support the district with additional funds; providing regular financial reports to the superintendent, school committee, and school leaders; engaging in a transparent financial tracking process; and taking a proactive approach to planning for the district’s capital needs. An area of growth is to continue the fund the district’s capital replacement plan in light of other large town budget priorities.

## Littleton Public Schools: District Review Overview

### Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.[[2]](#footnote-3) The Littleton review focused only on the three governance-centered standards: Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, 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. The design of the district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

### Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data prior to conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including school committee members, teachers’ association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students’ families. Virtual interviews and focus groups also are conducted as needed. Information about review activities and the site visit schedule is in Appendix A. Team members also observe classroom instruction and collect data using the CLASS protocol. The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report resulting from these classroom observations is in Appendix B.

Following the site visit, the team members code and analyze the data to develop a set of objective findings. The team lead and multiple quality assurance reviewers, including DESE staff, then review the initial draft of the report. DESE staff provides recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas of growth identified, before AIR finalizes and submits the report to DESE. DESE previews and then sends the report to the district for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website. DESE also provides additional resources to support implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators, summarized in Appendix C.

### Site Visit

The site visit to Littleton occurred during the week of November 13, 2023. The site visit included 12 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 37 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with seven elementary school teachers, five middle school teachers, and five high school teachers as well as one family focus group with five parents.

The site team also conducted 82 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

Appointed in 2011, the superintendent of Littleton is Dr. Kelly R. Clenchy. He receives support from the director of teaching and learning, director of student services, business manager, instructional technology coordinator, technology systems coordinator, accounts payable manager, student services liaison, and school payroll coordinator. A school committee composed of five members who are elected for three-year terms governs the district.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 125 teachers in the district, with 1,690 students enrolled in the district’s four schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for the 2023-2024 school year.

Table 1. Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2023-2024

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| Shaker Lane School | Elementary | PK-2 | 443 |
| Russell Street School | Elementary | 3-5 | 356 |
| Littleton Middle School | Middle | 6-8 | 388 |
| Littleton High School | High | 9-12 | 487 |
| Total |  |  | 1,674 |

*Note.* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2023.

Between 2021 and 2024, overall student enrollment increased by 121 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

In fiscal year 2022, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Littleton was $17,231, which is $1,916 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($19,147), and $1,397 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures in districts of similar wealth ($18,628).[[3]](#footnote-4) In-district per pupil expenditures for Littleton were $2,323 less than the average state spending per pupil ($19,554). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

### School and Student Performance

The following section includes selected highlights regarding student performance in Littleton. This section is meant to provide a brief synopsis of data, not a comprehensive analysis of district performance data. For additional details and data on district performance, please see Appendix E and [School and District Profiles (mass.edu)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/general/general.aspx?topNavID=1&leftNavId=100&orgcode=01580000&orgtypecode=5).

#### Achievement

* In ELA and mathematics in Grades 3-8 and science in Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of Littleton’s all students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next Generation Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) was above the state rate.
  + ELA: the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations was 21 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
  + Mathematics: the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations was 13 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
  + Science: the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations was 23 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
* ELs and former ELs in Grades 3-8 outperformed their statewide peers on the Next Generation MCAS by 25 percentage points in ELA and by 37 percentage points in mathematics.
* In Grade 10, every student group with reportable data met or exceeded expectations on the Next Generation MCAS at a higher rate than their statewide peers.
  + ELA: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was above the state rate by 6 to 19 percentage points.
  + Mathematics: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was above the state rate by 9 to 21 percentage points.
  + Science: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was above the state rate by 17 to 38 percentage points.

#### Growth

* ELA student growth percentiles (SGP)[[4]](#footnote-5) were typical in 2023 for all student groups with reportable data.
* In Grades 3-8, student growth percentiles in mathematics were typical for each student group with reportable data, except for Hispanic/Latino students, who exceeded typical growth. In Grade 10, all student groups with reportable data exceeded typical growth in mathematics.

#### Other Indicators

* In 2022, Littleton’s four-year graduation rates were above the state rate for each student group with reportable data by 3.3 to 6.0 percentage points. Between 2020 and 2022, Littleton’s rates also improved for each student group (by 3.8 to 25.7 percentage points, depending on the group).
* Littleton’s dropout rates in 2022 were below the state rate for each student group with reportable data, except for Hispanic/Latino students, whose dropout rate was 10.5 percent, more than double the state rate of 4.3 percent.
* There were lower rates of in-school and out-of-school suspensions than the state for each student group with reportable data.
* In 2023, Littleton Middle School was identified as a *School of Recognition* via the state’s accountability system. Schools of recognition demonstrate high achievement and high growth and meet or exceed accountability targets.

### Classroom Observations

Five observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Littleton during the week of November 13, 2023. The observers conducted 82 observations across four schools in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, social studies, science, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

The K-3 protocol includes 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. The Upper Elementary and Secondary protocols include 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support, in addition to Student Engagement. The three domains observed at all levels broadly are defined as follows:

* Emotional Support. Describes the social-emotional functioning of the classroom, including teacher-student relationships and responsiveness to social-emotional needs.
* Classroom Organization. Describes the management of students’ behavior, time, and attention in the classroom.
* Instructional Support. Describes the efforts to support cognitive and language development, including cognitive demand of the assigned tasks, the focus on higher order thinking skills, and the use of process-oriented feedback.

When conducting a classroom visit, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 (low range) indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 (middle range) indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 (high range) indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

In Littleton, ratings are provided across three grade bands: K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. For each grade band, ratings are provided across the overarching domains as well as at individual dimensions within those domains. The full report of findings from observations conducted in Littleton is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

In summary, findings from the Littleton observations were as follows:

* Emotional Support. Ratings were in the high-middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.6) and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (4.7 and 4.7, respectively).
* Classroom Organization. Ratings were in the high-middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.6) and in the high range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (6.0 and 6.6, respectively).
* Instructional Support. Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (3.4, 3.9, and 3.9, respectively).
* Student Engagement. For Grades 4 and up, in which student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the middle range for Grades 4-5 (4.9) and in the high-middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (5.6 and 5.4, respectively).

Overall, in the K-5 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, classroom organization, instructional support, and student engagement (Grades 4-5). In the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, instructional support, and student engagement, and strong evidence of classroom organization. In the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of strong emotional support, instructional support, and student engagement, and strong evidence of classroom organization.

## Leadership and Governance

The superintendent of Littleton, since 2011, is Dr. Kelly R. Clenchy. He receives support from a director of teaching and learning, director of student services, business manager, instructional technology coordinator, technology systems coordinator, accounts payable manager, student services liaison, and school payroll coordinator. These district officials, particularly the superintendent, work closely with the elected school committee members who represent Littleton residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has five members, each serving a three-year term.

The district’s Administrative Council meets biweekly to support the superintendent and focus on school improvement. This group uses a collaborative approach and meeting topics include administrator evaluations, family engagement, and academic progress monitoring. School leadership teams are used at each level and are comprised of school leaders, teachers, counselors, and special education teachers. The team at each school facilitates communication and decision-making at the building level. The district values feedback from families which is evident by the influence family feedback had on COVID-19 protocols and school calendar adjustments. Efforts to engage historically underserved stakeholders include connection evenings and regular communications, though improvements in communication effectiveness are acknowledged.

Littleton teachers have a variety of leadership opportunities including involvement in professional development councils, curriculum councils, and school improvement planning. The district emphasized aligning district and school improvement plans, incorporating feedback from parents and educators. However, some stakeholders report limited awareness of these plans. Despite efforts to communicate progress, feedback on the effectiveness of communication varies among stakeholders. The district’s commitment to Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives is recognized, with positive feedback on professional development efforts.

The budget development process in Littleton involves collaboration among stakeholders, starting with discussions between district leaders and principals to prioritize needs. Transparent communication between the district and town facilitates the budget process, with the superintendent presenting a comprehensive budget proposal to the school committee annually. The district is generally satisfied with the budget and the support received from the town and acknowledged resounding support from other groups that provide supplementary funds.

Table 2 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in leadership and governance.

Table 2. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Leadership and Governance Standard

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [School committee governance](#_School_Committee_Governance) | * The school committee and superintendent maintain a positive working relationship. * The superintendent, school committee, and the teacher’s association maintain a collaborative relationship. |  |
| [District and school leadership](#_District_and_School) | * The district uses systems and processes that facilitate collaboration between school- and district-level leaders. * The district maintains strong family engagement by actively working to engage all stakeholders, including historically underserved families. | * Expanding families’ visibility into district and school decision-making |
| [District and school improvement planning](#_District_and_School_1) | * Each school’s improvement plans are aligned to the district strategic plan. | * Engaging broader participation from families who do not serve on school councils and educators to contribute to district and school improvement planning efforts * Communicating effectively about improvement plans, including planning and progress monitoring, to families and educators |
| [Budget development](#_Budget_Development) | * The district has a well-defined, transparent process for budget development that includes a wide range of stakeholders. * The superintendent clearly communicates budgetary priorities and concerns during a formal presentation to the school committee each year. | * Providing more explicit connection between the district and school improvement plans with the budget process to show the connection of budgetary decisions to closing existing gaps |

### School Committee Governance

The school committee collaborates with district leaders to uphold Massachusetts laws and regulations, including overseeing the budget, operating with transparency, negotiating collective bargaining agreements, making school policy, and maintaining their fiduciary responsibilities to the district and town of Littleton. According to the school committee’s website and interviews with school committee members and district leaders, the primary role of the school committee is to manage the budget and policies as well as oversee and evaluate the superintendent. School committee meetings purposefully focus on school improvement. They frequently include time for each school principal and district leaders to provide progress updates on school and district improvement plans. In addition, according to meeting agendas, some school committee meetings include presentations of data, such as MCAS results, Advanced Placement results, and NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing results. In a November 2023 school committee meeting, committee members and attendees received an update on 2023 MCAS results including disaggregated results for students with an individualized education program or 504 plan.

Each year, the school committee evaluates the superintendent’s performance using the Indicator Rubric for Superintendent Evaluation provided by DESE. The superintendent completes a self-reflection based on the five standards in the district’s strategic plan and provides supporting evidence for each standard. Each school committee member submits a separate evaluation to a subcommittee, which summarizes the scoring and comments and presents the feedback publicly in April. According to school committee minutes from April 13, 2023, the school committee shared their feedback with the superintendent as part of his annual evaluation. The superintendent was marked proficient in most areas and exemplary in a few areas.

The superintendent, school committee, and the teacher’s association report having a collaborative relationship with each other, which is a strength for the district. District leaders and school committee members report that these groups have collaborative relationships focused on issues and not individuals. This is exemplified by the district’s recent collective bargaining process, which district leaders, school committee members, and teachers agreed went well and was collaborative in nature. A school committee member attributes this collaborative relationship between stakeholders to the school committee being “highly functional [and] highly respectful.”

The school committee also engages students and families regularly. The committee has two student representatives who attend meetings on an alternating schedule. These students participate by providing short five-minute presentations at each meeting and then typically stay for the remainder of the meeting. Parents and other community members also have opportunities to participate in school committee meetings through scheduled public participation.

### District and School Leadership

At the district level, a team of district-level administrators and school leaders participates in the Administrative Council that meets every two weeks to support the superintendent. According to district leaders, Administrative Council meetings focus on district and school improvement. Meeting agendas from 2022-2023 show a variety of topics discussed at these meetings, including administrator evaluations, activities to engage families, alleged racist incidences, professional development, monitoring of academic progress, and Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds updates. School and district leaders agree that the relationship is collaborative and that the structures and processes in place for meeting help maintain the collaborative culture between school- and district-level leaders, which is a strength of the district.

At the building level, each school has a school leadership team that meets regularly. School leadership teams comprise administrators, teachers (the goal is to have one from each grade level), a guidance counselor, and a special education teacher. According to school leaders and teacher focus group participants, the school leadership team members communicate with their respective grade level teams, gather input on various initiatives, and help school leadership make decisions.

District leaders, school leaders, and teacher focus group participants agree that the district aims to engage all stakeholders, including its historically underserved families, by building relationships and through intentional outreach efforts, which is a strength of the district. For example, Littleton holds “connection evenings,” which are information sessions held in a variety of neighborhoods throughout the district to reach all families. Additionally, district leaders describe taking parent feedback seriously and using the feedback to inform decision making. When considering changing school start times in the 2022-2023 school year, which carried associated transportation costs, the district sent out surveys to families and used the data to inform their decisions. Family feedback also influenced district decision-making around mandatory masking and the hybrid model during the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of holy days in the school calendar that are observed by having days off, and school start times. Overall, district leaders, school leaders, teacher focus group participants, and the school committee agree that the community strongly supports the school system; a district leader offered the fact that relatively few families choose to send their children elsewhere as evidence of their support.

Additionally, district and school leaders agree that they consistently communicate with families. For example, the superintendent sends out a newsletter every two months to communicate with families. The district redesigned and shortened the newsletter to make it more accessible, based on family feedback. According to family focus group participants, principals also send weekly emails to families. Despite these efforts, family focus group participants report mixed results about the efficacy of district and school communications. Some family focus group participants report being able to find what they need if they have the time to look for it, whereas other participants do not feel well informed. For example, these parents reported wanting to know more about professional development that educators are receiving, incidents that occur in schools, curricular changes, and how the budget is allocated at the school level. Expanding families’ visibility into district and school decisionmaking is an area for growth.

### District and School Improvement Planning

Aligning the district and school improvement plans has been a priority spanning the past six years. Littleton’s *District Strategic Plan 2023-2028* delineates the district’s five standards with accompanying goals and elements that include indicators of success. The five standards of the district improvement plan are (1) align and enhance curriculum, instruction, and assessment to continually improve student achievement; (2) provide staff with a variety of professional development opportunities that are connected with the district Strategic Plan and Individual School Improvement Plans; (3) preserve and enhance communication strategies between the school district and its constituents; (4) foster a respectful and responsive culture that provides a safe, secure learning and work environment; and (5) preserve and enhance the integration and utilization of technology for preK-12 students and staff. Each school’s improvement plan aligns with the five district standards and includes action steps, indicators of success, person(s) responsible, timeline, and cost/resources needed. The strong alignment between the district strategic plan and the school improvement plans is a strength of the district.

The extent to which families or educators are meaningfully engaged around district and school improvement efforts is unclear. Each school has a school council comprised of parents and teachers, and one of the elementary schools also has a community member participant. School councils participate in developing school improvement plans and meet monthly to track and discuss progress. In addition, school leaders described a collaborative and inclusive process to develop school improvement plans. One principal explained that they start with parent input and then bring in teachers to hear their views about what is working well and the areas for growth. However, some educators and parents from focus groups stated that they did not know about the existence of a district or school improvement plan or did not recall being asked to give feedback on the plans while they were being created. Similarly, teacher focus group participants were not certain whether there was a district plan; although they thought a district plan probably existed, none of the participants recalled providing feedback on it while it was being created. Educators were more familiar with school improvement plans. Creating meaningful opportunities for broader participation from families who do not serve on school councils and educators to contribute to district and school improvement planning efforts is an area for growth.

Although the district uses different strategies to report progress on the district’s strategic plan and school improvement plans, family focus group participants were not aware of or familiar with the plans or district or school progress toward their stated improvement goals. School leaders from each school report giving monthly updates on school improvement plans at school committee meetings and during faculty meetings, presenting goals and progress updates. However, educators were mixed in their familiarity with the district and school plans and these progress reports. At one school, participants stated that plan updates have not been as frequent this school year as they have been in the past. A participant from another teacher focus group reported receiving updates on the improvement plans on an as-needed basis. A few educators stated that they would not be comfortable speaking about the district goals, although one participant said that they all have access to the district improvement plan online. Therefore, communicating effectively about the existence of and progress toward school and district improvement goals to families and educators is an area for growth.

### Budget Development

District leaders articulated a clear budget development process that involves close collaboration with school and district leaders, the school committee, and town administrators. Their well-defined process for budget development that includes a wide range of stakeholders is a clear strength of the district. The process starts in September with the 10-year capital plan, which is submitted to the town in October. The development of the operating budget begins in October. In December, the district meets with the town’s finance committee. In January, the town holds a “Super Saturday” when all departments present their budget to the town’s finance committee and select board. They release a preliminary budget in February and finalize the proposed budget in March. Town meeting members vote on the budget in May.

The budget process starts with district leaders meeting individually with each principal to discuss their building’s needs and priorities. District leaders described giving the principals as much budgetary autonomy as possible. Educators also report being part of the process through discussions in their buildings and teams. After the finance office presents a budget to the superintendent, they meet with the budget subcommittee of the school committee. From there, the district makes a budget request to the town. Town leaders talk about the importance of transparent communication between the district and the town so that the town can understand what is happening in the district, understand their needs, and be able to place their needs in the larger context. District leaders report there is strong communication which helps facilitate the budgeting process.

Providing clear communication regarding the budget to the school committee through a formalized presentation that outlines priorities and concerns is a strength of the district. Each March, the superintendent presents the requested budget at a school committee meeting. The fiscal year 2024 presentation included a timeline and description of the cost centers and information about revolving funds and grants, the allocation of the requested budget increases and compared the budget request with the previous year’s appropriation, budget concerns, and district budget priorities. The comprehensive presentation provides clear communication regarding the budget and is an important component in maintaining clarity around budgeting for the school committee and school community stakeholders.

According to district leaders, the strategic plan drives the whole budget process. Teacher focus group participants agree and report that improving outcomes for all students is an underlying assumption of decisions around how to allocate resources. The fiscal year 2024 budget presentation partially aligns with the district’s strategic plan. Accomplishments are grouped by school level and strategic standard, including curriculum/instruction/assessment, professional development, culture/climate, community/communication, and technology. Priorities for 2023-2024, however, are presented as a bulleted list without explicit connection to the district improvement plan. Providing more explicit connection between the district and school improvement plans with the budget process to show the connection of budgetary decisions to closing existing gaps is an area for growth.

District and school leaders report being satisfied with their budget and describe the town as supportive of the schools, and district leaders report that in some years, all budgetary requests are granted from the town. Although they typically do not get their full budget request, district leaders stated that the budget is sufficient and allows them to prioritize the needs of students. Similarly, one school leader stated that they rarely cannot find a way to get what they need. This may include getting resources from other sources, such as the Littleton Education Fund or the town’s cultural council. Educators also report that they can get what they need. One educator stated, “If I need something, I just ask for it and I get it.” Another teacher reports being reimbursed for resources they had purchased with their own money.

### DESE Recommendations

* *Where feasible, the district should revisit its strategies for communication with families and determine where it can provide additional information around school- and district-level decisions to allow for greater engagement with families.*
* *The district should review how it has historically incorporated feedback from families and educators into the development of district and school improvement plans, and adjust so that all stakeholders have meaningful opportunities to provide input into plan development and have access to information about progress towards stated goals.*
* *The district should update their budget communications to include explicit connections between the district strategic plan and the budgetary allocations.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

Littleton has a relatively stable teacher workforce with a 2023 teacher retention rate of 87.9%, above the state retention rate of 84.6%. Like other districts, Littleton faces more challenges in hiring teaching assistants and special education teachers than in hiring general education teachers. For school-based positions, hiring happens at the school level, with final approval by the superintendent. The district has systems to make sure that candidates have proper licensure. The hiring and interview process is consistent across the four schools.

Professional development is a focus area of the district’s strategic plan. Throughout the year, the district has 10 half day professional development days, plus one full-day cross-district professional development day. School or district staff lead five of the district’s professional development days. In addition, each teacher has access to a $2,000 reimbursement to pursue professional development outside of the district in a specific area of their interest. The district has a formal induction and mentoring system for new teachers that spans two years. In their first year, all new teachers receive support from a mentor, and they participate in a professional learning community for their first two years in district.

Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.

Table 3. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Infrastructure](#_Infrastructure) | * The district and town work together to share and support human resource functions. |  |
| [Recruitment, hiring, and assignment](#_Recruitment,_Hiring,_and) | * The district and town have shared responsibility in the hiring process with clearly defined roles. | * Systematic review of scheduling and staffing across schools to ensure equitable student access to all offered courses |
| [Supervision, evaluation, and educator development](#_Supervision,_Evaluation,_and) | * The district has a multifaceted approach to orienting new teachers to the district. * The district provides teachers with additional funds to seek professional growth opportunities. | * More consistent opportunities for classroom observations and feedback outside the formal evaluation * Completing all required elements of educator evaluations in full * Providing feedback to district administrators that includes areas for improvement |
| [Recognition, leadership development, and advancement](#_Recognition,_Leadership_Development) | * The district provides teachers with numerous meaningful leadership opportunities. * The district uses a variety of awards to recognize excellence in the various education professions. |  |

### Infrastructure

Littleton’s human resources operations are housed within their business office, and the staff that support it include the business manager and school payroll coordinator. The district and town work together to share and support the human resource functions which is a strength of the district. The district is responsible for the full hiring process including recruiting, posting positions, and the interview process. The district posts all open positions on the district’s website and SchoolSpring, and also posts custodial and café positions on Indeed. The town is responsible for supporting the district with onboarding new hires including running background checks and providing employee and retiree benefits. Furthermore, the town shares responsibility for building maintenance, including snow plowing.

The central office for the district maintains personnel files on each staff member, which employees can request to view at any time. The district also keeps track of when teachers need to renew their licenses and sends letters to all staff members at the beginning of each year reminding them to make certain that their licenses are current. In addition, the district is responsible for handling payroll. The district’s business office reviews payroll to confirm that payments are accurate and as expected.

### Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

The district and town have shared responsibility in the hiring process with clearly defined roles which is a strength of the district. The district has a written checklist documenting the hiring process. The checklist includes information about posting positions, which documents must be submitted, and who is responsible for different aspects of the process. The town supports the district with functions including performing background checks and new hire paperwork for new teachers. The district and the town share the new hire process. All hiring begins with the superintendent’s executive administrative assistant. This position supports all new hires to complete all forms. After the forms are completed, the new hire completes the onboarding process in the human resources department for the town of Littleton. According to district leaders, the district has systems in place to make sure that candidates have the proper licensure for the job for which they are being hired.

District leaders and teacher focus group participants do not believe that the district faces significant challenges in recruiting general education teachers. In contrast, a district leader and teacher focus group participants reported a shortage of teacher assistants, and some participants from specific schools reported a shortage of special education teachers. One of the goals in the district improvement plan is formalizing a comprehensive staff recruitment and retention program that includes recruiting and supporting a diverse workforce. According to one district leader, this goal is guiding efforts to ensure that recruiting and hiring practices work toward diversifying the workforce The process for hiring begins with the school identifying a staffing need, at which point the building principal has a conversation with district personnel. The district determines whether the budget allows for the position. If it can be funded, and if the position is school-based, a school-based hiring committee formed by building leaders manages hiring. For district positions, community members and sometimes students are involved, but neither constituency participates on school-hiring teams. In adherence to the district improvement plan, the human resources staff works with colleges and universities to recruit student teachers. Positions are posted on Indeed, SchoolSpring, and Littleton websites to recruit candidates. All new hire certifications are verified through the director of teaching and learning prior to being submitted to the superintendent for approval.

In regard to educator assignment, systematically reviewing staffing and scheduling to ensure equitable student access to courses is an area of growth for the district. Teacher focus group participants’ perception is mixed concerning the extent to which the district systematically reviews the budget for adequate staffing that aligns with equitable practices. According to a teacher focus group, currently, students at the middle school may not be able to take a world language because students are pulled for special education services during the time these courses are offered. The district is aware of such issues and is currently having conversations about staffing, scheduling, and equity.

### Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

The superintendent and director of teaching and learning share the responsibility for managing the staff evaluation process. The principal or assistant principals are responsible for teacher evaluations. This process begins when school leaders meet with each educator in the fall to assess their plan and set goals. In the upper grades, evidence of practice also includes feedback from students. School and district leaders conduct observations throughout the year to gather evidence of instructional practice. Near the end of the school year, school leaders document and submit the educator evaluations in Vector Solutions (formerly known as TeachPoint). According to school leaders, evaluators frequently give educators feedback in person. District leaders emphasized the importance of evaluators connecting with teachers and developing a rapport so that educators feel comfortable sharing what is not going well in their classrooms. Beyond formal evaluations, district leaders expect that administrators are in classrooms every day. A district leader explained that “teachers and students need to know that you are there, you’re visible, and you care.”

Despite these expectations, the frequency of classroom observations varies across the different schools, according to focus group participants. One teacher described the supervisory process as “really hands off” and noticeably lacking in observations. Another teacher at a different school agreed, stating that the administrators conduct only the number of observations required by the contract. In contrast, a teacher at a third school reported administrators popping into classrooms more frequently. More consistent opportunities across all schools for classroom observations and feedback outside of formal evaluations is an area for growth.

The district has a written document that explains the educator evaluation process and includes the forms and rubrics required by DESE. District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently documented using Vector Solutions. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample of 10 of the 74 Professional Teacher Status teachers due for summative evaluations for the 2022-2023 school year. All (100 percent) of the teacher evaluations selected for review had summative evaluations available for review. However, only 3 (30 percent) of the teacher evaluations were complete and were not missing required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. Nearly all (9 of 10) of the reviewed teacher evaluations included both student learning and professional practice specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely (SMART) goals; however, the goals were inconsistently included in the summative evaluation report. Only five of the student learning and professional goals could be found on the summative evaluation report, whereas the other four were included only on the “educator plan form.” All (100 percent) of the reviewed evaluations included multiple sources of evidence, such as artifacts of planning or instruction, observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. All (100 percent) summative evaluations included feedback for each standard and feedback naming strengths or practices that the teacher should continue, whereas only two evaluations included feedback indicating areas of improvement. Completing all required evaluations in full is an area for growth for the district.

Administration evaluations also are consistently completed using Vector Solutions. Of the 10 administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2022-2023 school year, all were available for review, and a majority (8 of 10) were complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Of the 10 summative evaluations reviewed, only one included student learning and professional practice SMART goals, whereas none included a school improvement goal. None of the evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. All the summative evaluations (10) included feedback for each standard, providing administrators with specific, actionable feedback identifying each administrator’s strengths. However, only half (5 of 10) of the evaluator’s feedback identified areas of improvement for district administrators. Providing feedback to district administrators that includes areas of improvement is an area of growth for the district.

The district has a focus on supporting the professional development of staff as evidenced by their district goal to provide staff with a variety of professional development opportunities that align with the district strategic plan and individual school improvement plans. Professional development takes place during a full day in the fall and then 10 early release days throughout the year. Two of the early release days are district-based professional development, three are building based, and five are led by faculty. The Professional Development Council, a districtwide committee that includes representation from all buildings, reviews proposals for faculty-led professional development. All staff also participate in a cross-district professional learning day with the Ayer-Shirley and Harvard Public Schools. The cross-district professional development will continue themes from the prior year, including UDL, equity, SEL, trauma-informed practice, and innovation.

District leaders, school leaders, teacher focus group participants, and the school committee agree that Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a key part of Littleton’s strategy to improve student outcomes. School leaders describe UDL as an instructional design approach that equips teachers with multiple strategies to enable them to meet the learning needs of all students. During the pandemic, the district fully adopted UDL as an instructional approach to help minimize learning gaps as students returned to in-person learning. According to focus group participants, school administrators and teachers generally embrace UDL. The district’s professional development plan states that UDL, through a lens of culturally responsive teaching and social-emotional learning (SEL), will be a continued focus for the district. The district also has a focus on providing professional development to - specifically engage educators in embracing diversity, equity, and inclusion. Teachers from multiple focus groups describe the professional development they have received thus far as engaging and helpful in improving their craft as educators. According to the district’s 2023-2024 professional development plan,

The focus of professional development for the 2023-2024 school year will be a continued focus on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) through a lens of culturally responsive teaching and social emotional learning. This focus will allow LPS to ensure that all students and staff are included and feel a sense of belonging in their learning environment, as well as allow for the continued ability to embed SEL and cultural proficiency within all learning for all students.

Mathematics educators in Grades K-5 will also participate in professional development related to the continued implementation of a new elementary mathematics program. The district collects feedback from teachers through surveys to assess teachers’ perception of knowledge gained and whether they acquired new strategies or skills that they were able to immediately implement in their practice. Their responses vary across different sessions. Participants are asked whether they have gained knowledge, strategies, and skills as a result of the professional development that they were able to immediately implement in their work. Most participants were positive in response to UDL professional development. In addition to receiving the professional development opportunities offered within the district, each teacher also has access to $2,000 annually to reimburse costs for professional development outside of the district in a specific area of their interest. Teachers agree that these funds are used to pursue areas of interest and they believe it has a positive impact on their practice. Providing teachers with additional funds to seek professional growth opportunities is a strength for the district.

Littleton’s professional development program also includes a structured induction and mentoring program for all teachers who are new to the district. According to documents, the purpose of this program is to “create a team environment” that provides multiple levels of support, guidance, and education. All new staff participate in an orientation before the school year begins, which includes allowing students to participate to share what it is like to be a student in Littleton. These teachers are also assigned a mentor and participate for two years in a professional learning community for new teachers. They meet monthly during the first year and every five to six weeks during the second year. The meetings blend fixed agendas with adaptive agendas to meet the needs of the teachers. In addition to having formal mentors, teachers report informal mentoring as well; one teacher stated that they are “a pretty strong community that anyone can knock on anyone’s door.” Focus group participants also report the ability to observe colleagues’ classrooms, although finding time to do this can be challenging. The district has a multifaceted approach to orienting new teachers to the district which is a strength of the district.

### Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Littleton offers a variety of opportunities for educators to exercise and grow leadership skills, which is a strength of the district. For example, teachers facilitate half of the district’s professional development days which is a strength of the district. According to a document entitled “Faculty Led Professional Development Instructions for 2023-2024,” the goal of teacher-led professional development is “to benefit both teachers’ individual development and school and district-wide improvement efforts.” Additionally, teachers serve as members of the school instructional leadership teams in three of the four schools. and, depending on the school, teachers participate in school councils and student support teams. Teachers can also apply to be a curriculum advisor (at the elementary level) or curriculum coordinator (at the secondary level), can join school-based curriculum councils, and can participate in the district’s professional development council. Teacher focus group participants at the middle school mentioned additional informal opportunities for leadership, such as leading assemblies. Finally, each school has a technology teacher leader position, which is a leadership position in which a teacher supports colleagues throughout the building with technology troubleshooting and advancing technology-related skills.

A district leader stated that “we work very hard at maintaining and building capacity within our educators to become the best educators that they can be in the role that they are in and then also support their growth within our own district moving up.” However, despite the district’s emphasis on teacher leadership and support for training for administrative roles, opportunities to advance are limited within the district because of a lack of openings, according to focus group participants.

The district uses a variety of awards to recognize excellence, which is a strength of the district. To recognize teacher excellence, Littleton has a monthly Paw of Excellence award. The award is passed from one staff member to another, and the person who receives the award identifies the next recipient. Teachers also report some other opportunities for staff to recognize their colleagues at the elementary schools. For example, they use a system to provide peer support, encouragement, and acknowledgment by giving each other “stripes for teachers.” In addition, the district gives a Golden Apple award at the end of the school year. People nominate candidates, and a committee determines the winners for excellence in their specific roles. Teachers, teacher assistants, custodians, nurses, guidance counselors, technology staff, and others are eligible for this award. The number of awards varies each year. One district leader reported the desire to bring back a previous excellence in teaching award that is recognized by the school committee.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should examine the extent to which each school and subject area is sufficiently staffed to facilitate equitable access to coursework for all students, including those who receive specialized services, and leverage their financial resources to minimize disparities.*
* *The district should work with its educators and evaluators to diagnose and address the barriers to frequent classroom observations and feedback cycles outside the formal evaluation process.*
* *The district should disseminate guidance to all evaluators to ensure that all teacher evaluations are completed in full and include all required elements.*
* *As part of the feedback and evaluation process, the district should intentionally provide administrators with more comments around areas of improvement.*

## Financial and Asset Management

The district manages the budget with transparency and collaboration. The business manager and the financial assistant document budgetary details and provide regular updates to the school committee, district and school leaders. Budget development discussions begin early in the school year, involving district and school leaders in assessing needs and priorities. The district has an adequate budget which is evident in its provision of funds to meet essential spending requirements and cover additional costs. The budget is supported with supplemental funds from sources like the Littleton Education Fund and parent-teacher associations, and the budget creation process allows for thorough consideration of expenditures and funding sources.

Accountability and transparency are prioritized through processes and systems related to financial tracking, forecasting, and auditing procedures, providing regular updates to school committee members, and utilizing Munis for budget tracking. Annual audits ensure compliance and address financial management aspects. Proactive grant management practices contribute to spending down grant funds. Furthermore, capital planning efforts are supported by regular facility maintenance walkthroughs and a comprehensive maintenance plan, despite ongoing budgetary challenges posed by capital projects and maintenance needs.

Table 4 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management.

Table 4. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Budget documentation and reporting](#_Budget_Documentation_and) | * The district maintains transparency around the status of the budget. |  |
| [Adequate budget](#_Adequate_Budget) | * The collective commitment of the school community to support the district with additional funds is a strength of the district. |  |
| [Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits](#_Financial_Tracking,_Forecasting,) | * The district provides regular reports to the superintendent, school committee, and principals. * The district engages in a transparent financial tracking process. |  |
| [Capital planning and facility maintenance](#_Capital_Planning_and) | * District leaders are proactive in planning for capital needs. | * Continuing to fund the district’s capital replacement plan in light of other large town budget priorities |

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

The business manager plays a pivotal role in overseeing the budget for the district. According to the organizational chart, the business manager has a team consisting of a financial assistant, a financial clerk, and a payroll coordinator. Transparency of budget status is a strength of the district. The school budget is intricately documented as part of the town of Littleton’s overall budget, and this information is readily accessible on the town’s website. The budget is documented in Munis. School committee members are updated on the budget at bi-monthly committee meetings with paper printouts from Munis. Information on the printouts includes budget details, year-to-date expenditures, and available budget remaining for each cost center. School committee participants agree that the information provided to them is comprehensive and satisfactory. District and school leaders also agree that information provided to them regarding budget documentation and reporting meets their needs.

The budget development process for the following school year begins in September with district leaders meeting with school leaders. Their early budget development discussions focus on their current budget, anticipated needs for the upcoming school year, and budgetary priorities. District leaders and school leaders work together to determine if their anticipated needs have a cost associated and where the funding for that cost will come from. District leaders report that the district considers grade enrollments and student needs throughout the year and throughout the budgeting process.

The budget is created by the director of finance and presented to the superintendent. From there, the budget is presented to the school committee’s budget subcommittee. After the budget receives initial approval from the school committee it is presented to the town in two parts for negotiations and approval. According to district leaders, the town requests to see the district’s capital needs first and that is submitted in October. Once the capital needs are submitted, the district submits the budget requests for the next school year.

### Adequate Budget

Littleton provides sufficient general appropriation funds each year to meet or exceed required net school spending and to cover other costs. Multiple interview and focus group participants across roles and responsibilities agree that the budget always meets the district’s needs. According to a district leader, the district typically gets most of what it requests from the town. The superintendent recalls only one year, about a decade ago, when he had to make substantial cuts because the budget was not adequately meeting the needs of the district. The district also has other sources of funding if needed. District leaders, teacher focus groups across all levels, and school leaders explained that the town has the Littleton Education Fund, the cultural committee fund, and a strong parent-teacher association, all of which provide additional funding for programs and projects when needed. The collective commitment of the school community to support the district with additional funds is a strength of the district.

Teacher focus group participants reported mixed views about the extent to which the district uses all available funding effectively to support student performance, opportunities, and outcomes. According to some teacher participants, meeting the needs of all students underlies all budget decisions. One educator stated that “one of the only reasons we do allocate certain things and why we allocate them and where we allocate them is for student improvement and student outcomes.” Another educator offered an example of presenting data on usage of Lexia and student progress to justify purchasing additional licenses. Similarly, the teachers agreed that they have used student growth data to show that a mathematics curriculum was effective. In contrast, other teacher focus group participants offered examples of needs that are not met, despite data showing the needs exist. For instance, teachers stated that a risk behavior survey indicated that many students across their school are experiencing signs of depression, yet an additional adjustment counselor had not been hired (at the time of the review). Similarly, others reported that although students with disabilities scored lower on the MCAS, the district did not hire additional staff to support students with disabilities, and vacancies in the department persisted.

### Financial Tracking, Forecasting, Controls, and Audits

The district’s business office is responsible for monitoring spending. The business manager leads the office, and he meets regularly with the superintendent to provide budget updates. According to district leaders, the business manager also provides monthly updates to the school committee. School committee meeting minutes reflect these updates, which include year-to-date budget reports. According to district leaders, the business manager and the financial assistant constantly monitor the budget. This collaborative effort ensures a vigilant tracking of financial activities. The business manager also sends principals their expense reports every few months. The district and town use Munis to track the budget, which is publicly available for the community to view at all times. The district provided reports that are also publicly available through the School Committee Agenda Packets. In addition, the school committee budget subcommittee meetings are open, and anyone can attend. Providing regular reports to the superintendent, school committee, and principals as well as using a transparent financial tracking process are clear strengths of the district.

The business office is responsible for meeting end-of-year reporting requirements for the DESE and the town. According to a district leader, the district receives multiple audits per year. The district receives an audit through the town as part of the single audit procedures and another audit for the end-of-year report. In addition, the student activity accounts have received audits every two years. According to a district leader, the district has made some minor adjustments based on auditors’ “recommendations.” For example, one audit recommendation the district implemented was to include school committee approval for inter-revolving account transfers. This is now an adopted practice of the district. Recent audit reports for end-of-year reporting and student activity accounts confirm that an independent firm audited the district.

According to the district leaders, the business manager and financial assistant track grant funding monthly. The business office meets regularly with district leaders who manage the grants to discuss spending plans and to make sure that they are on target to spend the grant funds. The office gives year-to-date reports on how much grant money remains. The office also creates a final grants expenditure report at the end of the grant cycle. Typically, the district is successful at spending all the grant money. According to district leaders, the district infrequently returns money to the state.

The business manager uses historical information, historical institutional knowledge, as well as discussions with principals to create financial forecasts. In the case of unexpected expenses, the district has built up a reserve in a school choice account that is kept in a separate revolving fund. According to district leaders and school committee members, forecasting changes little year to year.

### Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

Littleton has a 10-year capital plan that is updated every year. The budget process starts in September with the 10-year capital plan, which is submitted in October. The superintendent, business manager, maintenance supervisor, principals, school committee, and the town’s finance director are involved in the review. After the review, they give the plan to the town’s finance committee and select board members, and the town then integrates the district’s plan with the town’s plan. District leaders are proactive in their planning for capital needs by building additional funding into their budget, which is a strength of the district. For instance, they know that they will need additional funding soon because the heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning contract is going to be rebid and the cost will increase.

According to a district leader, several projects have presented budgeting challenges. These projects include a new town public library, a new town senior citizens center, and new water treatment plants. Currently, Shaker Lane School is in Phase 2 of a renovation plan, which includes planning and determination of which renovations will be prioritized. The district is also planning for a new roof at the high school. In addition, the district recently fixed a sidewalk and will be doing more sidewalk repairs at the high school. Because of these recent capital projects, a district leader states that he believes it will become more difficult over the next three to five years to put money into the district’s capital replacement plan, indicating a potential area for growth for the district.

To have safe, clean, well-maintained buildings, district leaders conduct regular walkthroughs. According to district leaders, the business manager conducts an annual walkthrough with the fire department and building inspector in the summer before the school year begins. In addition, both the business manager and superintendent do walkthroughs of the buildings weekly. The district also has a written “Building Maintenance Plan” that includes all required internal and external building maintenance as well as maintenance for building grounds, parking lots, and sidewalks. The plan outlines custodial responsibilities and details building and equipment needs for each of the four schools.

### DESE Recommendations

* *In partnership with municipal leaders, the district should work with its community to source money to address its requisite district maintenance and replacement needs, while also simultaneously identifying alternative solutions where feasible.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review in Littleton. The team conducted 82 classroom observations during the week of November 13, 2023, and held interviews and focus groups between November 13 and November 16, 2023. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

* Superintendent
* Other district leaders
* School committee members
* Teachers’ association members
* Principals
* Teachers
* Support specialists
* Parents
* Town manager

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

* 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 DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
* 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

## Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report
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Introduction

The *Districtwide Instructional Observation Report* presents ratings for the classroom observations that were conducted by certified observers at American Institutes for Research (AIR) as part of the Massachusetts District Reviews.

Five observers visited Littleton Public Schools during the week of November 13, 2023. Observers conducted 82 observations in a sample of classrooms across four schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

The classroom observations were guided by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) at the University of Virginia. Three levels of CLASS Manuals were used: K–3, Upper Elementary, and Secondary. The K–3 tool was used to observe grades K–3, the Upper Elementary tool was used to observe grades 4–5, and the Secondary tool was used to observe grades 6–12.

The K–3 protocol includes 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 1).

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Emotional Support | Classroom Organization | Instructional Support |
| * Positive Climate * Negative Climate * Teacher Sensitivity * Regard for Student Perspectives | * Behavior Management * Productivity * Instructional Learning Formats | * Concept Development * Quality of Feedback * Language Modeling |

The Upper Elementary and Secondary protocols include 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 2), in addition to Student Engagement.

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Emotional Support | Classroom Organization | Instructional Support |
| * Positive Climate * Teacher Sensitivity * Regard for Student Perspectives | * Behavior Management * Productivity * Negative Climate | * Instructional Learning Formats * Content Understanding * Analysis and Inquiry * Quality of Feedback * Instructional Dialogue |
| Student Engagement | | |

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support or attention, was unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students’ problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

Members of the observation team who visited the classrooms all received training on the CLASS protocol and then passed a rigorous certification exam for each CLASS protocol to ensure that they were able to accurately rate the dimensions. All observers must pass an exam annually to maintain their certification.

Research on CLASS protocol shows that students in classrooms that rated high using this observation tool have greater gains in social skills and academic success than students in classrooms with lower ratings (MET Project, 2010; CASTL, n.d.). Furthermore, small improvements on these domains can affect student outcomes: “The ability to demonstrate even small changes in effective interactions has practical implications—differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students” (CASTL, n.d., p. 3).

In this report, each CLASS dimension is defined, and descriptions of the dimensions at the high (6 or 7), middle (3, 4, or 5), and low levels (1 or 2) are presented *(definitions and rating descriptions are derived from the CLASS K–3*, *Upper Elementary, and Secondary Manuals).* For each dimension we indicate the frequency of classroom observations across the ratings and provide a districtwide average of the observed classrooms. In cases where a dimension is included in more than one CLASS manual level, those results are combined on the dimension-specific pages. In the summary of ratings table following the dimension-specific pages the averages for every dimension are presented by grade band (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12). For each dimension, we indicate the grade levels for which this dimension is included.

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Positive Climate reflects the emotional connection between the teacher and students and among students and the warmth, respect, and enjoyment communicated by verbal and nonverbal interactions (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 23, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 21, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 21). Table 3 (as well as tables for the remaining dimensions) includes the number of classrooms for each rating on each dimension and the district average for that dimension.

Table 3. Positive Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 5.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 41 | 5.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 5.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 20 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 27] + [6 x 22] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 82 observations = 5.4

Ratings in the Low Range. All indicators are absent or only minimally present. Teachers and students do not appear to share a warm, supportive relationship. Interpersonal connections are not evident or only minimally evident. Affect in the classroom is flat, and there are rarely instances of teachers and students smiling, sharing humor, or laughing together. There are no, or very few, positive communications among the teacher and students; the teacher does not communicate encouragement. There is no evidence that students and the teacher respect one another or that the teacher encourages students to respect one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some indications that the teacher and students share a warm and supportive relationship, but some students may be excluded from this relationship, either by the teacher or the students. Some relationships appear constrained—for example, the teacher expresses a perfunctory interest in students, or encouragement seems to be an automatic statement and is not sincere. Sometimes, teachers and students demonstrate respect for one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There are many indications that the relationship among students and the teacher is positive and warm. The teacher is typically in close proximity to students, and encouragement is sincere and personal. There are frequent displays of shared laughter, smiles, and enthusiasm. Teachers and students show respect for one another (e.g., listening, using calm voices, using polite language). Positive communication (both verbal and nonverbal) and mutual respect are evident throughout the session.

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Teacher Sensitivity encompasses the teacher’s awareness of and responsiveness to students’ academic and emotional needs. High levels of sensitivity facilitate students’ abilities to actively explore and learn because the teacher consistently provides comfort, reassurance, and encouragement (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 32, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 27, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 27).

Table 4. Teacher Sensitivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 5.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 41 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 21 | 5.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 20 | 5.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 4] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 27] + [6 x 21] + [7 x 17]) ÷ 82 observations = 5.4

Ratings in the Low Range. In these sessions, the teacher has not been aware of students who need extra support and pays little attention to students’ needs. As a result, students are frustrated, confused, and disengaged. The teacher is unresponsive to and dismissive of students and may ignore students, squash their enthusiasm, and not allow them to share their moods or feelings. The teacher is not effective in addressing students’ needs and does not appropriately acknowledge situations that may be upsetting to students. Students rarely seek support from the teacher and minimize conversations with the teacher, not sharing ideas or responding to questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher is sometimes aware of student needs or aware of only a limited type of student needs, such as academic needs, not social-emotional needs. Or the teacher may be aware of some students and not of other students. The teacher does not always realize a student is confused and needs extra help or when a student already knows the material being taught. The teacher may be responsive at times to students but at other times may ignore or dismiss students. The teacher may respond only to students who are upbeat and positive and not support students who are upset. Sometimes, the teacher is effective in addressing students’ concerns or problems, but not always.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher’s awareness of students and their needs is consistent and accurate. The teacher may predict how difficult a new task is for a student and acknowledge this difficulty. The teacher is responsive to students’ comments and behaviors, whether positive or negative. The teacher consistently addresses students’ problems and concerns and is effective in doing so. Students are obviously comfortable with the teacher and share ideas, work comfortably together, and ask and respond to questions, even difficult questions.

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Regard for Student Perspectives captures the degree to which the teacher’s interactions with students and classroom activities place an emphasis on students’ interests, motivations, and points of view and encourage student responsibility and autonomy (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 38, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 35, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 35).

Table 5. Regard for Student Perspectives: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 3.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 3.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 41 | 4.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 3.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 1] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 24] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 20] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 82 observations = 3.9

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher exhibits an inflexible, rigid adherence to his or her plan, without considering student ideas or allowing students to make contributions. The teacher inhibits student enthusiasm by imposing guidelines or making remarks that inhibit student expression. The teacher may rigidly adhere to a lesson plan and not respond to student interests. The teacher does not allow students any autonomy on how they conduct an activity, may control materials tightly, and may offer few opportunities for students to help out with classroom responsibilities. There are few opportunities for students to talk and express themselves.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher exhibits control at times and at other times follows the students’ lead and gives them some choices and opportunities to follow their interests. There are some opportunities for students to exercise autonomy, but student choice is limited. The teacher may assign students responsibility in the classroom, but in a limited way. At times, the teacher dominates the discussion, but at other times the teacher allows students to share ideas, although only at a minimal level or for a short period of time.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher is flexible in following student leads, interests, and ideas and looks for ways to meaningfully engage students. Although the teacher has a lesson plan, students’ ideas are incorporated into the lesson plan. The teacher consistently supports student autonomy and provides meaningful leadership opportunities. Students have frequent opportunities to talk, share ideas, and work together. Students have appropriate freedom of movement during activities.

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K− 3  
Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4− 12

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 55, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.[[5]](#footnote-6)

Table 6. Negative Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 6.7 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 34 | 41 | 6.8 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 6.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 2] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 67]) ÷ 82 observations = 6.7

Ratings in the Low Range.Negativity is pervasive. The teacher may express constant irritation, annoyance, or anger; unduly criticize students; or consistently use a harsh tone and/or take a harsh stance as he or she interacts with students. Threats or yelling are frequently used to establish control. Language is disrespectful and sarcastic. Severe negativity, such as the following actions, would lead to a high rating on negative climate, even if the action is not extended: students bullying one another, a teacher hitting a student, or students physically fighting with one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some expressions of mild negativity by the teacher or students. The teacher may express irritability, use a harsh tone, and/or express annoyance—usually during difficult moments in the classroom. Threats or yelling may be used to establish control over the classroom, but not constantly; they are used more as a response to situations. At times, the teacher and students may be sarcastic or disrespectful toward one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There is no display of negativity: No strong expressions of anger or aggression are exhibited, either by the teacher or students; if there is such a display, it is contained and does not escalate. The teacher does not issue threats or yell to establish control. The teacher and students are respectful and do not express sarcasm.

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

Behavior Management refers to the teacher’s ability to provide clear behavioral expectations and use effective methods to prevent and redirect misbehavior (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 45, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 41, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 41).

Table 7. Behavior Management: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Behavior Management District Average\*: 5.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 5.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 12 | 15 | 41 | 5.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 20 | 6.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 18] + [7 x 41]) ÷ 82 observations = 5.9

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the classroom is chaotic. There are no rules and expectations, or they are not enforced consistently. The teacher does not monitor the classroom effectively and only reacts to student disruption, which is frequent. There are frequent instances of misbehavior in the classroom, and the teacher’s attempts to redirect misbehavior are ineffective. The teacher does not use cues, such as eye contact, slight touches, gestures, or physical proximity, to respond to and redirect negative behavior.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Although rules and expectations may be stated, they are not consistently enforced, or the rules may be unclear. Sometimes, the teacher proactively anticipates and prevents misbehavior, but at other times the teacher ignores behavior problems until it is too late. Misbehavior may escalate because redirection is not always effective. Episodes of misbehavior are periodic.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the rules and guidelines for behavior are clear, and they are consistently reinforced by the teacher. The teacher monitors the classroom and prevents problems from developing, using subtle cues to redirect behavior and address situations before they escalate. The teacher focuses on positive behavior and consistently affirms students’ desirable behaviors. The teacher effectively uses cues to redirect behavior. There are no, or very few, instances of student misbehavior or disruptions.

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

Productivity considers how well the teacher manages instructional time and routines and provides activities for students so that they have the opportunity to be involved in learning activities (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 51, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 49, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 49).

Table 8. Productivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Productivity District Average\*: 6.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 6.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 41 | 5.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 21 | 6.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 20 | 6.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 18] + [6 x 18] + [7 x 37]) ÷ 82 observations = 6.0

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low level, the teacher provides few activities for students. Much time is spent on managerial tasks (such as distributing papers) and/or on behavior management. Frequently during the observation, students have little to do and spend time waiting. The routines of the classroom are not clear and, as a result, students waste time, are not engaged, and are confused. Transitions take a long time and/or are too frequent. The teacher does not have activities organized and ready and seems to be caught up in last-minute preparations.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher does provide activities for students but loses learning time to disruptions or management tasks. There are certain times when the teacher provides clear activities to students, but there are other times when students wait and lose focus. Some students (or all students, at some point) do not know what is expected of them. Some of the transitions may take too long, or classrooms may be productive during certain periods but then not productive during transitions. Although the teacher is mostly prepared for the class, last-minute preparations may still infringe on learning time.

Ratings in the High Range. The classroom runs very smoothly. The teacher provides a steady flow of activities for students, so students do not have downtime and are not confused about what to do next. The routines of the classroom are efficient, and all students know how to move from one activity to another and where materials are. Students understand the teacher’s instructions and directions. Transitions are quick, and there are not too many of them. The teacher is fully prepared for the lesson.

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Instructional Learning Formats refer to the ways in which the teacher maximizes students’ interest, engagement, and abilities to learn from the lesson and activities (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 57; *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 63, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 61).

Table 9. Instructional Learning Formats: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 5.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 5.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 6 | 41 | 5.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 21 | 5.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 7] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 27] + [6 x 26] + [7 x 13]) ÷ 82 observations = 5.4

Ratings in the Low Range. The teacher exerts little effort in facilitating engagement in the lesson. Learning activities may be limited and seem to be at the rote level, with little teacher involvement. The teacher relies on one learning modality (e.g., listening) and does not use other modalities (e.g., movement, visual displays) to convey information and enhance learning. Or the teacher may be ineffective in using other modalities, not choosing the right props for the students or the classroom conditions. Students are uninterested and uninvolved in the lesson. The teacher does not attempt to guide students toward learning objectives and does not help them focus on the lesson by providing appropriate tools and asking effective questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher sometimes facilitates engagement in the lesson but at other times does not, or the teacher facilitates engagement for some students and not for other students. The teacher may not allow students enough time to explore or answer questions. Sometimes, the teacher uses a variety of modalities to help students reach a learning objective, but at other times the teacher does not. Student engagement is inconsistent, or some students are engaged and other students are not. At times, students are aware of the learning objective and at other times they are not. The teacher may sometimes use strategies to help students organize information but at other times does not.

Ratings in the High Range.The teacher has multiple strategies and tools to facilitate engagement and learning and encourage participation. The teacher may move around, talk and play with students, ask open-ended questions of students, and allow students to explore. A variety of tools and props are used, including movement and visual/auditory resources. Students are consistently interested and engaged in the activities and lessons. The teacher focuses students on the learning objectives, which students understand. The teacher uses advanced organizers to prepare students for an activity, as well as reorientation strategies that help students regain focus.

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K−3

Concept Development refers to the teacher’s use of instructional discussions and activities to promote students’ higher order thinking skills and cognition and the teacher’s focus on understanding rather than on rote instruction (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 64).

Table 10. Concept Development: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Concept Development District Average\*: 2.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 2.5 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 4 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 2.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 4] + [2 x 10] + [3 x 7] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 24 observations = 2.5

\*\*Concept Development does not appear in the CLASS Upper Elementary Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades K-3 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher does not attempt to develop students’ understanding of ideas and concepts, focusing instead on basic facts and skills. Discussion and activities do not encourage students to analyze and reason. There are few, if any, opportunities for students to create or generate ideas and products. The teacher does not link concepts to one another and does not ask students to make connections with previous content or their actual lives. The activities and the discussion are removed from students’ lives and from their prior knowledge.

Ratings in the Middle Range. To some extent, the teacher uses discussions and activities to encourage students to analyze and reason and focuses somewhat on understanding of ideas. The activities and discussions are not fully developed, however, and there is still instructional time that focuses on facts and basic skills. Students may be provided some opportunities for creating and generating ideas, but the opportunities are occasional and not planned out. Although some concepts may be linked and also related to students’ previous learning, such efforts are brief. The teacher makes some effort to relate concepts to students’ lives but does not elaborate enough to make the relationship meaningful to students.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the teacher frequently guides students to analyze and reason during discussions and activities. Most of the questions are open ended and encourage students to think about connections and implications. Teachers use problem solving, experimentation, and prediction; comparison and classification; and evaluation and summarizing to promote analysis and reasoning. The teacher provides students with opportunities to be creative and generate ideas. The teacher consistently links concepts to one another and to previous learning and relates concepts to students’ lives.

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Content Understanding refers to the depth of lesson content and the approaches used to help students comprehend the framework, key ideas, and procedures in an academic discipline. At a high level, this dimension refers to interactions among the teacher and students that lead to an integrated understanding of facts, skills, concepts, and principles (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 70, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 68).

Table 11. Content Understanding: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 58 | 4.3 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 3.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 4.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 4.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 3] + [3 x 16] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 13] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 58 observations = 4.3

\*\*Content Understanding does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the focus of the class is primarily on presenting discrete pieces of topically related information, absent broad, organizing ideas. The discussion and materials fail to effectively communicate the essential attributes of the concepts and procedures to students. The teacher makes little effort to elicit or acknowledge students’ background knowledge or misconceptions or to integrate previously learned material when presenting new information.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the focus of the class is sometimes on meaningful discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. At other times, the focus is on discrete pieces of information. Class discussion and materials communicate some of the essential attributes of concepts and procedures, but examples are limited in scope or not consistently provided. The teacher makes some attempt to elicit and/or acknowledge students’ background knowledge or misconceptions and/or to integrate information with previously learned materials; however, these moments are limited in depth or inconsistent.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the focus of the class is on encouraging deep understanding of content through the provision of meaningful, interactive discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. Class discussion and materials consistently communicate the essential attributes of concepts and procedures to students. New concepts and procedures and broad ideas are consistently linked to students’ prior knowledge in ways that advance their understanding and clarify misconceptions.

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Analysis and Inquiry assesses the degree to which students are engaged in higher level thinking skills through their application of knowledge and skills to novel and/or open-ended problems, tasks, and questions. Opportunities for engaging in metacognition (thinking about thinking) also are included (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 81, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 76).

Table 12. Analysis and Inquiry: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 58 | 2.7 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 3.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 2.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 2.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 12] + [2 x 22] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 4]) ÷ 58 observations = 2.7

\*\*Analysis and Inquiry does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, students do not engage in higher order thinking skills. Instruction is presented in a rote manner, and there are no opportunities for students to engage in novel or open-ended tasks. Students are not challenged to apply previous knowledge and skills to a new problem, nor are they encouraged to think about, evaluate, or reflect on their own learning. Students do not have opportunities to plan their own learning experiences.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Students occasionally engage in higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry, but the episodes are brief or limited in depth. The teacher provides opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills within familiar contexts and offers guidance to students but does not provide opportunities for analysis and problem solving within novel contexts and/or without teacher support. Students have occasional opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning; these opportunities, however, are brief and limited in depth.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, students consistently engage in extended opportunities to use higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry. The teacher provides opportunities for students to independently solve or reason through novel and open-ended tasks that require students to select, utilize, and apply existing knowledge and skills. Students have multiple opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning.

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 12

Quality of Feedback refers to the degree to which the teacher provides feedback that expands learning and understanding and encourages continued participation in the learning activity (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 72). In the upper elementary and secondary classrooms, significant feedback also may be provided by peers (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 89, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 93). Regardless of the source, the focus of the feedback motivates learning.

Table 13. Quality of Feedback: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 3.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 82 | 3.7 |
| Grades K-5 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 41 | 3.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 3.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 4.1 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 3] + [2 x 17] + [3 x 21] + [4 x 17] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 82 observations = 3.7

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher dismisses incorrect responses or misperceptions and rarely scaffolds student learning. The teacher is more interested in students providing the correct answer than understanding. Feedback is perfunctory. The teacher may not provide opportunities to learn whether students understand or are interested. The teacher rarely questions students or asks them to explain their thinking and reasons for their responses. The teacher does not or rarely provides information that might expand student understanding and rarely offers encouragement that increases student effort and persistence.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In the middle range, the teacher sometimes scaffolds students, but this is not consistent. On occasion, the teacher facilitates feedback loops so that students may elaborate and expand on their thinking, but these moments are not sustained long enough to accomplish a learning objective. Sometimes, the teacher asks students about or prompts them to explain their thinking and provides information to help students understand, but sometimes the feedback is perfunctory. At times, the teacher encourages student efforts and persistence.

Ratings in the High Range. In this range, the teacher frequently scaffolds students who are having difficulty, providing hints or assistance as needed. The teacher engages students in feedback loops to help them understand ideas or reach the right response. The teacher often questions students, encourages them to explain their thinking, and provides additional information that may help students understand. The teacher regularly encourages students’ efforts and persistence.

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

Language Modeling refers to the quality and amount of the teacher’s use of language stimulation and language facilitation techniques (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 79).

Table 14. Language Modeling: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 3.2 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 2 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 3.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 2] + [2 x 8] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 24 observations = 3.2

\*\*Language Modeling does not appear in the CLASS Upper Elementary Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades K-3 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. In the low range, there are few conversations in the classroom, particularly between the students and the teacher. The teacher responds to students’ initiating talk with only a few words, limits students’ use of language (in responding to questions) and asks questions that mainly elicit closed-ended responses. The teacher does not or rarely extends students’ responses or repeats them for clarification. The teacher does not engage in self-talk or parallel talk—explaining what he or she or the students are doing. The teacher does not use new words or advanced language with students. The language used has little variety.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In this range, the teacher talks with students and shows some interest in students, but the conversations are limited and not prolonged. Usually, the teacher directs the conversations, although the conversations may focus on topics of interest to students. More often, there is a basic exchange of information but limited conversation. The teacher asks a mix of closed- and open-ended questions, although the closed-ended questions may require only short responses. Sometimes, the teacher extends students’ responses or repeats what students say. Sometimes, the teacher maps his or her own actions and the students’ actions through language and description. The teacher sometimes uses advanced language with students.

Ratings in the High Range.There are frequent conversations in the classroom, particularly between students and the teacher, and these conversations promote language use. Students are encouraged to converse and feel they are valued conversational partners. The teacher asks many open-ended questions that require students to communicate more complex ideas. The teacher often extends or repeats student responses. Frequently, the teacher maps his or her actions and student actions descriptively and uses advanced language with students.

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Instructional Dialogue captures the purposeful use of content-focused discussion among teachers and students that is cumulative, with the teacher supporting students to chain ideas together in ways that lead to deeper understanding of content. Students take an active role in these dialogues, and both the teacher and students use strategies that facilitate extended dialogue (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 97, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 101).

Table 15. Instructional Dialogue: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 58 | 3.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 17 | 4.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 3.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 5] + [2 x 15] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 58 observations = 3.6

\*\*Instructional Dialogue does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, there are no or few discussions in the class, the discussions are not related to content or skill development, or the discussions contain only simple question-response exchanges between the teacher and students. The class is dominated by teacher talk, and discussion is limited. The teacher and students ask closed-ended questions; rarely acknowledge, report, or extend other students’ comments; and/or appear disinterested in other students’ comments, resulting in many students not being engaged in instructional dialogues.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At this range, there are occasional content-based discussions in class among teachers and students; however, these exchanges are brief or quickly move from one topic to another without follow-up questions or comments from the teacher and other students. The class is mostly dominated by teacher talk, although there are times when students take a more active role, or there are distributed dialogues that involve only a few students in the class. The teacher and students sometimes facilitate and encourage more elaborate dialogue, but such efforts are brief, inconsistent, or ineffective at consistently engaging students in extended dialogues.

Ratings in the High Range.At the high range, there are frequent, content-driven discussions in the class between teachers and students or among students. The discussions build depth of knowledge through cumulative, contingent exchanges. The class dialogues are distributed in a way that the teacher and the majority of students take an active role or students are actively engaged in instructional dialogues with each other. The teacher and students frequently use strategies that encourage more elaborate dialogue, such as open-ended questions, repetition or extension, and active listening. Students respond to these techniques by fully participating in extended dialogues.

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4−12

Student Engagement refers to the extent to which all students in the class are focused and participating in the learning activity that is presented or facilitated by the teacher. The difference between passive engagement and active engagement is reflected in this rating (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 105).

Table 16. Student Engagement: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Student Engagement District Average\*: 5.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 58 | 5.3 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 5.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 20 | 5.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 5] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 14] + [7 x 14]) ÷ 58 observations = 5.3

\*\*Student Engagement does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. In the low range, the majority of students appear distracted or disengaged.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In the middle range, students are passively engaged, listening to or watching the teacher; student engagement is mixed, with the majority of students actively engaged for part of the time and disengaged for the rest of the time; or there is a mix of student engagement, with some students actively engaged and some students disengaged.

Ratings in the High Range. In the high range, most students are actively engaged in the classroom discussions and activities.

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

Table 17. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension in Grades K–5

|  | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 39 | 33 | 57 | 164 | 5.6 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 41 | 5.7 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 34 | 41 | 6.8 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 41 | 5.5 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 41 | 4.2 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 24 | 34 | 39 | 123 | 5.6 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 12 | 15 | 41 | 5.7 |
| Productivity | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 41 | 5.9 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 6 | 41 | 5.3 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 9 | 42 | 33 | 22 | 16 | 15 | 3 | 140 | 3.4 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 4 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 2.5 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 3.9 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 1 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 3.0 |
| Quality of Feedback | 2 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 41 | 3.5 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 2 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 3.2 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 17 | 4.3 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 12] + [7 x 12]) ÷ 41 observations = 5.7

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([5 x 1] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 34]) ÷ 41 observations = 6.8. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

\*\*\*Instructional Learning Formats appears in the Instructional Support Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

Table 18. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension in Grades 6–8

|  | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 1 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 19 | 12 | 7 | 63 | 4.7 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 5.2 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 21 | 5.0 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 3.7 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 37 | 63 | 6.0 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 21 | 6.0 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 6.5 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 8 | 15 | 26 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 7 | 105 | 3.9 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 21 | 5.5 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 4.3 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 6 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 2.4 |
| Quality of Feedback | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 3.7 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 3.6 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 5.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 3] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 21 observations = 5.2

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([4 x 2] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 15]) ÷ 21 observations = 6.5

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

Table 19. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension in Grades 9–12

|  | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 17 | 13 | 6 | 60 | 4.7 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 20 | 5.0 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3.4 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 41 | 60 | 6.6 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 20 | 6.7 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 9 | 18 | 15 | 14 | 22 | 18 | 4 | 100 | 3.9 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 5.2 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 4.7 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 2.7 |
| Quality of Feedback | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 4.1 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 20 | 5.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 2] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.0

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.9
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision. |
| [Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html) | A series of modules designed to support novice principals and their mentors in the development of antiracist leadership competencies aligned to the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership. |
| [Planning for Success In Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | Planning for Success (PfS) is an inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |

Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision. |
| [Curriculum Frameworks Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/) | Some of the most frequently used resources include “What to Look For” classroom observation guides; the Family Guides to help families understand what students are expected to know and do by the end of each grade; and the Standards Navigator tool and app, which can be used to explore the standards, see how they are connected to other standards and related student work samples, reference guides, and definitions. |
| [Curriculum Matters Webpage](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/default.html) | A suite of resources to support the use of high-quality curriculum, including [IMplement MA](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/implement-ma.html), our recommended four-phase process to prepare for, select, launch, and implement new high-quality instructional materials with key tasks and action steps. Also includes [CURATE](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate/default.html), which convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate evidence on the quality and alignment of specific curricular materials and then publish their findings for educators across the Commonwealth to consult. |
| [Digital Literacy and Computer Science (DLCS) Curriculum Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/dlcs/curriculum-guide.pdf?v=4/12/2023) | The DLCS Curriculum Guide provides curricular overviews for schools to engage students in learning digital literacy and computer science (DLCS) concepts and skills aligned to the standards found in the 2016 Massachusetts DLCS Framework. |
| [Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/ccr/ewis/) | Tools for districts to identify students who are at risk of not meeting important academic goals to help students get back on track. This comprehensive system spans first grade through high school graduation and beyond. |
| [Foundations for Inclusive Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) | This Guidebook includes tools for districts, schools, and educators that are aligned to the MA Educator Evaluation Framework and promote evidence-based best practices for inclusion. |
| [Guidebook of Culturally Diverse Artists and Artworks](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Finstruction%2Farts%2Fdiverse-arts-guidebook.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | The purpose of this resource is to promote culturally responsive teaching in the arts through the study of culturally diverse artists and their artworks. This guidebook highlights art made by people with racial identities that historically have been and continue to be marginalized. |
| [Mass Literacy Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/massliteracy/) | An interactive site with research, information, and resources on evidence-based practices for early literacy that are culturally responsive and sustaining. There is current information on complex text, fluent word reading, language comprehension, students experiencing reading difficulties, equity in literacy, how to support a multitiered system of support for ELA/literacy, and much more. |
| [Massachusetts Blueprint for English Learner Success](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/blueprint/default.html) | Framework for English learner education in MA, with embedded Quick Reference Guides (QRGs) and other resources to support implementation. |
| Massachusetts Curricular Resources:   * [Appleseeds](https://sites.google.com/view/appleseedsk2/home) * [Investigating History](https://www.doe.mass.edu/investigatinghistory/) * [OpenSciEd](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/openscied.html) | Free, open-source curricular resources aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. |
| [Planning for Deeper Learning](https://www.doe.mass.edu/kaleidoscope/planning/default.html) | KCL worked with educators and leaders across the Commonwealth to develop tools, protocols, examples, and professional learning experiences. |
| [Supporting Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/culturally-sustaining/default.html) | Culturally and linguistically sustaining practices are essential for all students in the classroom, regardless of their background, culture, or identity. |
| [Synthesized ILT Framework](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsdp%2Fguidebook%2Fappendix-ilt-framework.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | District and school teams can use this resource to reflect and identify specific actions they could take to establish or improve their instructional leadership teams (ILTs). |

Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Approved Early Language and Literacy Assessments for Preschool](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/default.html) | DESE's Early Learning Team in collaboration with EEC is working with a vendor to approve preschool language and literacy assessments to support classroom instruction. |
| [Assessment Literacy Continuum](https://www.doe.mass.edu/acls/assessment/continuum.pdf) | Tool to help teachers identify what aspects of assessment literacy they should focus on for their own goal setting. |
| [District Data Team Toolkit](http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/toolkit/) | A set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team. |
| [Early Literacy Universal Screening Assessments](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/screening-assessments.html) | Guidance and support for schools and districts to select and use an early literacy universal screening assessment. Grant funding may be available. |
| [Student Assessment](https://www.doe.mass.edu/assessment/) | Statewide assessments help parents, students, educators, and policymakers determine where districts, schools, and students are meeting expectations and where they need additional support. |

Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Early Literacy Observation Form](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/resources/early-literacy-observation.html) | This tool supports the observation and provision of high-quality feedback to teacher candidates on their practice in evidence-based early literacy. |
| [Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/default.html) | A suite of resources and practical tools for effective and equitable implementation of educator evaluation, including Focus Indicators, a subset of Indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the school year. |
| Induction and Mentoring:   * [Teacher Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.html) * [Principal Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html) | Resources that highlight best practices and reinforce the recently updated guidelines and standards for induction and mentoring. |
| [Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/mtel/) | Information on MTEL exams, MTEL alternatives, and licensure requirements for educators. |
| [OPTIC](https://www.ma-optic.com/) | A professional development tool that supports Massachusetts educators to build a shared understanding of high-quality instruction and improve the feedback that teachers receive. |
| [Professional Learning Partner Guide](https://plpartnerguide.org/) | A free, online, searchable list of vetted professional development providers who have expertise in specific sets of high-quality instructional materials. Schools and districts can use this guide to easily find PD providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials. |
| [“What to Look For” Observation Guides](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/observation/) | Observation tools to help district staff observe instruction. |
| [Talent Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/talent-guide/default.html) | An online hub of resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on equity. |
| [WIDA Professional Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/prof-learning/wida/default.html) | WIDA professional development provides great information and strategies to support multilingual learners in Massachusetts public schools, and WIDA PDPs satisfy educator licensure renewal requirements. These DESE Sponsored courses are available at no cost to participants and are perfect for teams of teachers seeking impactful collaboration to support students' access to rigorous course content. |

Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Bullying Prevention and Intervention](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/bullying/default.html) | DESE’s Guidance and Technical Assistance for districts/schools related to state requirements around bullying prevention and intervention. |
| Emergency Management   * [Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools](https://rems.ed.gov/) (Federal Guidance) * [Emergency Management Planning](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/emergencyplan/default.html) (State Guidance) | Guidance and Technical Assistance for districts/schools related to emergency management planning and implementation. |
| Family Partnerships   * [DESE Family Portal](https://www.doe.mass.edu/families/) * [Strengthening Partnerships: A Framework for Prenatal through Young Adulthood Family Engagement in Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/family-engagement-framework.pdf) * [Learning Standards For Families](https://www.doe.mass.edu/highstandards/default.html) | Resources for authentically engaging families in their child’s education and centering families voices in school and district decision-making. |
| [Guidance on Updated Expectations for School and District Leaders Related to Student Discipline](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/discipline/updated-expectations.docx) | Guidance on updated expectations for school and district leaders related to student discipline associated with the 2022 mental health law (G.L. c. 71, §37H¾). |
| MTSS Resources:   * [MTSS Blueprint, Self-Assessment, and Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/) * [Massachusetts Tools for Schools](https://matoolsforschools.com/) | MTSS is a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that every student receives a high-quality educational experience. |
| [Resources for Supporting Immigrant and Refugee Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/resources/immigrant-refugee.html) | An evolving compilation of resources that can support districts in meeting the needs of immigrant and refugee students. |
| [Safe and Supportive Schools Framework and Self-Reflection Tool](https://www.sassma.org/) | These resources can help guide school- and district-based teams to create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures. Through a phased process (with preliminary and deeper dive self-reflection options) teams can create plans based on local context and data, and through examination of six areas of school operation. |
| [School Breakfast: Breakfast After the Bell Resources](https://www.projectbread.org/resource-directory/breakfast-after-the-bell-resources) | The Breakfast After the Bell Toolkit Series is designed to help with the launch and implementation of alternative breakfast models. |
| [School Wellness Initiative for Thriving Community Health](https://massschoolwellness.org/) (SWITCH) | SWITCH provides resources that support and advance wellness efforts for Massachusetts students, schools, and communities. |
| Social Emotional Learning:   * [SEL Resources Grades 1-3](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/resources/sel1-3/resources-g1-3.docx) * [SEL Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/bullying/selguide.docx) (K-12) * [SEL/APL Standards](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/resources/#standards) (PK/K) * [Playful Learning Institute, Preschool through 3rd Grade](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/pli.html) * [Culturally Responsive Social-Emotional Competency Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/sel/sel-all.docx) | These resources provide evidence-based and developmentally appropriate guidance around supporting social emotional learning in schools. |
| [Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/slife/default.html) | Guidance and resources to support districts in meeting the needs of Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE). |

Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [DESE Spending Comparisons Website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) | A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public. |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grants resources. |
| [Massachusetts Farm to School Grant Opportunities](https://www.massfarmtoschool.org/announcement/grant-opportunities/) | A summary of state, regional and national grant opportunities related to farm to school, school gardens, hydroponics, school food and more. |
| [Office for Food and Nutrition Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/) | Resources for school districts, childcare centers, family day care homes, adult day health programs, Summer Eats community organizations, USDA Foods storage and distribution vendors, food banks, and anti-hunger organizations across the Commonwealth. |
| [Planning for Success (PfS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |
| [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) | RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions. |
| [Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets (scroll down to Research section)](https://gtlcenter.org/products-resources/spending-money-wisely-getting-most-school-district-budgets) | A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities. |
| [Summer Eats | Free Meals for Kids and Teens in MA](https://www.projectbread.org/summer-eats-program?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&gclid=CjwKCAjwzo2mBhAUEiwAf7wjkljB4ngm0uZLSTYsl5hK5QGTkC3mKF_4ae_5AUxyrVs6UiPIIrys1RoCQV0QAvD_BwE) | Summer Eats is a free-of-charge program that provides free meals to all kids and teens, ages 18 and under, at locations all across Massachusetts during the summer months. |
| [Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB) from Education Resource Strategies](https://www.erstrategies.org/cms/files/2752-student-based-budgeting-guide.pdf),%20from%20Education%20Resource%20Strategies) | This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table D1. Littleton Public Schools: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2023-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | District | Percentage of total | State | Percentage of total |
| All | 1,674 | 100.0% | 914,959 | 100.0% |
| African American | 21 | 1.3% | 88,104 | 9.6% |
| Asian | 255 | 15.2% | 67,847 | 7.4% |
| Hispanic | 68 | 4.1% | 229,930 | 25.1% |
| Native American | 1 | 0.1% | 2,178 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,278 | 76.3% | 484,692 | 53.0% |
| Native Hawaiian | 7 | 0.4% | 790 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 44 | 2.6% | 41,418 | 4.5% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023.

Table D2. Littleton Public Schools: 2023-2024 Student Enrollment by High-Need Populations

|  | District | | | State | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of district | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of state |
| All students with high needs | 463 | 100.0% | 27.3% | 515,939 | 100.0% | 55.8% |
| Students with disabilities | 306 | 66.1% | 18.1% | 187,160 | 36.3% | 20.2% |
| Low-income | 160 | 34.6% | 9.6% | 385,697 | 74.8% | 42.2% |
| English learners | 36 | 7.8% | 2.2% | 119,749 | 23.2% | 13.1% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,693; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 924,947.

Table D3. Littleton Public Schools: Chronic Absencea Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | N (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 1,737 | 5.0 | 17.9 | 14.8 | 22.2 |
| African American/Black | 21 | 6.3 | 20.0 | 9.5 | 25.3 |
| Asian | 256 | 1.5 | 19.3 | 17.2 | 13.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 64 | 15.1 | 49.1 | 39.1 | 34.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 38 | 11.4 | 21.2 | 26.3 | 23.3 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 33.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 7 | — | — | 0.0 | 28.3 |
| White | 1,349 | 4.8 | 16.3 | 13.0 | 17.0 |
| High needs | 502 | 13.8 | 30.3 | 26.5 | 30.3 |
| Low income | 210 | — | 42.8 | 36.7 | 33.5 |
| ELs | 29 | 3.4 | 34.4 | 37.9 | 33.5 |
| Students w/disabilities | 308 | 15.3 | 27.4 | 22.7 | 30.4 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school.

Table D4. Littleton Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2020-2022

|  | Fiscal year 2020 | | Fiscal year 2021 | | Fiscal year 2022 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| From local appropriations for schools |  | | | | | |
| By school committee | $21,357,192 | $21,803,040 | $21,847,651 | $21,528,406 | $22,590,000 | $23,017,694 |
| By municipality | $8,609,643 | $8,202,867 | $8,474,844 | $7,896,918 | $8,448,875 | $8,564,217 |
| Total from local appropriations | $29,966,835 | $30,005,907 | $30,322,495 | $29,425,324 | $31,038,875 | $31,581,911 |
| From revolving funds and grants | — | $2,587,570 | — | $2,904,682 | — | $3,181,823 |
| Total expenditures | — | $32,593,477 | — | $32,330,006 | — | $34,763,734 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aida | — | $4,039,908 | — | $4,039,908 | — | $4,085,358 |
| Required local contribution | — | $13,448,982 | — | $13,852,830 | — | $13,387,414 |
| Required net school spendingb | — | $17,488,890 | — | $17,892,738 | — | $17,472,772 |
| Actual net school spending | — | $26,188,031 | — | $25,712,269 | — | $27,920,660 |
| Over/under required ($) | — | $8,699,141 | — | $7,819,531 | — | $10,447,888 |
| Over/under required (%) | — | 49.7% | — | 43.7% | — | 59.8% |

*Note*. Data as of July 25, 2023, and sourced from fiscal year 2022 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.

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

Table D5. Littleton Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| Administration | $836 | $867 | $840 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,192 | $1,245 | $1,228 |
| Teachers | $6,039 | $6,011 | $6,337 |
| Other teaching services | $1,471 | $1,406 | $1,351 |
| Professional development | $115 | $124 | $161 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $466 | $363 | $396 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $628 | $612 | $662 |
| Pupil services | $1,320 | $1,441 | $1,549 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,662 | $2,418 | $1,836 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $2,538 | $2,743 | $2,766 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $16,266 | $17,231 | $17,124 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from <https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/per-pupil-exp.xlsx>.
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Table E1. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 773 | 56 | 63 | 42 | 37 | 31 | 39 | 7 | 6 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 4 | — | — | 26 | — | — | 45 | — | — | 29 |
| Asian | 116 | 75 | 78 | 64 | 23 | 20 | 27 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 27 | 17 | 33 | 22 | 48 | 52 | 43 | 35 | 15 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 11 | 67 | 73 | 49 | 25 | 27 | 35 | 8 | 0 | 16 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 29 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 28 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 6 | — | — | 45 | — | — | 37 | — | — | 18 |
| White | 608 | 54 | 61 | 50 | 39 | 33 | 37 | 7 | 7 | 13 |
| High needs | 238 | 30 | 30 | 24 | 48 | 51 | 45 | 22 | 19 | 31 |
| Low income | 94 | 30 | 35 | 24 | 44 | 49 | 44 | 27 | 16 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 40 | 54 | 45 | 20 | 39 | 48 | 42 | 7 | 8 | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 141 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 53 | 52 | 40 | 30 | 30 | 48 |

Table E2. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 121 | 81 | 77 | 58 | 15 | 22 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 17 |
| Asian | 14 | 100 | 86 | 79 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 7 | — | — | 36 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | 63 | — | — | 29 | — | — | 9 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 11 |
| White | 97 | 82 | 77 | 67 | 15 | 22 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| High needs | 27 | 41 | 44 | 37 | 44 | 52 | 42 | 15 | 4 | 21 |
| Low income | 12 | 62 | 58 | 39 | 31 | 33 | 40 | 8 | 8 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | 16 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 45 |
| Students w/disabilities | 18 | 22 | 28 | 22 | 61 | 67 | 47 | 17 | 6 | 31 |

Table E3. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 771 | 49 | 54 | 41 | 43 | 39 | 41 | 7 | 8 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 4 | — | — | 21 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 32 |
| Asian | 116 | 75 | 77 | 71 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 27 | 13 | 19 | 19 | 61 | 63 | 47 | 26 | 19 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 11 | 58 | 55 | 46 | 25 | 36 | 38 | 17 | 9 | 16 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 28 | — | — | 46 | — | — | 26 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 6 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 606 | 46 | 50 | 49 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 7 | 9 | 11 |
| High needs | 236 | 25 | 27 | 23 | 53 | 50 | 47 | 22 | 23 | 30 |
| Low income | 92 | 17 | 25 | 21 | 58 | 47 | 48 | 25 | 28 | 31 |
| ELs and former ELs | 40 | 59 | 58 | 21 | 32 | 35 | 44 | 10 | 8 | 34 |
| Students w/disabilities | 141 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 52 | 52 | 41 | 31 | 33 | 46 |

Table E4. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 122 | 74 | 71 | 50 | 19 | 28 | 42 | 7 | 1 | 9 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 27 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 15 |
| Asian | 14 | 91 | 100 | 80 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 7 | — | — | 25 | — | — | 57 | — | — | 18 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 8 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 32 | — | — | 59 | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | 57 | — | — | 7 |
| White | 98 | 78 | 70 | 60 | 16 | 29 | 36 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| High needs | 28 | 37 | 36 | 27 | 33 | 61 | 57 | 30 | 4 | 16 |
| Low income | 13 | 38 | 38 | 27 | 31 | 54 | 57 | 31 | 8 | 16 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 28 |
| Students w/disabilities | 18 | 28 | 28 | 16 | 28 | 67 | 59 | 44 | 6 | 25 |

Table E5. Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 268 | 59 | 64 | 41 | 34 | 31 | 40 | 7 | 6 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 21 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 32 |
| Asian | 43 | 83 | 77 | 65 | 14 | 19 | 27 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 10 | — | 20 | 20 | — | 40 | 45 | — | 40 | 35 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 37 | — | — | 15 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 31 | — | — | 44 | — | — | 25 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 209 | 57 | 64 | 50 | 38 | 32 | 38 | 6 | 4 | 11 |
| High needs | 79 | 30 | 23 | 23 | 51 | 58 | 46 | 19 | 19 | 31 |
| Low income | 35 | 26 | 29 | 22 | 48 | 49 | 46 | 26 | 23 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 9 | 62 | — | 18 | 31 | — | 43 | 8 | — | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 47 | 23 | 15 | 14 | 51 | 57 | 40 | 26 | 28 | 45 |

Table E6. Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 116 | 76 | 77 | 47 | 18 | 21 | 42 | 6 | 3 | 11 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | 55 | — | — | 20 |
| Asian | 13 | — | 92 | 75 | — | 8 | 21 | — | 0 | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | 24 | — | — | 52 | — | — | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | 51 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 30 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 12 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 31 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 15 |
| White | 95 | 79 | 76 | 55 | 15 | 22 | 39 | 5 | 2 | 6 |
| High needs | 25 | 33 | 52 | 26 | 38 | 40 | 54 | 29 | 8 | 21 |
| Low income | 11 | 50 | 64 | 26 | 33 | 18 | 53 | 17 | 18 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | 13 | — | — | 50 | — | — | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 16 | 13 | 44 | 16 | 47 | 50 | 53 | 40 | 6 | 31 |

Table E7. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2023

| Grade | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | 125 | 64 | 56 | 44 | 33 | 41 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| 4 | 123 | 55 | 60 | 40 | 41 | 37 | 43 | 4 | 3 | 17 |
| 5 | 140 | 48 | 58 | 44 | 46 | 39 | 40 | 6 | 4 | 16 |
| 6 | 126 | 58 | 64 | 42 | 33 | 25 | 34 | 8 | 10 | 24 |
| 7 | 130 | 57 | 72 | 40 | 28 | 25 | 40 | 15 | 4 | 19 |
| 8 | 129 | 53 | 66 | 44 | 40 | 20 | 34 | 7 | 14 | 22 |
| 3-8 | 773 | 56 | 63 | 42 | 37 | 31 | 39 | 7 | 6 | 19 |
| 10 | 121 | 81 | 77 | 58 | 15 | 22 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 11 |

Table E8. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2023

| Grade | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | 125 | 57 | 50 | 41 | 34 | 40 | 39 | 8 | 10 | 20 |
| 4 | 124 | 50 | 62 | 45 | 42 | 32 | 37 | 8 | 6 | 18 |
| 5 | 139 | 49 | 58 | 41 | 42 | 39 | 46 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| 6 | 124 | 43 | 58 | 41 | 52 | 36 | 42 | 5 | 6 | 17 |
| 7 | 131 | 53 | 40 | 38 | 39 | 47 | 40 | 8 | 13 | 22 |
| 8 | 128 | 45 | 54 | 38 | 50 | 37 | 42 | 5 | 9 | 20 |
| 3-8 | 771 | 49 | 54 | 41 | 43 | 39 | 41 | 7 | 8 | 18 |
| 10 | 122 | 74 | 71 | 50 | 19 | 28 | 42 | 7 | 1 | 9 |

Table E9. Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2023

| Grade | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | | | Percentage partially meeting expectations | | | Percentage not meeting expectations | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 5 | 139 | 62 | 64 | 42 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 7 | 6 | 19 |
| 8 | 129 | 56 | 64 | 41 | 38 | 31 | 40 | 6 | 5 | 19 |
| 5 and 8 | 268 | 59 | 64 | 41 | 34 | 31 | 40 | 7 | 6 | 19 |
| 10 | 116 | 76 | 77 | 47 | 18 | 21 | 42 | 6 | 3 | 11 |

Table E10. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 619 | 51.9 | 58.7 | 49.7 |
| African American/Black | 4 | — | — | 48.0 |
| Asian | 85 | 58.0 | 58.3 | 56.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 22 | — | 52.9 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | 50.0 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 46.7 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 4 | — | — | 50.5 |
| White | 494 | 51.1 | 58.7 | 50.0 |
| High needs | 181 | 43.5 | 51.8 | 47.3 |
| Low income | 69 | 44.9 | 52.7 | 47.0 |
| ELs and former ELs | 28 | 48.4 | 50.1 | 49.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 111 | 39.8 | 49.6 | 43.7 |

Table E11. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 88 | 54.4 | 48.4 | 49.5 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 45.5 |
| Asian | 12 | — | — | 56.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | 45.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | 51.3 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 46.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 45.2 |
| White | 69 | 54.2 | 51.7 | 50.7 |
| High needs | 18 | 43.1 | — | 44.7 |
| Low income | 9 | — | — | 44.9 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | 42.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 11 | — | — | 39.9 |

Table E12. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 618 | 47.1 | 54.5 | 49.8 |
| African American/Black | 4 | — | — | 47.8 |
| Asian | 85 | 47.9 | 57.3 | 57.7 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 21 | — | 64.9 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | 50.3 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 47.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 4 | — | — | 51.5 |
| White | 494 | 47.1 | 53.4 | 50.1 |
| High needs | 179 | 46.8 | 53.2 | 47.8 |
| Low income | 66 | 43.9 | 50.9 | 47.3 |
| ELs and former ELs | 28 | 52.3 | 58.3 | 49.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 112 | 45.3 | 52.3 | 44.8 |

Table E13. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 90 | 57.6 | 65.0 | 49.6 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 41.4 |
| Asian | 12 | — | — | 55.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | 41.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | 51.1 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 45.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 56.1 |
| White | 71 | 58.6 | 66.3 | 52.9 |
| High needs | 18 | 54.7 | — | 43.9 |
| Low income | 9 | — | — | 43.2 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | 40.2 |
| Students w/disabilities | 11 | — | — | 41.7 |

Table E14. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 115 | 53.3 | 52.3 | 49.4 |
| 5 | 136 | 46.3 | 48.2 | 49.8 |
| 6 | 119 | 55.0 | 63.6 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 123 | 52.3 | 69.5 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 126 | 51.7 | 60.6 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 619 | 51.9 | 58.7 | 49.7 |
| 10 | 88 | 54.4 | 48.4 | 49.5 |

Table E15. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 117 | 47.3 | 54.4 | 49.6 |
| 5 | 134 | 49.1 | 60.4 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 117 | 33.7 | 59.3 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 125 | 54.3 | 46.7 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 125 | 51.3 | 51.4 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 618 | 47.1 | 54.5 | 49.8 |
| 10 | 90 | 57.6 | 65.0 | 49.6 |

Table E16. Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 103 | 90.6 | 94.6 | 96.1 | 90.1 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 86.2 |
| Asian | 10 | 87.5 | 100 | 100 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3 | 92.7 | — | — | 81.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 88.7 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.2 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 86 | 92.7 | 93.6 | 96.5 | 93.2 |
| High needs | 36 | 75.0 | 87.5 | 88.9 | 83.9 |
| Low income | 27 | 63.2 | 85.7 | 88.9 | 83.2 |
| English learner | — | — | — | — | 73.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 16 | 72.7 | 85.0 | 81.3 | 78.0 |

Table E17. Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2021) | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | State (2021) |
| All | 112 | 95.8 | 92.1 | 95.5 | 91.8 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 88.1 |
| Asian | 10 | 85.7 | 87.5 | 100 | 97.0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 4 | — | — | — | 84.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 91.2 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 84.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 87.7 |
| White | 94 | 97.0 | 94.5 | 94.7 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 24 | 90.2 | 77.5 | 87.5 | 85.8 |
| Low income | 7 | 85.7 | 63.2 | 85.7 | 85.1 |
| English learner | — | — | — | — | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 20 | 91.2 | 75.8 | 85.0 | 80.6 |

Table E18. Annual Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 447 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 6 | — | — | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 43 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 19 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 4.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 4.3 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 1.2 |
| White | 363 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.3 |
| High needs | 96 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 54 | — | — | 3.7 | 3.8 |
| English learner | 2 | — | — | — | 7.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 53 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 3.4 |

Table E19. In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 1,727 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 22 | — | — | -- | 2.1 |
| Asian | 256 | — | — | -- | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 66 | — | — | -- | 1.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 39 | — | — | -- | 1.6 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | -- | 1.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 7 | — | — | -- | 1.4 |
| White | 1,335 | — | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| High needs | 503 | 0.0 | 0.4 | -- | 2.0 |
| Low income | 209 | — | 0.5 | -- | 2.1 |
| English learner | 41 | — | — | -- | 1.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 313 | — | 0.7 | -- | 2.5 |

Table E20. Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 1,727 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 2.5 |
| African American/Black | 22 | — | -- | -- | 5.0 |
| Asian | 256 | — | -- | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 66 | — | -- | -- | 3.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 39 | — | -- | -- | 3.0 |
| Native American | 2 | — | -- | -- | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 7 | — | -- | -- | 3.1 |
| White | 1,335 | -- | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
| High needs | 503 | 1.4 | 2.0 | -- | 3.8 |
| Low income | 209 | — | 3.3 | -- | 4.3 |
| English learner | 41 | — | -- | -- | 2.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 313 | — | 3.1 | -- | 4.7 |

Table E21. Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 227 | 75.6 | 76.6 | 75.3 | 65.8 |
| African American/Black | 5 | — | — | — | 57.3 |
| Asian | 21 | 85.0 | 94.7 | 95.2 | 84.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 8 | 50.0 | — | 25.0 | 51.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | 62.5 | 54.5 | 67.4 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 50.6 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 60.0 |
| White | 181 | 75.6 | 77.0 | 77.9 | 70.4 |
| High needs | 49 | 37.8 | 38.0 | 44.9 | 49.8 |
| Low income | 25 | — | 48.3 | 60.0 | 50.7 |
| English learner | 2 | — | — | — | 31.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 28 | 23.8 | 23.1 | 25.0 | 36.0 |

Table E22. Accountability Percentile and Classification, 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| District | 80 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Shaker Lane Elementary | — | — | Insufficient data | Insufficient data |
| Russell Street Elementary | 78 | 76 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Littleton Middle School | 80 | 78 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | School of recognition |
| Littleton High School | 69 | 84 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |

1. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Districts with similar demographics and similar wealth are based on [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) (retrieved February 2024). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Average SGP ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0-29.9, Low Growth = 30.0-39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0-59.9, Exceeded Typical Growth = 60.0 or higher. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)