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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 Carlisle Public Schools (hereafter, CPS) in March 2025. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews and were designed to understand how districts operate in support of 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. The resulting report provides an in-depth look at district systems, policies, and practices and includes recommendations to promote systemic improvements and advance equitable student outcomes and experiences.

In addition, to collect data on instructional practices, three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited CPS during the week of March 11, 2025. The observers conducted 30 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused primarily 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).

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

In CPS, there is a strong working relationship between the school committee and the superintendent, with both described as communicative, which is a strength of the district. The leadership teams in CPS, being a small, single-school district, serve multiple purposes: The district leadership team also functions as the school leadership team, which meets weekly to discuss a variety of district-level and school-level topics, and grade-level teams meet weekly with principals to review the School Improvement Plan (SIP), district initiatives, curricula, and student data. These shared, distributed leadership structures are effective in supporting the district’s goals, which is a strength.

The district has a shared vision outlined in their Portrait of a Graduate to “cultivate balanced learners who can stand confidently with one foot in the field and the other in the future.” District and school leaders work collaboratively to ensure that the SIP and District Improvement Plan (DIP) align to this vision and to each other. District and school leaders regularly share progress toward the goals identified in these plans through regular updates to the school committee, which are disseminated through the district’s website and the local newspaper. However, the district has not developed a Student Opportunity Act plan or progress report, which is an area for growth.

The school committee, superintendent, and district administrators set a tone for the district in which stakeholders collaborate, make decisions, and exercise agency in advancing opportunities and outcomes for all students, which is a strength of the district. In addition, the district has a variety of mechanisms used to gather feedback from stakeholders, including topic-specific committees, the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC), the school council, regular meetings with the parent teacher organization (PTO), and districtwide surveys. District leaders use this feedback in decision making, which is a strength for the district.

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

The superintendent, the director of student support services, and the Town of Carlisle’s human resources director are collectively responsible for the district’s human resources functions. However, staff were not clear on where to direct any human resources–related inquiries. Staff also expressed concern about the superintendent handling grievances and conflicts. Establishing clear processes for staff with human resources requests and increasing the capacity of staff apart from the superintendent to handle more human resources responsibilities are areas for growth.

District staff have clear roles and responsibilities in place to hire and onboard new staff, which is a strength. However, the district has faced challenges in recruiting a diverse workforce, which is an area for growth. District records suggest that school-level evaluators consistently complete teacher evaluations. A review of evaluations indicates that the district consistently highlights areas of strength during administrator and teacher evaluations, and consistently highlights areas of improvement for administrators, which are strengths. However, an area for growth is more consistently articulating areas for educator improvement. The district cultivates a working environment in which school staff can count on each other for professional and personal support through their diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging and mental health programming, which is a strength.

Teachers receive schoolwide professional development opportunities aligned to the SIP, and teacher input, observation data, and administrative data inform the selection of these offerings. Teachers have agency in selecting additional professional development offerings that best suit their needs as educators through individual professional development funds and enrollment in Carlisle College courses, which is a strength of the district. Teachers have sufficient time to collaborate within grade-level teams, with at least one structured grade-level meeting per week run by the principal. However, there are limited opportunities for teachers to collaborate across grade levels, which is an area for growth for the district.

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

The business office is staffed by a school business consultant and an administrative assistant. The district and town staff have a strong working relationship characterized by open communication; school committee liaisons to town departments and a shared accounting system (MUNIS) facilitate this communication, which is a strength. However, an area for growth is developing a written agreement between the town and district officials about cost assumptions. In addition, it is unclear whether a consistent document retention and destruction process is currently implemented.

The district has a clear budget development process, and budget presentation documents and school committee meeting information (including meeting times, agendas, minutes, and recordings) are available on the district website. The budget provides appropriate levels of funding for key instructional resources, though substantial out-of-district placement costs and noncompetitive bids from contractors can make the budget vulnerable to funding challenges. The district considers future needs such as salary adjustments, projected enrollment and required staffing, and potential increases in service agreements in financial planning. There are also effective internal controls, including monitoring funds through purchase orders, multiple district and town reviews of accounts payable and payroll, and a yearly independent audit. These are both strengths of the district.

District operations and facilities are managed by the district’s facilities director. The director has implemented a formal process for maintenance requests in an online system with quick response times, which is a strength. There is also an established process for procurement using a purchase order system, and contracts with vendors are managed effectively. The district’s capital plan incorporates input from school leaders and is developed in collaboration between the facilities director, the network/information technology manager, and the town administrator. The current capital plan includes wastewater treatment plant repairs, an HVAC upgrade, window replacements, flooring, and information technology equipment. Inventory of capital assets is tracked and managed in an efficient manner, which is a strength.

## Carlisle Public Schools: District Review Overview

### Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews 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) Reviews provide the state, district leaders, and the public with an in-depth look into the systems, structures, and practices of a district and how they affect student experiences and opportunities. District reviews provide information and recommendations to support districts in implementing systemic improvements and advance equitable student outcomes and experiences.

### 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 municipal staff, school committee members, teachers’ association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students’ families. Reviewers also conduct focus groups and virtual interviews 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, all interview and focus group data are transcribed using automated transcription. The transcripts are then coded using both deterministic coding, based on the protocol questions, and natural language processing models. Team members analyze the coded 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 provide recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas for 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 CPS occurred during the week of March 10, 2025. The site visit included 12 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 38 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted two teacher focus groups with five elementary school teachers and five middle school teachers and one family focus group with 14 parents. Data collection also included distributing a questionnaire to district leaders, as well as to each principal, to gather information about district and school processes and operations; respondents in CPS completed the district questionnaire and two of two principal questionnaires.

The site team also conducted 30 observations of classroom instruction in one school. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

The Town of Carlisle is located north of Boston and borders the towns of Concord, Acton, Billerica, Bedford, Westford, and Chelmsford. According to [census data](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlisletownmiddlesexcountymassachusetts,MA/PST045223), Carlisle’s median income from 2019 to 2023 was more than $250,000, which is above the state median income of $101,341. In 2023, Carlisle had an estimated 5,192 residents.

The superintendent of CPS is Mr. James O’Shea, who was appointed in 2016. In addition, governance of the district is through a school committee composed of five members who are elected for three-year terms.

In the 2024-2025 school year, the district served 612 students in its one school. Since the 2020-2021 school year, total enrollment has increased by 33 students. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for the 2023-2024 school year.

Table 1. Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| Carlisle School | Elementary/Middle | PK-8 | 612 |
|  |  | Total | 612 |

Students who graduate from the Carlisle School feed into the Concord-Carlisle Regional School District, which is overseen by a separate superintendent.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of CPS’s students by race/ethnicity. Figure 2 shows the distribution of CPS’s students for selected populations. Full enrollment figures compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, student attendance, and expenditures.

Figure 1. Distribution of Students, by Race/Ethnicity (2024-2025)

Figure 2. Distribution of Students, by Selected Populations (2024-2025)

Figure 3 shows the percentage of CPS’s All Students group meeting or exceeding expectations on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), compared with the statewide percentage of All Students meeting or exceeding expectations on MCAS. In 2024, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher for CPS than for the state in Grades 3-8 (ELA and mathematics) and 5 and 8 (science).

Figure 3. Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

CPS’s High Needs students, who comprise 19 percent of the district, met or exceeded expectations on the 2024 MCAS assessments at rates 29 percentage points to 39 percentage points higher than High Needs students across the state (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Percentage of High Needs Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

In the 2024 statewide accountability results, CPS was identified as *not requiring assistance or intervention*, Both the district and school met or exceeded accountability targets set by DESE.

In fiscal year 2023, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Carlisle was $23,446, which is $5,738 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($17,708) and $2,704 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts of similar wealth ($26,150).[[3]](#footnote-4) In-district per-pupil expenditures for Carlisle were $2,190 more than the average state spending per pupil ($21,256). Actual net school spending was much greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D5 in Appendix D.

### Classroom Observations

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited CPS during the week of March 10, 2025. The observers conducted 30 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, 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 are broadly 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 from 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 CPS, ratings are provided across two grade bands: K-5 and 6-8. For each grade band, ratings are provided across the overarching domains as well as at individual dimensions within those domains. Figure 5 shows average ratings, by domain, for each grade band. The full report of findings from observations conducted in CPS is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17 and 18 in this appendix.

Figure 5. CLASS Domain Averages by Grade Band

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

In the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide strong evidence of classroom organization and student engagement, generally strong evidence of emotional support, and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support.

## Leadership and Governance

This section examines the extent to which school committees, district leaders, school leaders, and advisory council members work collaboratively and strategically to promote high-quality teaching and learning that (a) is antiracist, inclusive, multilingual, and multicultural; (b) values and affirms each student and their families; and (c) creates equitable opportunities and experiences for all students, particularly those historically underserved. It also focuses on the extent to which districts establish, implement, and evaluate policies, plans, procedures, systems, and budgets by focusing on achieving districtwide strategic objectives through the equitable and effective use of resources, which ultimately lead to high-quality teaching and learning for all students.

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

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

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Leadership and Governing Structures](#_Leadership_and_Governing) | * Strong working relationships exist between the school committee and the superintendent. * The district’s shared, distributed leadership structures are effective. |  |
| [Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring](#_Strategic_Planning,_Implementation,) | * District and school leaders regularly share progress toward identified goals with staff, students, families, and the school committee. | * Developing a Student Opportunity Act plan and progress report |
| [District Culture](#_District_Culture) | * The school committee, superintendent, and district administrators set a tone for the district in which stakeholders collaborate, make decisions, and exercise agency in advancing opportunities and outcomes for all students. * CPS partners with key stakeholders and intentionally seeks input from underrepresented groups in decision making. |  |

### Leadership and Governing Structures

James O’Shea, the superintendent since 2016, leads CPS with the support of the assistant to the superintendent and the district leadership team, comprising the business/finance contractor, two CPS school principals (one oversees Grades K-4 and one oversees Grades 5-8), student supports staff, the director of student support services, the facilities director, and the network/information technology manager.

The district’s leadership team works closely with the school committee. CPS’s school committee consists of five core members elected to serve three-year terms. The CPS school committee creates and implements policies, engages with the community to incorporate diverse stakeholder input, and helps to make budgetary decisions to support the district’s priorities, according to a review of the district’s school committee website, meeting minutes, and interviews. For instance, one school committee member explained how the committee surveyed parents and faculty to determine which school start time models would work best, resulting in the creation of a school start time exploratory committee. At least one member from CPS’s student council attends every school committee meeting and provides updates. In addition, the town newspaper, the *Carlisle Mosquito*, covers every meeting, as confirmed by a school committee member and a review of the newspaper website.

The school committee’s strong working relationship with the superintendent is a strength of the district. The superintendent described his relationship with the school committee as favorable, noting that the school committee members are “thoughtful and engaged people” with whom he collaborates well. School committee members agreed that they share a positive relationship with the superintendent, noting that he is forthcoming with information, is very accessible and involved, and supports the school committee communications. Another committee member described the superintendent as a “compassionate and experienced leader.” Past school committee evaluations of and feedback on the superintendent were generally positive.

Similarly, the teachers’ association characterized their working relationship with the school committee as communicative and hands-on, with school committee members participating in book fairs and frequently conducting walkthroughs in the school building. Municipal officials added that they meet with the school committee when requested and that data drives their financial meetings.

A major responsibility of the school committee is to evaluate the superintendent, which occurs on an annual basis. The school committee minutes include summaries of discussions regarding the outcomes of the evaluations.

Effective distributed leadership structures are a strength of the district. According to district and school leaders, the district leadership team meets weekly, and these meetings focus on topics including, but not limited to, strategic planning, resource allocation, staffing, program implementation, operations, and reviewing student data and work aligned to district priorities. However, the district leadership team also functions as the school leadership team because of the small size of the district. School principals explained how the director of student support services attends collaborative planning time meetings with school leaders and teachers when asked and helps review student data to determine which individualized supports to provide to students. The director of student support services and the middle and elementary school principals are responsible for maintaining compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act, overseeing special education needs and supports, and managing English learner needs across schools. The director of student support services, the middle school principal, and the wellness committee are responsible for overseeing health and wellness programs in the district. Moreover, the district leadership team works collaboratively to engage in strategic planning, resource allocation, implementation of the DIP, and monitoring instruction. For example, one district leader noted that the team uses a distributive leadership approach by being supportive of one another and being able to step in to manage other members’ responsibilities when a member of the leadership team is out.

Distributive leadership structures also are effective at the school level. School principals explained that they meet weekly with grade-level teacher teams, the school psychologist, a Board-Certified Behavior Analyst, and the school nurse to reflect on accomplishments, review the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and its alignment to district initiatives, review curricula, and review student data to determine appropriate interventions. In focus groups with staff from across the district, participants said that they agree that the district empowers these school leadership teams to establish an inclusive environment and foster positive and collaborative learning. School staff noted that the level of autonomy granted to these teams enhances their effectiveness in implementing school initiatives aligned with the district’s educational vision and strategic goals. District leaders explained that the district supports school leaders by giving constructive feedback on the DIP and SIP within conversations that include school leaders, teachers, school committee members, and parents. School personnel echoed these experiences, noting that they recently implemented the district’s initiative, Portrait of a Graduate, at the elementary level and that they received a substantial amount of feedback from district leaders on the implementation of their SIP and its alignment to district initiatives. School leaders also described the various teams or committees that are active at the Carlisle School, which include data teams, student support teams, grade-level teams, subject area teams, the student advisory council, the administrative leadership team, and the school council.

District leaders reported that CPS has established representative school and parent advisory councils, including school councils; the PTO; the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC); and the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Carlisle Advisory Committee. Consequently, school leaders reported having a representative school council that aligns with district initiatives, complies with state statutes and regulations, and comprises the principals, teachers, caregivers, and other administrators as well as the SEPAC that meets at least monthly.

### Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring

According to the district’s public website, the mission and vision is to “cultivate balanced learners who can stand confidently with one foot in the field and the other in the future,” and the district’s Portrait of a Graduate outlines the specific skills with which they aim to equip students, in service of this vision. Focus group responses indicate that this mission/vision is widely shared across the district, with staff articulating that the district mission is to “create independent learners that are curious about the world” and explaining how district and school leaders have gathered feedback from teachers on instructional materials and have supported teachers in implementing evidence-based instructional practices across grades so that students have the same experiences.

The district has developed a DIP but has not developed a Student Opportunity Act plan or progress report. The superintendent described the process for creating the three-year 2022-2025 DIP, which began with a review of previous challenges; development of the district mission/vision and the portrait of a graduate; and a district self-reflection that incorporated community members and teachers. The superintendent and several school leaders explained how they meet with the school advisory council, comprising teachers, community members, and parents, to obtain feedback on the DIP, set long-term and short-term goals within the district, and share progress toward their identified goals. According to district leaders, the district’s main goals/priorities for the year include improving Tier 2 supports, improving school belonging and inclusion, celebrating diversity, addressing the needs of students and their families, and implementing evidence-based curricula. The development of a Student Opportunity Act plan and progress report is an area for growth for the district, and a need that the superintendent is aware of.

Carlisle School principals have developed a SIP for 2024-2027 that aligns with the DIP. These plans include instructional priorities and strategies for reducing disparities in student opportunities and outcomes, such as reviewing and enhancing the systemic use of instructional time and structures in CPS to foster improved tiered programming and supports to best meet the needs of all students. In focus groups, school leaders explained collaborating with the district to align their plans with broader district goals (including those outlined in the district’s Portrait of a Graduate), stating that they review district initiatives, examine student grades, and receive feedback from district leaders and the school advisory council to verify that school improvement goals align with the DIP. School leaders also described their school improvement goals for the year, which include reviewing and articulating curricula for Grades 5-8; reviewing and piloting writing programs; improving diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging; improving Tier 1 strategies for executive functioning, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), and anxiety; and improving Tier 2 supports. A school leader elaborated, “We ask teachers when they [complete] their goals, professional practice goals, learning goals, that [they] should be aligned with the School Improvement Plan, the District [Improvement] Plan, and ultimately the Portrait of a Graduate. . . . We’re looking for coherence.” For each priority, the plan includes the specific action steps needed, person or team responsible, resource needs, and data to show evidence of implementation.

District and school leaders regularly share progress toward identified goals with staff, students, families, and the school committee—a strength of the district. Discussions with the school leaders and the superintendent also revealed that district and school leaders implement existing improvement plans and have established formal processes to assess their effectiveness and communicate progress to the district community. For example, although the superintendent noted that the district has not consistently reviewed and shared data with the district community, semi-annual presentations communicate progress on district goals to the school committee. The district website posts recordings of the presentations, and the local newspaper, the *Carlisle Mosquito*, shares the presentations as well. School principals and teachers echoed these statements in focus groups and added that the school sends out individual report cards for students and shares updates with parents through weekly newsletters or through parent-teacher conferences. School and district leaders reported conducting regular informal walkthroughs in each classroom in addition to formal walkthroughs. School leaders also reported meeting regularly with grade-level teachers to share feedback. Furthermore, family focus group respondents explained that the district communicates student, school, and district performance through emails and report cards.

### District Culture

The school committee, superintendent, and district administrators set a tone for the district in which stakeholders collaborate, make decisions, and exercise agency in advancing opportunities and outcomes for all students, which is a strength of the district. In interviews, district leaders explained how the district partners with stakeholders to represent the community in school committee meetings, to share resources between the town and the school, and to ensure that the district is creating the types of environments, atmospheres, and educational programs that the community wants to see. In addition, elected, district, and school leaders have clearly defined roles, as described in interviews and indicated by a review of district administrators’ evaluations. District and school leaders also maintain strong working relationships with each other, described in evaluations as strong and productive, enabling their ability to advance the district’s strategic objectives and improvement plans. School committee members also acknowledged that the district’s working relationship with the Town of Carlisle is very collaborative and that several committee members are liaisons to the main town departments, including the finance committee, the select board, and recreation.

The superintendent reported that the district has high retention for leadership positions and has not hired new leaders, apart from the facilities director, in seven years. However, CPS does not have strategies in place for recruiting diverse leaders, should they need to fill a leadership position (see the Staffing section). The superintendent explained that “everybody’s been here for a while; that doesn’t change the fact that we haven’t really found these [strategies]” that are effective for recruiting diverse candidates.

CPS partners with key stakeholders and intentionally seeks input from underrepresented groups in decision-making, which is a strength of the district. Parents in focus groups noted that the district uses Seesaw and emails to communicate regularly with parents. The superintendent, district staff, and school leaders outlined the district’s efforts to engage the broader community, including giving tours of the school to community members and engaging the community in building a new school playground. District leadership solicits parent feedback on district priorities through a variety of methods, including surveys administered throughout the school year (such as a survey on student use of tablets outside of school and surveys on school start time), quarterly meetings with the PTO, and topic-specific committees (such as the school start time exploratory committee). District leaders also described efforts to leverage stakeholder feedback on operations, such as a student survey designed by teachers and parents to solicit feedback on new food service programming. The district also invites parents to participate in hiring committees. Parent focus group participants reported that although these mechanisms do not provide them with direct opportunities to make district-level decisions, the process gathers parent input, which district and school leaders consider when they make decisions. One parent explained that district and school leaders “definitely take [feedback] seriously and they do value the parents’ opinions.” Parents also noted that the high level of parent engagement “makes the district special” and that parents “appreciate the ability to have a connection to the school.”

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district must develop and share a Student Opportunity Act plan and progress report, in order to comply with Chapter 132 of the Massachusetts General Laws.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

This section examines the extent to which the district has established systems, policies, and practices that allow administrators to effectively recruit, hire, onboard, and support a highly effective, diverse, and culturally responsive workforce. It also focuses on the systems and structures that the district uses to provide all educators with ongoing access to high-quality professional learning and actionable feedback and establishes a culture that fosters collaboration, retention, recognition, and advancement.

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices](#_Human_Resources_Infrastructure,) |  | * Establishing clear processes for staff with human resources requests * Increasing the capacity of staff apart from the superintendent to handle more human resources responsibilities |
| [Staffing](#_Staffing) | * District staff have clear roles and responsibilities in place to hire and onboard new staff. * Evaluations highlight areas of strength through the evaluation process for teachers and administrators. * Evaluations highlight areas of improvement for administrators. * The district has a working environment in which school staff can count on each other for professional and personal support. | * Recruiting a diverse workforce * Consistently providing feedback for teachers and articulating areas for improvement to encourage continuous development |
| [Professional Learning](#_Professional_Learning_1) | * Teachers have agency in selecting professional development offerings that best suit their needs as an educator. | * Establishing additional common planning time for teachers across grade-levels at both the elementary and middle grade levels |

### Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices

The director of student support services, the superintendent, and the Town of Carlisle’s human resources director are collectively responsible for overseeing the district’s human resources functions. The director of student support services oversees professional development and hiring and fulfills the role of Title IX and civil rights coordinator; the superintendent oversees the grievance process; and the Town of Carlisle human resources director is responsible for payroll and benefits processing. According to district leaders, the director of student support services works closely with the town’s human resources director to address human resources matters and “work in tandem for any discussion of issues that come up” and also works with the principals during the hiring process.

According to district staff, the district, with support from the Carlisle human resources director and Carlisle benefits coordinator, can handle all key human resources functions, including managing the hiring and interviewing process, maintaining employee records and payroll, posting vacancies, and tracking employee time and attendance. However, support from the Carlisle human resources director is necessary for handling benefits and other key human resources duties. Respondents shared that the district would benefit “if there was a little more support on [the district’s] end” to make sure that human resources processes are “streamlined.” When staff have inquiries about benefits, they typically reach out to district staff, who must then direct the requests to the town’s human resources office. District staff are able to answer questions about salaries, and teachers’ association leaders promptly respond to other human resources–related inquiries or connect staff with the town’s office. Although association leaders have quickly connected staff with relevant resources, respondents still noted that there is no clear process for these questions. Focus group respondents expressed that the process to submit human resources–related inquiries is currently “convoluted” and could be streamlined so that staff are not “bounced around.” Teacher respondents also said that teachers often go to their union representative because it is not clear to them who they should speak to at the district level. Establishing clear processes for staff with human resources requests is an area for growth for the district.

Furthermore, according to teacher focus group responses, conflicts and grievances are brought to the superintendent, which can feel “awkward” for staff raising concerns about the superintendent’s responsibility and leads to staff discussing issues with their union representative instead. The superintendent shared that exit interviews with staff leaving the district showed that other staff members had this experience. Respondents expressed their opinion that having an individual who exclusively handles human resources could address this issue. Increasing the capacity of staff, apart from the superintendent, to handle more human resources responsibilities is an area for growth.

Despite a lack of clarity concerning processes for human resources inquiries, the district has established procedures for newly hired staff laid out in a Teacher Employment Packet on the district’s website, which includes a document with the town’s sexual harassment policy, mandatory ethics training, and other benefits-related documents. Staff have access to policies outlined in the contract between the teachers’ association and the school committee. The district also has a handbook for noncontractual employees.

In addition, respondents said that the district has formal processes in place to promptly verify educators’ licensure status and resolve staff conflicts and grievances; when staff raise grievances, the district closely follows these processes, which are clearly outlined in teachers’ contracts. All educators report to one of three administrators (director of student support services or a principal). The supervisors’ responsibilities include having discussions with teachers about misconduct or attendance.

The school’s business office maintains employee records and Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) results using a paper-based filing system. The director and administrators also maintain a secure Google Drive for résumés while hiring, and teachers can view paystubs, payroll information, and staff attendance through an online portal. District staff and school administrators can view a full staff list and other employee records.

### Staffing

District and school staff agree that their district has clear roles and responsibilities to hire and onboard new staff, which is an area of strength for the district. According to school leaders, the district administrators lead the hiring of a principal or other district roles. For other school-based roles, one of the school principals or the director of student support services leads a hiring committee. First, school principals and the director of student support services work together to create a job posting, which is posted internally first and then in School Spring and Indeed. District staff also noted that they use their connections with school leaders from surrounding districts in the Concord Area Special Education (CASE) Collaborative to help recruit staff for open positions. Then, district leaders and principals assemble a hiring committee that represents a range of perspectives (i.e., general education teachers, special education teachers, parents). The hiring committee members collaborate to draft interview questions, prescreen applications, and schedule and conduct interviews. In a final step, the principals and director submit a form with a recommendation for the individual to hire, and the superintendent reviews it to officially fill the position. The principals, the superintendent, the director of student support services, and the administrative assistant review this hiring process annually. According to district staff, they are responsible for reviewing qualifications and licensure documents before a new staff member receives an employee number or school email. District leaders noted that the district does not frequently hire staff holding licensure waivers, and most staff members have professional licensure; in the 2023-2024 school year, 100 percent of teachers were licensed and not on waivers.

However, according to district leaders, the district has had challenges with recruiting a diverse workforce and cited a lack of public transportation as one barrier. According to state-reported data in 2025, 6.4 percent of students are Hispanic or Latino and zero percent of teachers are Hispanic or Latino; similarly, 11.9 percent of students are Asian and 4.6 percent of teachers are Asian. The district also does not have strategies in place for recruiting diverse leaders (see *District Culture*). Recruiting a diverse workforce marks an area for growth for the district.

Prior to the start of the school year, all teachers (including long-term substitutes) new to CPS attend an orientation, which the mentor coordinators are responsible for preparing. At this orientation, new teachers complete Arc-Ed training (focused on care for people with autism and intellectual and developmental disabilities), meet with the director and school principal, and learn about the school. They also connect with their mentor and the mentor coordinators at this orientation (see the Professional Learning section for more details). In their focus group, teachers described their district’s onboarding process as effective and indicated that they felt that the process did provide new staff with the information and resources they needed to get started in their role and be successful, further indicating that the district’s approach to onboarding new teachers is a strength.

The school principals and the district’s director of student support services lead the educator evaluation and feedback process, which involves observations and meetings with teachers and paraprofessionals about their goals. School leaders and teachers agree that their district’s evaluation systems reflect a culture of high expectations for all educators, and district staff noted that the district clearly communicates these expectations, as well as timelines and their approach to evaluations, to all staff. District records indicate that district leaders consistently complete teacher evaluations using Vector Solutions. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample of 10 teachers due for summative evaluations for the 2023-2024 school year. All teachers (100 percent) selected for review had a summative evaluation available for review, complete and not omitting required components, such as a rating for each standard or an overall rating. All evaluation documents reviewed included a student learning SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goal and a professional practice SMART goal. In addition, all the teachers’ progress toward their student learning and professional goals was evaluated. All evaluations reviewed included multiple sources of evidence, such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. District staff shared that year-end evaluations include comprehensive written reports for staff, and AIR’s evaluation review found that all summative evaluations included feedback for each standard and overall feedback related to each teacher’s overall rating. Whereas all evaluations included feedback naming strengths or practices that the teacher should continue, only 10 percent of evaluations included feedback indicating areas for improvement.

District records also suggest that the district completes administration evaluations outside of the electronic evaluation system used for teachers, using the state form. Only four administrative district staff were due for a summative evaluation for the 2023-2024 school year. Of those four evaluations available for review, all were complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Three of four evaluations included student learning and professional practice SMART goals, and one evaluation included a school improvement SMART goal. Additionally, only one evaluation included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. All four evaluations included feedback for each standard, which included comments with specific, actionable feedback naming each administrator’s strengths and identified areas for improvement for administrative district staff.

Taken together, the review of teacher and administrator evaluations highlights that the strength of the district is in identifying areas of strength through the evaluation process for teachers and administrators, and in identifying areas for improvement for administrators. This evidence also suggests that the district could improve by consistently providing feedback for teachers and articulating areas for improvement for teachers to encourage continuous development.

Teachers reported being observed consistently and meeting with administration consistently in their first years of teaching. Teachers meet with their assigned evaluator to set goals at the beginning of the year and then are observed throughout the year, receiving a write-up of the observation and sometimes having a follow-up meeting after formal observations.Teachers also noted that informal observations are common, and administrators will pop into classes to see what students are learning. Members of the teachers’ association added that the district conducts evaluations in a manner consistent with their collective bargaining agreement. They shared that, at the beginning of the year, staff engage in goal setting that reflects high expectations and aligns with the district’s Portrait of a Graduate.

When it comes to advancement in their careers, teachers feel that their district has the resources to support their professional learning or pathways to advancement. District staff and school leaders agree with these sentiments, adding that the district gives a few awards, including one per year to a staff member who demonstrates kindness and thoughtfulness to their peers, and primarily provides staff recognition and encouragement through observation write-ups and feedback.

District leaders described their approach to retaining educators as maintaining open communication with staff about their needs, questions, or concerns. Principals within the district agree that they have not faced challenges in retaining staff, with the main retention strategies being the professional development fund (see Professional Learning) and providing high teacher salaries. With an average teacher salary of $111,213 in fiscal year 2023, Carlisle is one of the highest paying districts in the state. Participants in the teacher focus groups agree that competitive salaries and ample professional development opportunities help retain staff. Other common reasons that teachers stay in the district are the “strong team approach” among teachers, opportunities to learn, and strong special education supports, according to teachers’ association members. Principals and teachers said that common reasons that staff leave are retirement, moving away from the town, or new opportunities.

Principals within the district agree that their district fosters a positive, productive, and inclusive work environment for all staff through resources such as programming focused on mental health awareness and diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging. For example, the district is participating in the Yellow Tulip Project, which is an effort to encourage staff and students to feel comfortable talking about mental health. Teacher focus group participants agree that their district provides effective mental health and wellness support specifically for staff. For example, staff can join a wellness committee that occasionally runs programming, such as creating a mindfulness calendar that staff can print out. This evidence suggests that the district has a working environment in which school staff can count on each other for professional and personal support, which is an area of strength for CPS.

In addition, principals and teachers work closely together to establish class period schedules and class assignments. Teachers receive a stipend to help with scheduling and give their input on class dynamics when assigning students. Other staff agree with this characterization, describing a “trusting relationship” between staff and the administration as well as an environment in which school staff can count on each other for professional and personal support. In interviews, the superintendent described trust and mutual respect between the administration and the collective bargaining unit, saying that the district strives to be “a place where everybody aspires to be effective in their work.”

### Professional Learning

Teachers’ contracts include a district-provided rubric, which provides school leadership with guidelines for observation and feedback cycles. School leaders use the rubric for the evaluation process; it consists of standards and indicators of effective teaching practice, descriptors of indicators, and benchmarks that define acceptable demonstrations of knowledge, skills, and behavior aligned with each performance rating (exemplary, proficient, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory). According to district teachers in their focus group, their district and school leaders provide them with regular instructional coaching and feedback. The teachers’ contract outlines an evaluation cycle that consists of five stages: self-assessment, goal setting and educator plan development, plan implementation, formative assessment, and summative evaluation.

District staff and teachers reported that the district provides evidence-based, data-informed, and relevant professional development opportunities. District administrators select schoolwide professional development opportunities on the basis of feedback from teachers, observation data, and administrative data, according to a district leader. The district solicits teacher input on professional development offerings through a survey in the prior school year, according to teachers, and teachers’ association members noted that, in their regular meetings with the superintendent, they have provided input on what professional development offerings they would like to see. For example, district staff noted that feedback from paraprofessionals and an increase in inappropriate student behaviors influenced the decision to offer professional development on behavior interventions, ADHD, and anxiety.

According to teacher focus group participants, these schoolwide professional development opportunities are high quality and align with their district’s instructional vision. The district’s professional development calendar includes programming on ADHD, anxiety, executive functioning, and behavior interventions, which align with the district's objective to “enhance student self-advocacy skills [and] increase their appropriate responses to a range of expected behaviors.” The district collaborated with outside consultants from the organization Cognitive Connections to provide these professional development opportunities. The district professional development calendar also includes programming on Universal Design for Learning, and the district offers to all educators free Sheltered English Immersion training courses, which align to the objective to “provide professional learning for CPS educators to best address the diverse needs of students so all students feel supported, known, and cared for.” Professional development related to the curriculum has also been a focus at the middle school level, as the middle school has recently made changes to its curricula. In addition, the district runs MCAS testing training every year. District staff also noted that noninstructional staff, specifically food service employees, can participate in trainings.

In addition, school leaders and teachers agree that teachers have agency in selecting additional offerings that best suit their needs as educators, which is a strength of the district. The district has a professional development fund that provides each educator with a budget (approximately $500 annually) to sign up for professional development offerings of their choice, which teachers noted allows their professional development to be “pretty individualized.” Teachers also described the district’s “Carlisle College” program, in which CPS faculty can create and design a professional development course, lasting five to 10 weeks, that is offered to other teachers. The superintendent and the two “commissioners”—teachers who were voted on to serve in this role—must approve each course. Faculty who design and teach these courses have the option to be compensated with either a stipend or credits that count toward their professional status. Teachers noted that they have found these courses “really useful over the years” and have “gotten a lot out of learning from [their] colleagues.”

District leaders agree that their district uses multiple sources to select, develop, and monitor the effectiveness of its professional development offerings. At this time, the sources used are observation data, feedback from staff, and student performance data (such as grades, MCAS scores, and STAR scores). For example, one district leader recalled that, during an observation, an administrator noticed that a teacher could use more support in implementing the new civics curriculum, so the district offered the teacher an opportunity to attend a training on civics instruction. In addition, a district leader reported that their district’s professional development plan is sustainable and financially well supported by the PTO and community.

The district even further supports professional development by providing effective protocols for teachers to collaborate in grade-level teams. At the elementary and middle grade levels, grade-level teams have seven common periods, which provide an ample opportunity to collaborate with their grade-level peers. Regular grade-level team meetings occur for the elementary (two times per week) and middle (one time per week) grades; the school administrator facilitates one of these meetings at each grade level. These meetings provide an opportunity for school leaders to address data and school- or district-level priorities. Additional structured (e.g., child study team, facilitated by the school psychologist) and unstructured opportunities allow teachers to consult with support staff as needed.

However, teachers and school leaders agreed that more time for collaboration between teachers in different grade levels (within their elementary or middle school grouping) would be beneficial for teachers’ professional learning and for supporting their district’s needs. Middle school staff reported that they have about an hour every other month to collaborate with their subject-area team (which includes teachers in their subject area in Grades 5-8) but felt that this time was not sufficient, and that additional time to meet with subject-area teams would allow them to more effectively collaborate vertically on curriculum and instructional practices. Elementary teachers reported that they do not have any dedicated time to collaborate with teachers in different grade levels. They explained that because the grade level they teach often changes from year to year, it would be helpful to have collaborative planning time across grade levels so that they better understand what happens at each grade level and therefore are better prepared to teach other grade levels. Establishing additional common planning time for teachers across grade levels at both the middle and elementary levels is an area for growth for the district.

All educators new to CPS, including long-term substitutes, enter a three-year mentoring program, which provides regular opportunities for mentorship and peer observation. District leaders and school staff described clear processes for selecting teachers who volunteer to serve as mentors and pairing them with incoming mentees. When matching new teachers with mentors, the mentor coordinator considers new teachers’ years of experience and content area, and teachers noted that all mentors must complete a mentorship training, New teachers meet regularly with their mentors to discuss goals. District and school staff agree that the mentoring program is effective in supporting and retaining novice educators in the district and indicated that stakeholder feedback on the program is highly valued and incorporated into program modifications.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should clarify the responsibilities and processes for addressing human resources requests and inquiries.*
* *The district should explore options for increasing human resources capacity to streamline interactions between staff and the human resources department.*
* *The district should implement effective strategies for recruiting teachers of color, particularly Hispanic or Latino and Asian teachers, into the district.*
* *The district should set expectations around incorporating greater levels of constructive feedback on teacher evaluations.*
* *Where feasible, the district should allocate time for teachers to collaborate across grade levels.*

## Financial and Asset Management

This section focuses on the extent to which, through its policies, systems, and procedures, the district strategically allocates and uses funding and other resources in alignment with applicable laws to improve all students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes. It also focuses on the ways in which the district collaborates with its partners to run daily operations, manage its assets, and develop long-term plans for sustainability.

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure](#_Business_Office_Staffing) | * There is a good working relationship between the district and town finance departments. | * Formalizing written agreements between the district and town * Ensuring all relevant staff are aware of and implement a consistent document retention and destruction process |
| [Budgeting and Budget Process](#_Budgeting_and_Budget) | * Financial planning considers future needs (e.g., salary adjustments, student enrollment). * The district has effective internal controls. |  |
| [Operations](#_Operations) | * There is a formal process for maintenance requests with quick response times. |  |
| [Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning](#_Managing_Capital_Assets) | * There is an efficient system for managing and tracking the inventory of capital assets. |  |

### Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure

The business office consists of two individuals: a school business consultant who is in the district office one day a week, and an administrative assistant responsible for accounts payable and supporting the business facilities offices. District staff noted that although the business consultant only formally dedicates one day per week to CPS, he is very responsive via email at any time. School leaders and teachers explained that the district previously had an in-house finance director before transferring this responsibility to an outside consultant, who has a contract with the district to follow policies and procedures to maintain compliance with state and federal requirements and establish an internal system of checks and balances. The school business consultant has multiple qualifications for the role, including being a government finance manager (Association of Government Accountants) and a Massachusetts Certified Public Purchasing Official and having a Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials business manager’s license. The business office is able to manage its day-to-day responsibilities, with district staff noting that there are times that the office may be “really busy” because of new business office staff at the school and the town’s implementation of a new accounting system.

District staff explained that the district and the town have converted to the MUNIS accounting system this fiscal year. Although the district aligned with the Uniform Massachusetts Accounting System (UMAS), it previously did not have DESE function codes. These function codes were added as part of the upgrade to the accounting system, so the district now has a crosswalk within the accounting structure between DESE function codes and UMAS codes.

District staff explained that they preserve and categorize financial documents, including contracts, invoices, and purchase orders, in filing cabinets in the business office. Administrators also hold copies of their specific contracts. Some district staff noted that all administrators are aware of retention schedule requirements, but other staff members did not believe that the district has a process for getting rid of documents. Ensuring all relevant staff are aware of and implement a consistent document retention and destruction process is an area for growth for the district.

According to district staff, school committee members, and town officials, the district and town work together closely, as they share staff, such as the facilities director, and the same accounting system. A district leader explained that there is a “very good working relationship” between the town finance department and the district, and that being on the same accounting system facilitates this positive relationship. Another district leader agreed that the district and town “work together really well” as “one of the town’s goals is inter-board conversations and cooperation.” School committee members agreed and noted that there are open lines of communication because some school committee members serve as liaisons to town departments. The good working relationship between the district and town finance departments is a strength of the district.

Town officials shared that there is no formal, written agreement between the district and the town, but they “have an indirect cost assumption, more or less.” A potential area for growth for Carlisle would be developing a written agreement between the town and the district for cost assumptions to ensure stability in funding in the future, despite changing district and town administrations. The district does its own budgeting and invoicing, and district leaders (the business consultant and the superintendent) and then the town accountant review warrants. Town officials explained that the school business office initiates some accounts payable processes with invoices, while others are finalized at the town. Also, all benefits are paid through the town budget. Recently, the district facilities director has also taken on townwide facilities responsibilities, managing all buildings in the town. One town official noted that the process of consolidating the town and school facilities department has been “a little convoluted.”

### Budgeting and Budget Process

According to DESE data, the district exceeded net school spending requirements for fiscal year 2024 by $6,640,877, or 96.7 percent. In the previous year, fiscal year 2023, per-pupil funding for the district was $24,266, which is $2,381 higher than the state average of $21,885. The average teacher salary in fiscal year 2023 was $111,213**,** also higher than the state average of $89,576.

According to school committee members and teachers, the district’s budget provides appropriate levels of funding for key instructional resources. Teachers generally agree that they have a lot of resources; one teacher explained, “We’re very lucky. . . . We have a lot at our disposal to help kids,” and another teacher added that the school covers unexpected costs. Parents also noted that teachers can request faculty grants from the PTO for materials or equipment not covered by the school’s budget. Town officials acknowledged, however, that the size and location of the district made the budget vulnerable to funding challenges, explaining that local contractors (such as for transportation) often have a monopoly on the market, which forces the town to accept non-competitive bids.

In addition, town officials noted that substantial out-of-district (OOD) placement costs also contributed to making the budget vulnerable to funding challenges. A town official noted, “When it costs $150,000 to send one student to an out-of-district placement in a district that usually can handle almost anything, then there’s just no hope to pay for things properly.” A district representative explained, in relation to this potential uncertainty, that the district budgets for anticipated out-of-district special education placements and related transportation costs. Specifically, they “budget for [a contingency] in the local budget . . . and also use Circuit Breaker.” In the past, the district had a special education tuition revolving account, but it had been used up. A district leader explained that the district covers unexpected increases through a “legitimate shell game,” where surplus funds from preschool and kindergarten tuition and fees, which are in a revolving account, are used to support those programs, which provides an opportunity to transfer funds from their general fund appropriation that were originally intendent to support preschool and kindergarten (but are no longer needed to support those programs because the surplus funds from the revolving account are being used instead) to fund any potential unanticipated special education expenditures.

District representatives and teachers had different views on the extent to which funds are equitably distributed across the elementary and middle grades. A district representative explained that the budget is “needs-based” and, therefore, is equitable. They went on to say, “We’re true practitioners of program and site-based management. We are trusting that the principals and the directors are coming to us and ensuring that equitability is addressed.” However, elementary school teachers identified inequities in staffing between the elementary and middle grades. A teacher explained,

There is a priority given to maintaining the middle school model. Middle school has four teachers per grade level, regardless of how many students are in that grade level, which means at the elementary school level, our grade levels are constantly shifting how many teachers in order to maintain the four sections. So, there may be four sixth grades with 12 kids in each section because they need an ELA [teacher], they need a science [teacher], they need a social studies [teacher], they need a math [teacher], and they are not willing to adjust that model. And then there may be 20 kids in a first-grade section because we can’t have our teacher back because the model went to middle school. So, I would say between elementary school and middle school, there is an injustice in how that money is allocated.

Another teacher explained that, although the parents advocated for having the four teachers at the middle grades level, their intention was not that this should be at the expense of the elementary grades, “but that’s how it has played out.”

For the most part, the district has a transparent budgeting process. Budget presentation documents and school committee meeting times, agendas, minutes, and recordings are available on the district website. However, the district does not publish an annual budget calendar with critical meeting dates or milestones for the budget. In addition, some teachers and district staff noted that the finalized department budgets are not always clearly communicated to teachers.

According to district and school leaders, the budget process typically begins in September. It starts with the superintendent meeting with all the administrators to identify the needs of the schools, and teachers noted that leaders also ask fairly early on if there are new materials or a big-ticket item they need. School leaders noted that, although there is not a lot of flexibility in funds, they will bring up unanticipated needs and request their addition to the budget that year, if possible. The school business consultant compiles the information from school administrators into an Excel template. At the same time, there are ongoing discussions between the school and the town finance committee. These discussions focus on aligning the school’s needs with the town’s ability to fund them. By December or January, district leaders present the preliminary budget to the school committee for the next year. This happens when there are still unknowns, such as the amount of dollars coming from the state, special education tuition, and changes in personnel. Because of these changes, the district leaders, school committee members, and town officials continue discussions as new information becomes available.

A district leader explained that they do the budgetary work in advance, stating,

The hope is that, when we go to town meeting, the select board, the finance committee, school committee, everybody supports what’s on the table. . . . So, most of the community knows that this thing has been fully vetted and . . . budget conversation is five minutes, and they do the vote.

School committee members also agree that the review and approval process is timely and culminates in easily accessible, publicly available budget material.

District leaders reported that they review previous spending to create the basis for budget requests and evaluate the efficacy of previous investments to make budget decisions, as part of the budgeting process**.** A district leader explained that the budget considers five years of history and the average spending trend and that leaders use a “rule of reasonableness test” to see whether there are variances based on those trends and the average. Budget documents indicate that the district applies for state and federal grants when eligible and that there are systems in place to follow grant terms and requirements in a timely manner. A district leader said that federal and state grants are “all earmarked right at the beginning” so that when grants offset the cost of a particular line item in the budget, the budget documents show this. The school business consultant maintains compliance with the grant terms and requirements by completing all drawdowns and filing the reports. A district representative further explained that the district relies on multiple sources of funds to best serve students. District leaders described being able to absorb previously grant-funded programming into the local budget. District budget documents posted on the district website clearly identify funds associated with grants, student fees, and Circuit Breaker.

The district has a current financial plan for the coming year that incorporates projected enrollment and required staffing, cost-of-living adjustments set in its collective bargaining agreements, and anticipated increases in its service contracts. For example, a district representative explained that teachers’ contracts are currently in negotiations but that a 3-percent cost-of-living increase had been factored into their financial plan and that they “also tucked away a half a percent somewhere just in case.” Financial planning that considers future needs is a strength of the district.

District leaders explained that they are able to monitor funds “because everything needs to be on a purchase order, . . . [which is] a very simple powerful internal control system.” Also, there are internal controls with multiple district and town reviews of both payroll and accounts payable. In addition, the district hires independent financial auditing services each year and implements recommendations from those audits in a timely manner. Effective internal controls are a strength of the district.

There is evidence from school committee meeting minutes and reports from district leaders that the district provides budget updates to the school committee on a regular basis and tracks and adjusts current-year spending. A district leader added that the school business consultant follows the budget and reports to the school committee on the district’s financial performance. According to a school committee member, the school committee monitors the spending of funds by “reviewing warrants, . . . getting regular budget updates to see what categories are running over and under, and, once the books are closed at the end of the year, getting the final report.”

### Operations

Regular school operations such as enrollment and assignment, building and grounds, transportation, nutrition, and technology are somewhat simplified in CPS because the district has one school building. The district’s website provides families with clear, accessible information and makes it easy for families to register for school. Similarly, information regarding transportation (including bus routes and fees), technology, and nutrition is easily accessible through the website and is written for families. Transportation is provided by a vendor, and while there are no fees for elementary school students, the district charges a fee for all 7th and 8th-grade students.

According to a town official, the district has a formal process in place for requesting and responding to maintenance services and other assistance, and regularly reviews its preventative maintenance needs. Specifically, every request must be put in a work order and is tracked. Educators can request maintenance and similar assistance by using an online app through the facilities department. Teachers said making a request is easy, and there is a quick response time. One teacher said, “We have a strong facilities department.” And another agreed saying, “Facilities are amazing.” The formal process for maintenance requests with quick response times is a strength of the district. The Department of Public Works (DPW) is the only department in the town that helps with school facilities. The district and town share the responsibility for snow removal and district staff explained “[DPW will] come out and help move some sand with their big tractors or whatever. But that’s about it.”

In addition, the district has an established process for purchasing supplies and services, using a purchase order system for procurement, in alignment with state laws and effectively manages those contracts with vendors. For some of the larger purchases, such as those related to facilities and technology, the district used state contracts through Operational Services Division (OSD) but most of the purchases are with state-approved vendors and fall under the threshold needed to make a formal bid. Larger contracts (e.g., electricity, transportation) require a signature. Contracts are generally for no more than three years to avoid needing county approval. A town official described clear roles and responsibilities with regard to procurement; the school business manager handles the procurement process when the supply or service is built into the school budget, and the town manager handles it when the supply or service is town funds or is mostly capital.

### Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning

District facilities staff discussed that their district has an efficient system in which the district’s technology and equipment used by the facilities department are “tagged in inventory” to manage and track its inventory of capital assets and critical supplies. When it comes to the replacement or disposal of goods, district staff indicated that their district has a system for tracking these needs. A district leader explained,

They have a list of every piece of equipment on the property. And then when something gets sold, it goes through the proper paperwork. Like we have an old pickup truck. It’s falling apart, but it’s all in a spreadsheet.

The efficient system for managing and tracking inventory of capital assets is a strength of the district.

The district has a capital plan that describes future capital needs, is based on facility assessments, and incorporates input from district stakeholders. Some needs outlined in the five-year plan include wastewater treatment plant repairs, an HVAC upgrade, window replacements, flooring, and school information technology equipment. According to district leaders, for anything building-based, the capital plan incorporates input from school leaders. The facilities director and the network/information technology manager also play a role, as does the town administrator. The school committee reviews the capital plan at the beginning of the year, but they do not circle back or ask many questions because they are very busy with the operating budget, according to one member.

According to a district leader, the town’s municipal facilities committee helps bring the capital plan together. The district submits its needs to the town’s capital plan, and that goes to the town meeting. The town’s five-year capital plan incorporates all capital expenditures for CPS. Both the district and town address capital needs. In some cases, as with replacing elevators, the town will write the scope of work. In other cases, as with the HVAC system, the district leads.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should work with the town to document its practice of sharing services in a written agreement.*
* *The district should establish processes to preserve and destroy documents in alignment with the state’s document retention schedule, and cross-train staff to ensure faithful implementation.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following as part of the district review activities in CPS. The team conducted 30 classroom observations during the week of March 10, 2025, and held interviews and focus groups between March 5 and March 13. 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
* Parents
* Town representatives

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, retention, 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 the DIP and SIP, school committee policies, curriculum documents, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, the district’s professional development plan, the five-year capital plan, and end-of-year financial reports
* All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations
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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.

Three observers visited Carlisle Public Schools during the week of March 11, 2025. Observers conducted 30 observations in a sample of classrooms across one 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\*: 5.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 5.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 5.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 3] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 14] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 30 observations = 5.5

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\*: 6.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 6.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 5.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 2] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 14] + [7 x 10]) ÷ 30 observations = 6.1

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\*: 4.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 4.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 4.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 2] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 30 observations = 4.1

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.[[4]](#footnote-5)

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

Negative Climate District Average\*: 7.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 7.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:   
([7 x 30]) ÷ 30 observations = 7.0

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\*: 6.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 6.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 6.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:   
([5 x 2] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 27]) ÷ 30 observations = 6.8

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\*: 6.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 6.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 6.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 1] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 25]) ÷ 30 observations = 6.8

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\*: 6.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 6.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 20 | 6.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 5.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 2] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 16] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 30 observations = 6.0

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\*: 3.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 3.5 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 4] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 4]) ÷ 13 observations = 3.5

\*\*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\*: 4.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 4.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 17 observations = 4.6

\*\*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\*: 3.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 3.1 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.1 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 2] + [2 x 3] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 3]) ÷ 17 observations = 3.1

\*\*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\*: 3.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 30 | 3.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 2] + [2 x 6] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 30 observations = 3.8

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\*: 3.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 3.8 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 3.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 3] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 13 observations = 3.8

\*\*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\*: 4.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 4.2 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 1] + [2 x 2] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 5]) ÷ 17 observations = 4.2

\*\*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\*: 5.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 5.8 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 5.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 6.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 1] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 17 observations = 5.8

\*\*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 | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | n | Average Scores\* |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 15 | 18 | 29 | 80 | 5.6 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 5.5 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.9 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 42 | 60 | 6.7 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 20 | 6.1 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 3 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 67 | 3.5 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3.5 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.1 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3.1 |
| Quality of Feedback | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.3 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 3.8 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3.0 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **5** | **0** | **7** | **5.6** |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 3] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.5

\*\*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: ([7 x 20]) ÷ 20 observations = 7.0. 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 | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | n | Average Scores\* |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 3 | 30 | 5.3 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 5.6 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 5.9 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 4.4 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 30 | 6.7 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 6.5 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 6.5 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7.0 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 50 | 4.7 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 5.9 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 4.9 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.1 |
| Quality of Feedback | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.7 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 5.0 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 6.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([5 x 4] + [6 x 6]) ÷ 10 observations = 5.6

\*\*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: ([7 x 10]) ÷ 10 observations = 7.0
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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. |
| [New Superintendent Induction Program (NSIP)](https://www.massupt.org/professional-development/annual-programs/new-superintendent-induction-program/) | In partnership with the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, the New Superintendent Induction Program (NSIP) is a three-year professional development program for superintendents in their first 3 years of their position in a Massachusetts school district. The curriculum is aligned to DESE’s Educational Vision and supports new superintendents with developing the skills and competencies to be effective leaders of their school districts. |
| [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. |

\*The Coherence Guidebook may be useful across multiple standard areas including Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support

Table C2. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Early Literacy Observation Tools](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) * [Induction and Mentoring Annual Report](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.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. |
| [Promising Recruitment, Selection and Retention Strategies for a Diverse Massachusetts Teacher Workforce](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsi%2Fdiverse-workforce%2Fteacher-diversification.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | This guidebook provides a framework to help district and school leaders design and implement a teacher diversification strategy to improve student achievement and create equitable learning experiences. |
| [“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 C3. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grants resources. |
| [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. |
| [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 Meals Newsletter](https://us14.list-manage.com/subscribe?u=d8f37d1a90dacd97f207f0b4a&id=d29c4bc847) | Short articles summarizing current events including: changes in federal/state requirements; current grant opportunities; and notable dates. |
| [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. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table D1. Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All Students | 612 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 73 | 11.9 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 2 | 0.3 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 39 | 6.4 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, Not Hispanic or Latino | 57 | 9.3 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 3 | 0.5 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 438 | 71.6 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D2. Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2024-2025

| Group | *N*  (District) | Percentage of High Needs (District) | Percentage of District | *N*  (State) | Percentage of High Needs (State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 118 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 8 | 6.8 | 1.3 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low Income | 30 | 25.4 | 4.9 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 86 | 72.9 | 13.9 | 190,967 | 36.9 | 20.6 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. 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 placements is 617; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 926,057.

Table D3. Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All students | 614 | 10.1 | 7.8 | 6.2 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 22.5 |
| Asian | 70 | 11.5 | 6.7 | 12.9 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 39 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 2.6 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 50 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 2.0 | 20.6 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 450 | 10.8 | 7.4 | 6.0 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 133 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 36 | 9.1 | 15.2 | 5.6 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 8 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 91 | 11.0 | 6.8 | 3.3 | 27.5 |

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

Table D4. Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $11,281,833 | $12,056,751 | $12,415,135 |
| By municipality | $674,598 | $1,210,042 | $1,407,960 |
| Total from local appropriations | $11,956,431 | $13,266,793 | $13,823,095 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $858,746 | $994,577 | $1,000,942 |
| Total expenditures | $12,815,177 | $14,261,370 | $14,824,037 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D5. Chapter 70 State Aid and Net School Spending, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $1,012,143 | $1,028,823 | $1,353,970 |
| Required local contribution | $4,771,528 | $4,766,270 | $5,066,173 |
| Required net school spending b | $5,783,671 | $5,795,093 | $6,420,143 |
| Actual net school spending | $11,440,334 | $12,710,891 | $13,247,784 |
| Over/under required ($) | $5,656,663 | $6,915,798 | $6,827,641 |
| Over/under required (%) | 97.8% | 119.3% | 106.3% |

*Note*. Chapter 70 aid to education from Chapter 70 District Profiles sourced from [Chapter 70 Program - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/default.html) last updated August 8, 2024.

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 D6. Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $683 | $887 | $861 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $823 | $1,100 | $1,156 |
| Teachers | $10,782 | $10,197 | $11,129 |
| Other teaching services | $2,507 | $2,950 | $2,809 |
| Professional development | $97 | $184 | $244 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $901 | $820 | $577 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $572 | $585 | $604 |
| Pupil services | $1,331 | $1,482 | $1,816 |
| Operations and maintenance | $2,033 | $1,996 | $2,126 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $1,022 | $1,754 | $2,124 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $20,750 | $21,955 | $23,446 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.
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Table E1. MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 380 | 70 | 75 | 74 | 39 | 27 | 21 | 22 | 40 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | 49 | 80 | 80 | 84 | 62 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 29 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 30 | 70 | 71 | 67 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 27 | 44 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 22 | 84 | 85 | 91 | 46 | 16 | 9 | 9 | 37 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 274 | 67 | 74 | 73 | 47 | 30 | 23 | 24 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 13 |
| High needs | 95 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 22 | 37 | 33 | 33 | 45 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 33 |
| Low income | 29 | 68 | 52 | 72 | 21 | 27 | 33 | 10 | 45 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 21 | 72 | 68 | 62 | 17 | 21 | 24 | 14 | 43 | 7 | 8 | 24 | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 62 | 41 | 42 | 39 | 11 | 47 | 39 | 42 | 40 | 12 | 19 | 19 | 50 |

Table E2. MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 379 | 72 | 74 | 80 | 41 | 26 | 21 | 18 | 42 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 30 |
| Asian | 49 | 81 | 86 | 82 | 71 | 15 | 8 | 18 | 23 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 30 | 63 | 64 | 70 | 20 | 38 | 29 | 30 | 48 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/ Latino | 22 | 87 | 91 | 95 | 47 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 37 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 273 | 70 | 72 | 81 | 49 | 27 | 23 | 16 | 40 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 11 |
| High needs | 94 | 50 | 43 | 52 | 23 | 40 | 38 | 38 | 48 | 10 | 18 | 10 | 28 |
| Low income | 29 | 38 | 23 | 55 | 21 | 54 | 59 | 38 | 49 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 21 | 69 | 68 | 52 | 21 | 28 | 20 | 38 | 46 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 61 | 40 | 33 | 43 | 13 | 49 | 41 | 43 | 43 | 12 | 27 | 15 | 44 |

Table E3. MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 130 | 83 | 80 | 81 | 42 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 38 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | 16 | 100 | 80 | 75 | 64 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 8 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | 82 | 81 | — | 49 | 18 | 6 | — | 34 | 0 | 13 | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 95 | 81 | 82 | 81 | 51 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 36 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 12 |
| High needs | 32 | 75 | 52 | 63 | 24 | 19 | 37 | 25 | 44 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 32 |
| Low income | 9 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 9 | 82 | — | — | 17 | 18 | — | — | 41 | 0 | — | — | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 18 | 70 | 44 | 61 | 15 | 22 | 39 | 28 | 38 | 9 | 17 | 11 | 46 |

Table E4. MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 60 | 75 | 66 | 77 | 42 | 25 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 18 |
| 4 | 57 | 65 | 71 | 61 | 37 | 32 | 28 | 33 | 45 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 19 |
| 5 | 71 | 65 | 61 | 68 | 38 | 33 | 34 | 31 | 46 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 16 |
| 6 | 61 | 70 | 88 | 80 | 40 | 28 | 10 | 18 | 35 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 25 |
| 7 | 70 | 78 | 83 | 74 | 36 | 17 | 13 | 20 | 42 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 22 |
| 8 | 61 | 70 | 77 | 85 | 43 | 27 | 14 | 11 | 34 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 24 |
| 3-8 | 380 | 70 | 75 | 74 | 39 | 27 | 21 | 22 | 40 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 21 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 57 | — | — | — | 31 | — | — | — | 12 |

Table E5. MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 58 | 57 | 50 | 84 | 44 | 39 | 41 | 14 | 35 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 20 |
| 4 | 58 | 75 | 80 | 74 | 46 | 23 | 19 | 21 | 38 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 16 |
| 5 | 71 | 76 | 66 | 70 | 40 | 23 | 32 | 30 | 46 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| 6 | 61 | 77 | 86 | 79 | 40 | 19 | 10 | 20 | 43 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 17 |
| 7 | 70 | 82 | 75 | 87 | 37 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 44 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 19 |
| 8 | 61 | 66 | 80 | 84 | 38 | 32 | 10 | 13 | 42 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 19 |
| 3-8 | 379 | 72 | 74 | 80 | 41 | 26 | 21 | 18 | 42 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 13 |

Table E6. MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 70 | 81 | 78 | 81 | 45 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 36 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 20 |
| 8 | 60 | 85 | 81 | 80 | 39 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 41 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 130 | 83 | 80 | 81 | 42 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 38 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 20 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 40 | — | — | — | 11 |

Table E7. MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 307 | 54 | 58 | 58 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | 37 | 62 | 58 | 59 | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 24 | — | 58 | 59 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 20 | 56 | 64 | 60 | 51 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 221 | 53 | 58 | 58 | 50 |
| High needs | 78 | 54 | 55 | 53 | 48 |
| Low income | 22 | — | — | 59 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 18 | 55 | 58 | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 50 | 52 | 53 | 50 | 45 |

Table E8. MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 309 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | 37 | 65 | 66 | 59 | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 24 | — | 62 | 59 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 20 | 58 | 57 | 55 | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 223 | 57 | 57 | 60 | 50 |
| High needs | 79 | 59 | 56 | 59 | 48 |
| Low income | 23 | — | — | 69 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 18 | 66 | 65 | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 51 | 56 | 53 | 56 | 46 |

Table E9. MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 54 | 54 | 63 | 57 | 50 |
| 5 | 69 | 46 | 43 | 43 | 50 |
| 6 | 60 | 54 | 57 | 75 | 50 |
| 7 | 67 | 55 | 71 | 55 | 50 |
| 8 | 57 | 60 | 57 | 63 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 307 | 54 | 58 | 58 | 50 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 50 |

Table E10. MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 54 | 56 | 71 | 78 | 50 |
| 5 | 69 | 50 | 45 | 43 | 50 |
| 6 | 61 | 74 | 67 | 77 | 50 |
| 7 | 68 | 66 | 55 | 51 | 50 |
| 8 | 57 | 49 | 52 | 52 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 309 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 50 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 50 |

Table E11. In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 611 | 0.6 | 0.7 | — | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 70 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 39 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 50 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 447 | 0.9 | — | — | 1.1 |
| High needs | 141 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Low income | 35 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 8 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 99 | — | — | — | 2.4 |

Table E12. Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 611 | 1.1 | 0.8 | — | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 70 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 39 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 50 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 447 | 1.3 | — | — | 1.5 |
| High needs | 141 | — | — | — | 3.6 |
| Low income | 35 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 8 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 99 | — | — | — | 4.5 |

Table E13. Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall  classification | Reason for classification |
| District | 92 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Carlisle School | 92 | 98 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding 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 available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.docx>. [↑](#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 2025). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. 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-5)
5. Column headings for Tables E1-E6: M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)