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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 Concord Public Schools and Concord-Carlisle Regional School District (hereafter, CPS and CCRSD, respectively) in April and May 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 and CCRSD during the week of April 14, 2025. The observers conducted 84 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 districts. 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)

CPS and CCRSD are led by one superintendent. Although CPS is considered a department of the Town of Concord, whereas CCRSD operates independently from the towns, the districts share and maintain unified leadership structures, including a shared central office team. Both school committees have a collaborative and engaged working relationship with the superintendent and are actively involved in advancing the districts’ diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) efforts and addressing disparities in student achievements; their role in this work includes advocating for resource allocation that supports equity initiatives and tracking equity goals in a dashboard. The districts have distributed leadership structures that engage central office and school-based leaders in shared decision-making related to a variety of topics, including staffing, budget, professional development, and instructional priorities.

The districts share a strategic plan that identifies well-being and mental health, multiple paths to success, an inclusive culture, and an innovative environment as their overarching strategic objectives. A wide variety of district and school community members were engaged in crafting these objectives through the strategic planning process, which included a 50-member strategic planning committee, feedback surveys, and focus groups. Furthermore, the strategic plan actively informs school decision-making and includes equity priorities to address disparate outcomes.

CPS and CCRSD have separate teachers’ associations that operate independently of one another, but both have a positive relationship with the superintendent. The districts have effectively navigated contract negotiations directly with their teachers’ associations, without outside counsel, which is a strength of the districts’ culture. The districts have also been responsive to emerging student needs. For example, when the districts faced an unexpected influx of migrant families, they connected with districts with large English Learner populations for advice and recruited members of the community to address students’ language needs. The districts have some strategies in place to engage stakeholders, such as the superintendent’s monthly drop-in meetings for staff and her weekly newsletter for staff and families. However, some staff members’ lack of comfort in these meetings and parents’ desire for more consistent communication from teachers suggest that there could be greater consistency and openness in communication between the superintendent and teachers and teachers and parents.

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

The districts’ director of human resources, human resources specialist, and human resources assistant are responsible for the districts’ human resources functions. The districts’ human resources infrastructure uses integrated technology systems to effectively support human resources functions such as personnel management, recruitment, and data security. The districts also maintain accessible platforms for sharing human resources policies, procedures, and resources, such as the districts’ joint website and the employee handbook. In addition, the districts review staffing data, such as which positions attract fewer applicants and where applicants are coming from, and analyze trends to inform strategic planning.

Relatedly, the districts use intentional recruitment practices aimed at diversifying their workforce, including partnering with a local university, providing stipends for teachers to participate in a committee focused on diversifying the applicant pool, and prioritizing candidates whose lived experience mirrors those of students. Despite these efforts, diversifying the workforce remains a goal for district leaders. After candidates are hired, the districts use data to guide educator assignments and support equitable staffing across grade levels and content areas. District records indicate that educator evaluations are consistently completed, but do not consistently articulate areas for improvement. In addition, administrator evaluations do not consistently include feedback for administrators that articulates strengths and areas for improvement. Staff are provided with advancement opportunities, such as tuition reimbursement and leadership roles, and there are staff recognition programs. In addition, the districts foster staff satisfaction through their supportive working environment, which includes a wellness program and morale-building activities. Furthermore, the districts’ teacher retention rates are consistently high and exceed the state averages.

In recent years, the districts have begun efforts to promote consistency between principals and department heads in instructional walkthroughs. However, these efforts have not yet resulted in a consistent districtwide approach to conducting and providing feedback based on instructional walkthroughs. There are structured districtwide professional development offerings on a variety of relevant topics. However, school-based staff expressed a desire for more professional development time at the secondary level. For educators new to the districts or to the profession, there is a multilayered system of support that includes the formal mentorship program and the district-run Concord Fellows professional development series.

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

The districts share an office of finance and operations comprising well-qualified staff. Both districts have strong relationships with town officials that have been facilitated through regular communication. The districts have a transparent budget process that involves multiple stakeholders and includes data reviews. However, improving communication about how teacher/principal and department head requests are evaluated is an area for growth. Both districts exceeded net school spending and state averages for per-pupil spending in fiscal year 2024. Furthermore, the districts engage in effective grant management and sustainability planning.

The districts have strong procurement practices, including using purchase orders for small purchases and a formal bidding process for larger purchases. They also have strong contract oversight, which involves establishing timelines to proactively track the end of contracts. The districts also have an efficient system for actively monitoring and managing their inventory of assets and supplies. CPS has a 10-year capital plan focused on improving outdoor spaces; however, CCRSD does not appear to have a formal, multiyear capital plan, though the district plans to conduct a facility review over the next two years.

## Concord Public Schools and Concord-Carlisle Regional School District: 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 advancing 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 and CCRSD occurred during the weeks of April 14 and May 19, 2025. The site visit included 12 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 52 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with six elementary school teachers, six middle school teachers, and 10 high school teachers, as well as one family focus group with 13 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 and CCRSD completed two district questionnaires and five of five principal questionnaires.

The site team also conducted 84 observations of classroom instruction in five schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

The towns of Concord and Carlisle are located northwest of Boston, and both border each other and the towns of Acton and Bedford; in addition, Concord borders the towns of Maynard, Sudbury, Lincoln, and Wayland, and Carlisle borders the towns of Billerica, Westford, and Chelmsford. According to [census data](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlisletownmiddlesexcountymassachusetts,concordtownmiddlesexcountymassachusetts,MA/PST045223), Concord’s and Carlisle’s median incomes from 2019 to 2023 were $212,000 and more than $250,000, respectively, which are above the state median income of $101,341. In 2023, Concord had an estimated 18,086 residents, and Carlisle had an estimated 5,192.

The superintendent of CPS and CCRSD is Dr. Laurie Hunter, who was appointed in 2017 and leads one central office team that oversees both districts. Governance of CPS is through a school committee composed of five members who are elected for three-year terms, and governance of CCRSD is through a school committee composed of the five CPS school committee members and two (out of five) of the Carlisle Public Schools school committee members. Throughout the report, when referring to CPS and CCRSD collectively, the report uses the term *districts*. When referring to one district or the other, the report names the specific district.

CPS serves students in Grades PK-8, and CCRSD serves students in Grades 9-12. In addition to the students graduating from Concord Middle School, students who graduate from the Carlisle School (in Carlisle Public Schools) feed into CCRSD; Carlisle Public Schools is overseen by a separate superintendent and received [its own district review in 2025](https://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/nolevel/2025-0051.docx).

In the 2024-2025 school year, CPS served 1,914 students and CCRSD served 1,191 students, for a total of 3,105 students. Since the 2020-2021 school year, total enrollment has decreased by 212 students (decreased by 87 in CPS and 125 in CCRSD). Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for the 2024-2025 school year.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| Alcott Elementary School (CPS) | Elementary | PK-5 | 438 |
| Thoreau Elementary School (CPS) | Elementary | PK-5 | 401 |
| Willard Elementary School (CPS) | Elementary | PK-5 | 432 |
| Concord Middle School (CPS) | Middle | 6-8 | 643 |
| Concord-Carlisle High School | High | 9-12 | 1,191 |
|  |  | Total | 3,105 |

Figure 1 shows the distribution of CPS and CCRSD (aggregated) students’ race/ethnicity, and Figure 2 shows the percentage of students in selected groups in the districts compared with the state. 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 CPS and CCRSD Students, by Race/Ethnicity (2024-2025)

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

Figure 3 shows the percentage of CPS and CCRSD’s students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), compared with the statewide percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on MCAS. In 2024, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher for CCRSD than for the state in Grade 10 (ELA, mathematics, science), and higher for CPS than for the state in Grades 3-8 ELA and mathematics and Grades 5 and 8 science.

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

CPS and CCRSD’s High Needs students, who comprise 28 percent of the districts, met or exceeded expectations on the 2024 MCAS assessments at rates 13 percentage points to 28 percentage points higher than High Needs students across the state (see Figure 4). See MCAS data for additional student groups in Appendix E.

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

CCRSD’s 2023 four-year cohort graduation rate (97.4 percent) was 8.2 percentage points above the state rate (89.2 percent), and the dropout rate (0.2 percent) was 1.9 percentage points below the state rate (2.1 percent).

Of students who graduated from CCRSD in 2021-2022, 86 percent went on to attend a college or university by March 2023, which is 23.6 percentage points above the state rate of 62.4 percent. In addition, 1.5 percent of 2022-2023 graduates planned on entering the workforce or an apprenticeship after high school, compared with 13.8 percent of students across the state.

In 2024 statewide accountability results, both districts and all of their schools were classified as not requiring assistance or intervention via the state’s district and school accountability system, in which they were meeting or exceeding their targets.

In fiscal year 2023, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for CPS was $25,217 and for CCRSD was $24,518, which is $5,527 more for CPS and $699 less for CCRSD than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($19,690 for CPS and $25,214 for CCRSD). In districts of similar wealth in fiscal year 2023, the total in-district per-pupil expenditures for CPS and CCRSD were $2,903 and $1,384 more, respectively, than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures ($22,314 for both CPS and CCRSD).[[3]](#footnote-4) In-district per-pupil expenditures for CPS were $3,961 more and for CCRSD were $3,262 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 in both CPS and CCRSD, as shown in Table D5 in Appendix D.

### Classroom Observations

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited CPS and CCRSD during the week of April 14, 2025. The observers conducted 84 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the districts. 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 and CCRSD, ratings are provided across three grade bands: K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. For each grade band, ratings are provided across the overarching domains as well as at individual dimensions within those domains. Figure 5 shows average ratings, by domain, for each grade band. The full report of findings from observations conducted in CPS and CCRSD is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

Figure 5. CPS and CCRSD CLASS Domain Averages by Grade Band

Overall, for every grade band, instructional observations provide strong evidence of classroom organization, generally strong evidence of emotional support and student engagement   
(Grades 4-12), 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 and CCRSD.

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) | * The school committees play an active role in advancing diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) and addressing disparities in student achievement. * Working relationships between the superintendent and school committee members are collaborative and engaged. * The districts use distributed leadership structures, which engage central office and school-based leaders in shared decision making. |  |
| [Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring](#_Strategic_Planning,_Implementation,) | * The districts engaged a broad range of district and school community members in developing the strategic plan. * The strategic plan actively informs district and school-level decision making. * Equity priorities are embedded throughout the districts’ strategic plan, including targeted efforts to address racial and socioeconomic disparities. |  |
| [District Culture](#_District_Culture) | * The districts are responsive to emerging student needs. * The districts have effectively navigated contract negotiations directly with their respective teachers’ associations. | * Improving consistency and openness in communication between the superintendent and teachers and teachers and parents |

### Leadership and Governing Structures

Dr. Laurie Hunter, the superintendent of schools for CPS and CCRSD since 2017, leads the districts with the support of the shared central office team, which includes the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, the interim assistant superintendent of teaching and learning, the director of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB), the director of student services, the director of transportation, the director of information technology services, and the director of human resources. The leadership team includes the superintendent, assistant superintendents, director of DEIB, and the principals of all five schools: Alcott, Thoreau, and Willard Elementary Schools; Concord Middle School; and Concord-Carlisle High School.

CPS is considered a department of the Town of Concord and falls under its financial reporting structure, although there is no written agreement addressing the Town of Concord’s role in CPS. In contrast, CCRSD is autonomous and, according to town officials, operates “completely independent of the towns in terms of governance.”

Despite these differences, the superintendent leading CPS and CCRSD maintains unified leadership structures across the two districts. This includes a shared central office team, a shared strategic plan, and shared leadership team meetings. The superintendent explained,

I run a united leadership team, so we act like we’re K-12, but we are not technically on paper – the high school has its own budget, has its own DESE code, has its own school committee, [and its own teacher’s association]… it’s its own separate entity, but because I am the superintendent of both, I think holistically and we operate as if we are one.

The districts’ leadership team works closely with both the CPS and CCRSD school committees. The CPS school committee consists of five elected members from Concord, and the CCRSD school committee consists of these five members, along with two members elected from Carlisle. The CCRSD school committee also has three student representatives from Concord-Carlisle High School. The school committees establish and oversee district policies, evaluate and support the superintendent, and make budgetary decisions that align with district priorities.

During interviews and focus groups, school committee members described their active role in advancing DEIB and addressing disparities in student achievement, which is another strength of the districts. Members emphasized their role in communicating the districts’ educational vision and advocating for resources to meet student needs. “We really consider ourselves not only advocates but ambassadors for the school district,” one member stated. In fulfilling this role, the school committees, in collaboration with Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunities (METCO) representatives, set SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely), actionable, and reasonable goals based on the district and school improvement plans, including objectives related to equity. The school committees monitor these goals using a shared data dashboard that they regularly update and review, which facilitates data-informed decision-making to address equity and student achievement. Members explained how disaggregated data from MCAS, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), and METCO participation inform resource allocation and policy decisions to support historically underserved student groups. For example, school committee members explained how they supported funding for the Calculus Project – a nonprofit that offers math preparatory courses in the summer and math tutoring during the school year to students of color - because data showed that students of color were taking advanced courses at a lower rate than the general population.

Collaborative and engaged working relationships between the superintendent and school committee members are a strength of the districts. The superintendent stated, “They [the school committee members] are very much advocates for the schools, very much supporters of the work that we do and the value that we have in the community.” Committee members described ongoing communication with the superintendent, with one member noting that recommendations brought forward are “robust, well thought out, researched . . . always coming back to some kind of initiative or pinpoint that has been brought to her.” The superintendent stated, “They hold me very accountable for where they want to see us go and expect me to be able to report out on that.”

The districts’ distributed leadership structures, which engage central office and school-based leaders in shared decision making, are a strength. The leadership team makes decisions related to staffing, budget, professional development, and instructional priorities during weekly meetings, in which school leaders meet with the superintendent, assistant superintendents, and the director of DEIB to review priorities and monitor progress. Meeting agendas for 2024-2025 included topics such as strategic planning, reviewing MCAS and accountability data, program evaluation, K-12 literacy, DESE review preparation, Panorama survey results, METCO programming, DEIB initiatives, Title IX compliance, and fiscal planning. The superintendent described the team that participates in these meetings as “a really cohesive group” and stated, “We really function very much as one district even though, technically, it’s two. We’re always working as a team.” School committee members also referenced these meetings, describing participation by district leaders, principals, and, on occasion, assistant principals. School leaders also described positive and collaborative working relationships with the districts’ leadership. They reported that district leaders meet regularly with principals to review data, discuss instructional priorities, and monitor progress on district initiatives. One school leader explained, “There’s a lot of access. . . . We can call, email, and we have standing meetings.” Another leader added, “I’ve never had a time where I couldn’t get an answer or help.” School leaders described district leaders as responsive to staffing, scheduling, and operational needs as they arise and noted collaborative work in reviewing data to support student progress monitoring and instructional decision making.

Each school’s leadership team typically includes the principal, assistant principal(s), and key instructional staff such as teacher leaders or department heads—who receive stipends and a reduced teaching load, serve up to two three-year terms, and are selected through a contract-defined process involving administrative recommendation. In some schools, instructional coaches and student support staff also participate in leadership planning and decision making, depending on the school’s size and needs. One principal noted that they meet weekly as an administrative team and also hold more informal weekly check-ins, describing the structure as “very consistent and very supportive.”

District and school leaders described structures for engaging parents and advisory groups in the districts’ decision making. Required advisory bodies such as the Special Education Parent Advisory Council and the English Learner Parent Advisory Council meet regularly to provide input and advocate for student needs. Family focus group participants described strong parent engagement through parent teacher groups, school councils, and advisory groups. One parent shared, “We feel like we can give input and be part of conversations,” whereas others referenced consistent communication from school and district leaders, with one parent noting, “The communication from the district has been consistent and helpful.”

### Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring

The 2023-2028 Strategic Plan (shared between both districts) defines the mission of CPS and CCRSD to “educate all students as lifelong learners, caring citizens, and responsible contributors in our increasingly diverse global society.” Its vision emphasizes students actively seeking varied pathways to achieve their potential, finding joy in learning, and embracing responsibilities within local and global communities. These guiding statements, along with core values of belonging, excellence, engagement, inclusion, and innovation, demonstrate the districts’ priorities.

The 2023-2028 Strategic Plan identifies four strategic objectives that guide districts’ planning: Multiple Paths to Success, Well-Being and Mental Health, Inclusive Culture, and Innovative Environment. According to the superintendent, these priorities reflect the districts’ focus on “student well-being and mental health, cultural competency and inclusion, and innovation and facilities.”

The districts’ engagement of a broad range of district and school community members in developing their strategic plan is a strength. To create the strategic plan using DESE’s Planning for Success model, the districts convened a strategic planning committee and brought in a facilitator from DESE to support the planning process. District leaders and school committee members noted that this committee, led by the assistant superintendent, involved more than 50 active members—including staff, administrators, families, students, and community representatives—and met multiple times to develop a shared vision and establish the districts’ priorities. District leaders noted that school leaders gathered additional feedback through surveys and focus groups. After school leaders gathered these data and the committee developed priorities, the district leadership team met to refine the plan to promote cohesiveness.

The strategic plan actively informs district and school-level decision making, which reflects another strength. District leaders described regularly using the plan to inform agenda items for leadership team meetings, data reviews, and progress monitoring processes. The school committee also plays an active role in this work by using a dashboard—an Excel document stored on Google Drive—to track SMART goals in key areas such as student achievement, community outreach, budgeting, and school committee operations. The dashboard is updated regularly and shared with the public, typically as an attachment to meeting materials, in compliance with open meeting laws. The school committee noted, “We project manage our goals really strong[ly]. . . . Every other meeting we did a dashboard review and talked about what’s in the way. And all of that was guided . . . [by] school improvement plans, MCAS scores, YRBS results.” Multiple data sources, as outlined in the districts’ 2023-2028 Strategic Plan, inform ongoing progress monitoring processes. These include MCAS, STAR, ACCESS, Advanced Placement enrollment, SAT/ACT results, YRBS, Panorama surveys, and disaggregated staff recruitment data. Progress toward the districts’ goals is shared regularly with the school committees during public meetings and with families and the broader community through superintendent updates, public presentations, and annual reports.

Equity priorities are embedded throughout the districts’ strategic plan, including targeted efforts to address racial and socioeconomic disparities, which indicates a strength of the districts’ planning efforts. School committee members described resource allocation decisions that support equity initiatives, including the Calculus Project, the role of director of DEIB, and expanded access to honors-level courses. According to one school committee member, “What we put money behind is a strong indicator of where our focus is.” The 2022-2027 DEIB Strategic Plan was developed following equity audits, DEIB roundtables, and input from students, families, and staff gathered between 2021 and 2022, and it was used to inform later strategic planning. As described in the DEIB plan, a 19-member DEIB strategic planning committee—composed of school committee members, administrators, faculty, staff, parents, and students—met regularly to assess findings from various data collection opportunities and collaboratively draft the plan’s mission, objectives, and monitoring processes. District leaders reported that DEIB efforts are embedded across multiple areas of the districts’ practice, including hiring, curriculum, professional development, and student leadership. The DEIB plan includes clear objectives, action steps, and accountability measures across multiple areas, including culturally responsive curricula, inclusive hiring practices, professional development, student engagement, restorative justice practices, and institutional accountability.

District leaders reported that the initial implementation of Open Architects, a platform that brings together student, human resources, and financial data into a single portal to support system-level analysis, has begun to inform district-level conversations. According to the vendor’s website, the platform allows school and district leaders to view student assessment scores, monitor staff attendance, and track spending progress in one location. The superintendent explained, “We’ve started dabbling with Open Architect [*sic*]. It has allowed us to benchmark a little bit more carefully against other districts. But we’re still very much at the early stages with it.” Although full implementation is still in development, district leaders noted that the platform may support deeper analysis of student group performance and resource allocation over time.

School improvement plans closely align with the districts’ 2023-2028 Strategic Plan and reflect shared priorities across schools. School committee members agree that the school improvement plans fit in with the districts’ strategic plan in a way that is “seamless.” As described in the school improvement plan documents, school-based goals address student well-being, academic achievement, inclusive practices, and innovation, closely aligning with the districts’ overarching strategic objectives. School leaders described reviewing school improvement plans for alignment with both the districts’ strategic plan and DEIB plan. Teachers also confirmed this alignment, with one teacher noting that “the school improvement plan is created through our admin at a building level and that usually ties directly to the district strategic plan.”

District and school leaders attend leadership team meetings (described in the Leadership and Governing Structures section) to review progress on improvement goals. The superintendent conducts formal check-ins with principals at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to review benchmark assessment data that inform progress toward strategic plan goals. These are complemented by regularly scheduled leadership meetings, in which data are reviewed and outcomes are discussed collaboratively. In addition, school improvement plans are reviewed and discussed in school advisory councils, faculty meetings, and school committee meetings, providing multiple avenues for collective input and accountability. Teachers reported that school improvement plan updates also are shared through school committee meetings, which are broadcast publicly, and through communications from school leaders to families.

### District Culture

The districts have effectively navigated contract negotiations directly with their respective teachers’ associations, which is a strength of the districts’ culture. CPS and CCRSD have separate teachers’ associations that operate independently of one another; negotiations and regular meetings with the superintendent are separate for the two districts. However, teachers’ association representatives from both districts noted that both associations have a similarly positive relationship with the superintendent. During interviews, the superintendent described the districts’ approach to collective bargaining, stating, “We have eight bargaining units [across CPS and CCRSD]. And we do not use counsel at the table. So that’s pretty unusual. It speaks to the culture and the relationships.” During focus groups, teachers similarly described the relationship as collegial and respectful. One noted that not using outside counsel “speaks volumes to the fact that we do have good relationships with the administration because we’re able to sit down and do it directly.”

District leaders also highlighted the stability of leadership as a contributing factor to sustaining district culture. According to DESE’s staffing retention data, the districts retained the superintendent and all six principals in 2025 (Concord-Carlisle High School has two co-principals). In 2023 and 2024, the districts retained the superintendent and all but one principal each year. Teacher retention also remained consistently high for both districts across multiple years (see the Staffing section).

The districts’ responsiveness to emerging student needs is another strength. In particular, leaders referenced the districts’ response to newly arrived migrant families and the efforts made to meet the needs of these students. The superintendent explained, “We had to build structures up really on a dime. . . . It’s been really a labor of love and a lot of challenge and a lot of growth for us.” To build capacity for supporting English Learners, the superintendent explained that they connected with districts with large English Learner populations for advice. A school committee member confirmed the districts’ swift response to support newcomers—many with limited or no prior schooling—and praised their efforts to learn from other districts with similar populations to inform instructional and programmatic decisions. Another district leader shared an example in which the districts recruited parents from the shelter community to work in schools, particularly those who could support communication with students and families in their home languages. This effort helped bridge cultural and linguistic gaps by involving adults who shared similar lived experiences with the students (see the Staffing section).

The districts have some strategies in place for engaging a variety of stakeholders, such as the superintendent’s monthly drop-in meetings for staff and her weekly newsletter for staff and families. However, focus group responses suggest there could be more consistent and open communication between the superintendent and teachers, and teachers and parents, which is an area for growth. For example, while the superintendent offers voluntary monthly drop-in meetings for school staff, some teachers raised concerns about the level of comfort and openness during these meetings. During a focus group, one teacher shared,

Initially, the response was really strong. People wanted to go, and they wanted to be part of the conversation. Now that we’ve been doing it for a few months, I think, at some buildings, it’s kind of fizzled out. . . . The feedback that I’ve gotten from [teachers] is that since the building administrators also show up to that meeting, it can be kind of awkward to talk honestly about issues that they’re having because they don’t necessarily feel comfortable bringing it up in front of their principals and supervisors and the people doing their supervision and evaluation.

In addition, although parents have opportunities for providing input and receive consistent communication at the district and school levels (see Leadership and Governing Structures), parents agreed that on a classroom level, communication from teachers about their child’s performance is inconsistent and depends on the teacher; one parent noted that this inconsistency highlighted a “lack of institutional approach” to parent communication on a classroom level.

### Recommendations

* *The district should review the structure for the superintendent’s monthly drop-in meetings and consider holding separate sessions for teachers and building leaders.*
* *The district should work with its school leaders to establish consistent expectations for teachers around communicating students’ progress with their families.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

This section examines the extent to which the districts have 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 districts use 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 and CCRSD.

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,) | * The districts effectively use integrated technology systems to support personnel management, recruitment, and data security. * The districts maintain accessible platforms for sharing human resources policies, procedures, and resources. * The districts analyze staffing trends to inform long-term strategic planning. |  |
| [Staffing](#_Staffing) | * There are intentional recruitment practices, with focused efforts to diversify the workforce. * The districts use data to guide educator assignment and support equitable staffing across grade levels and content areas. * The districts provide staff advancement opportunities and recognition programs. * The districts have consistently high teacher retention rates that exceed state averages. * The districts foster a supportive working environment that contributes to staff satisfaction and well-being. | * Diversifying the educator workforce * Consistently articulating areas for improvement for all teachers in the educator evaluation process to encourage continuous development * Consistently including feedback for administrators, naming their strengths and areas for improvement |
| [Professional Learning](#_Professional_Learning) | * There is a well-established, multilayered system of support for new educators. | * Ensuring a consistent approach to conducting and providing feedback based on instructional walkthroughs * Providing sufficient time for professional development at the secondary level |

### Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices

The director of human resources, who has served in the role for five years, oversees both districts’ human resources functions. The human resources office includes a human resources specialist and a human resources assistant. The assistant primarily manages onboarding processes and credential verification, whereas the specialist handles leaves of absence, insurance, and workers’ compensation. Both staff members set up new hires in district systems and help them gain access to their district email. During interviews, a district leader noted that the specialist can “do all the things that [the director of human resources] can’t do when [she is not in her] office,” reflecting the collaborative nature of the team.

To support these responsibilities, the human resources team uses a suite of electronic systems to manage personnel records and streamline employee access to essential information. The use of integrated technology systems—including Infinite Visions, Frontline, and SchoolSpring—to support personnel management, recruitment, and data security is a strength of the districts’ human resources infrastructure. The districts use Infinite Visions as their primary system for managing personnel records and employee information. Staff can access pay stubs, W-2s, benefits, and leave balances through a web-based employee portal set up during onboarding. Following a previous data breach, district leaders transitioned Infinite Visions from a vendor-hosted cloud platform to an internally managed server. The office of finance and operations manages system access by assigning permissions based on job responsibilities. District leaders collaboratively mapped out the appropriate access levels for each role. For example, staff who submit requests can view their submission status but cannot approve or access subsequent steps in the process. This role-based access structure supports secure recordkeeping and protects sensitive personnel data.

The districts use additional electronic systems to support staffing oversight and recruitment. Frontline enables the districts to track and control staffing positions, allowing administrators to view staff lists by department or subject area and to complete educator evaluations. SchoolSpring serves as the districts’ primary recruitment platform, offering a user-friendly interface for posting vacancies and collecting applications. Job postings on the districts’ joint website link directly to SchoolSpring, which also pushes listings to external sites such as Indeed, Google Jobs, and Salary.com. To strengthen its efforts to attract a diverse candidate pool, the human resources office also posts job openings on LinkedIn and shares them with regional networks such as the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity in Education.

The districts maintain accessible platforms for sharing human resources policies, procedures, and resources, which is a strength. The Human Resources section of the districts’ joint website offers information on employment opportunities, licensure, benefits, and contracts. In addition to accessing online resources, staff receive an employee handbook that is updated annually. The handbook outlines expectations for professional conduct, discrimination and harassment policies, mandatory trainings (e.g., antibullying, Title IX), employee benefits, leave policies, safety procedures, and evaluation protocols. It also details key operational guidelines such as reporting absences, using personal devices, and maintaining student confidentiality.

Building on these expectations, the districts follow a multistep process to resolve staff conflicts and grievances. The employee handbook outlines expectations for respectful and professional conduct, and during interviews, district and school leaders explained that conflict resolution typically begins with informal efforts. The human resources office encourages staff to address concerns directly with colleagues or through their union representatives. As one district leader noted, “[Human resources staff] will ask . . . have you worked with your union? Have you been able to sit down with the individual? Do they even know that you’re upset about this?” Similarly, focus group responses suggest that the teachers’ associations aim to “handle things at the lowest level first” and often resolve concerns in collaboration with building leaders.

When issues require formal intervention, human resources asks staff to submit concerns in writing and initiates next steps, which may include involving the superintendent, launching an investigation, or placing an employee on paid administrative leave. Human resources then facilitates interviews and makes recommendations to the superintendent, who determines the outcome. Accounts from interview respondents suggest that when matters do escalate, these steps are focused on arriving at reasonable solutions to problems and productive paths forward. According to one interviewee, “[Staff] are able to just sit down and talk it through with HR [human resources] or the superintendent.”

Beyond resolving individual cases, the districts also analyze staffing trends to inform long-term strategic planning, which is another strength. District leaders shared that they review applicant pool data to evaluate outreach effectiveness and identify trends in hiring. For example, they examine where candidates are coming from, which positions attract fewer applicants, and where diversity is lacking. One district leader noted, “We pull from the applicant pools and try to figure out, are we reaching the right people? Where are we lacking?” These insights help inform future recruitment strategies, especially for roles that are difficult to fill. The superintendent added that the districts use staffing data to make broader strategic decisions: “When we’re planning for staffing needs or thinking about where to shift resources, we’re looking at what’s happened in the past and what that tells us.”

### Staffing

The districts demonstrate a strength in their intentional recruitment practices, particularly efforts to diversify their workforce. The superintendent described the districts as “very intentional” about these efforts and shared that the districts participate in regional job fairs, post on platforms focused on diverse hiring, and have built partnerships with organizations such as Framingham State University to build educator pipelines. Through this partnership, the districts plan to implement a paid internship model for student teachers, and teachers who serve as mentors will also receive stipends. In addition, the CCRSD teachers’ association has played a direct role in advancing these efforts. At the bargaining table, CCRSD union leaders proposed to be part of the district’s outreach and recruitment planning, resulting in dedicated stipends (memorialized in the contract) for participating in a committee that designs and implements strategies, such as attending hiring events and visiting graduate schools, to build a network of diverse candidates. One district leader noted, “I was really proud when they brought it to us.” Representatives from the teachers’ association affirmed this shared commitment, stating,

[We] brought to the table a . . . very detailed proposal . . . about recruiting and retaining a more diverse and representative [workforce] . . . and the district supported it. The school committee absolutely supported it. . . . So, I see that as very positive, and it certainly shows the commitment on the part of the school committee and [district leaders].

District leaders noted that they also prioritize candidates whose lived experiences mirror those of students, as part of these efforts. In response to the arrival of newcomer students residing in a local shelter, for example, the districts intentionally recruited and hired parents from that population to support language needs and provide cultural understanding in school settings. According to an article in *the Concord Bridge*, these parents were hired for custodial and classroom support staff positions. “There’s a lot of thought put into it,” the district leader explained. “It’s an intentional movement more often than not to make sure the students are comfortable.”

Despite targeted recruitment efforts, further diversifying the educator workforce is an area for growth. In 2023-2024, 8.7 percent of CCRSD students identified as Asian, whereas only 3.1 percent of CCRSD teachers identified as Asian, and 72.5 percent of CCRSD students identified as White, whereas 90.1 percent of educators identified as White. Similarly, in CPS, 8 percent of students identified as Hispanic or Latino, whereas only 3.3 percent of teachers identified as Hispanic or Latino, and 71.1 percent of CPS students identified as White, whereas 89.6 percent of educators were White. The superintendent noted that these statistics are “still not where we want to be” despite some progress over the past few years. Similarly, one school leader noted, “it is still an area of growth as we continue to bring this lens of equity and making sure that we are attracting and then selecting diverse candidates.” In addition, one teacher shared,

Although the district has a strong commitment to increasing diversity in the workforce, we have a difficult time . . . retaining diverse teachers. We do have a lot of people who come for a few years and then leave. So, that’s certainly an area for improvement.

School leaders and hiring committees lead the districts’ collaborative hiring process. When a vacancy arises, the superintendent, principal, and director of human resources are notified, and positions are posted on SchoolSpring in alignment with contractual requirements. School leaders shared that hiring committees typically include department heads or leadership team members, along with staff who would work directly with the new hire. As one school leader explained, “We usually have a leadership team, definitely members who will be working closely with that potential candidate.” At the secondary level, department chairs and assistant principals often lead the process, and some committees include students or parents during later interview rounds or through structured demo lessons. Hiring teams conduct interviews, narrow down candidates, and recommend finalists to the superintendent, who makes the final offer.

The human resources office conducts background checks and verifies licensure using the Educator Licensure and Renewal portal. According to one district leader, “We make sure that [candidates] are licensed appropriately,” and candidates are supported in meeting DESE credentialing requirements during onboarding. The onboarding process includes setting up access to district systems, email, and the web-based employee portal.

The districts use data to guide educator assignment and support equitable staffing across grade levels and content areas, which is a strength of the districts. During interviews, the superintendent explained, “Enrollment data is a big part of that,” and in addition, “the SPED [special education] director has been pulling IEP [individualized education program] grids and analyzing service delivery minutes” to work toward equitable staffing. These analyses revealed both overstaffing and gaps in support, leading the districts to recalibrate staff deployment to better align with student needs and fiscal constraints. “We’ve been able to really tighten that up and set expectations and use the data to drive all of those decisions,” the superintendent stated. Service models and class size targets guide regular education staffing decisions, including those for multitiered systems of support, mathematics specialists, and ELA specialists. Moreover, focus group and interview responses indicated that principals, the superintendent, and the assistant superintendent coordinate collaboratively on staffing assignments during weekly administrative meetings.

District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently completed using Frontline. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample of 10 percent of the 186 teachers from CPS and CCRSD (19 teachers) due for summative evaluations for the 2023-2024 school year. The majority of the teacher evaluations (15) selected for review had a summative evaluation available for review, meaning that a small number of teachers did not complete the evaluation cycle through the completion of a summative evaluation. Of the 15 evaluations available for review, nearly all (14) were complete and did not omit required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. All evaluation documents reviewed included a student learning SMART goal and a professional practice SMART goal. All of the teachers’ progress toward their student learning and professional SMART goals were evaluated. Nearly all evaluations reviewed (93 percent) 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. All summative evaluations (15) included feedback for each standard and overall feedback related to each teacher’s overall rating. All feedback provided to teachers named strengths or practices that teachers should continue. However, only two evaluations (13 percent) included feedback indicating areas for improvement. Furthermore, some teachers noted that teachers with professional status do not always receive a lot of feedback in their evaluations. One teacher noted that for teachers with professional status, “observations are less frequent, and the evaluation process as a whole is more of a procedural check boxes type situation rather than something where seasoned teachers are receiving much feedback about improving our practice.” Consistently articulating areas for improvement for all teachers is an area for growth for the districts.

District records suggest that administration evaluations are also completed using Frontline. Of the eight administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2023-2024 school year, all evaluations (100 percent) were available for review and complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Of the eight summative evaluations reviewed, all included student learning, professional practice, and school improvement SMART goals. In addition, all evaluations included multiple sources of evidence used to support their progress toward SMART goals and standards. None of the evaluations reviewed included feedback for each standard, including evaluator feedback citing each administrator’s strengths and areas for improvement, yet all administrative staff were evaluated as “exemplary” for each standard and “exceeded” for progress toward SMART goals. Consistently including feedback for administrators, naming their strengths and areas for improvement, is an area of growth for the districts.

The districts provide staff advancement opportunities and recognition programs, which is a strength of the districts. Educators described multiple ways to grow professionally, including leadership roles such as team leader, department head, and assistant principal. In addition, teachers reported opportunities to exercise leadership through school improvement teams, advisory committees, and steering groups. Teachers noted that principals invite staff to express interest in these leadership opportunities each year. The districts also support teachers in career advancement through tuition reimbursement: CCRSD and CPS offer $900 and $600, respectively, of tuition reimbursement per person per year, though some teachers noted that reimbursement comes from a finite pool of funds, so “if the money’s gone, it’s gone.” Recognition is both formal and informal—annual “Stone Apple” awards honor teachers who attain Professional Teacher Status, and staff have the opportunity to highlight each other’s efforts and accomplishments using the districts’ “Shout Outs!” form.

The districts foster a supportive working environment that contributes to staff satisfaction and well-being, which is another strength. The superintendent emphasized that district leaders are becoming more intentional about belonging and connection: “We’re doing a lot of that stuff . . . just as part of us to be sure they’re enjoying each other and feel connected.” For example, the superintendent noted that she has conducted school visits, staff meetings, and after-school focus groups to reconnect with staff. The director of human resources supports this effort by working with an insurance-provided wellness coordinator to offer wellness opportunities. Educators noted that these wellness opportunities, such as yoga and mindfulness sessions, therapy dog visits, chair massages, and access to mental health supports through Care Solace, helped staff feel seen and cared for. “I did the yoga nidra one this year. . . . I really enjoyed it,” said one teacher. They also described a culture of care, in which administrators are responsive to personal needs and proactive in supporting wellness. Teachers shared examples of school-based “Sunshine Committees” that promote morale through activities such as spirit weeks and personal milestone celebrations. The districts’ mentor and guide program was also seen as an effective way to welcome and retain new staff. As one school leader described, it helps foster the sense that “people feel welcome” from the outset.

Relatedly, another strength is the districts’ consistently high teacher retention rates, which exceed state averages. According to DESE data, both districts’ teacher retention rates were higher than the state average for the past 3 years; in 2025, CPS’s teacher retention rate was 93.2 percent, and CCRSD’s was 88.9 percent, which are both above the state average of 86.1 percent. As one school leader explained, “By and large, retention in this district is very high. . . . It’s very rare that people are leaving . . . and going to a [nearby] school district.” District and school leaders attributed this strong retention to the districts’ positive culture and wellness initiatives (described above), with one explaining, “if people are happy and they enjoy coming to school, they're going to stay.”

### Professional Learning

District leaders have begun reinvesting in structures to promote alignment in instructional practice and professional learning. The superintendent described the districts as being “in a bit of a reset” following disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which had interrupted earlier efforts to build coherence across classrooms. “We had done a lot of it five years ago,” she explained, referring to practices such as using the teacher evaluation rubric as a shared reference point and engaging administrators in calibration and learning walks to promote consistent expectations. “I think we’re still coming back to what I think the vision would be from the COVID disruption,” she said. In response, the interim assistant superintendent of teaching and learning has started partnering with principals to conduct informal walkthroughs and rebuild alignment. One school leader confirmed, “[The assistant superintendent] has taken that on this year . . . working with principals to do some walkthroughs and touch base.” High school administrators also have taken on shared observations. As the superintendent noted, “[They’ve been] out with multiple, if not all, department chairs in the same room, watching the same teacher and then debriefing afterwards. . . . We are starting to see some nice gains and growth there. If nothing else, their confidence is growing.” Educators noted that they value these informal walkthroughs because they promote school leaders’ visibility and occasionally lead to feedback.

However, greater consistency in the approach to conducting and providing feedback based on instructional walkthroughs is an area for growth. The superintendent noted that there is not currently a shared instructional walkthrough tool, but creating one is on the districts’ to-do list. Focus group responses suggest that the lack of a districtwide approach to walkthroughs may limit consistency in instructional feedback and shared expectations. One teacher noted that “there’s nothing from the teaching and learning team that says [department chairs] should all aim for [a consistent write-up or feedback format]. . . . There’s nothing kind of standardized.” Furthermore, teachers and school leaders noted that there is not a consistent approach to sharing walkthrough feedback—some respondents noted feedback being provided via email, informal conversations, and sticky notes, whereas others reported that teachers do not always receive feedback. Teachers and district staff agree that teachers would appreciate more feedback from informal walkthroughs to inform their instructional practices. High school teachers noted increased opportunities for observation and feedback, with department chairs providing more consistent observations, although feedback is not always provided. They also shared that the districts are working toward more equitable evaluations by requiring department chair training, supported by the central office, and rotating chairs on three-year terms.

At the elementary schools, teachers described a combination of structured and flexible collaboration time, including weekly planning blocks and bimonthly meetings for grade-level teams. Although some collaboration time is protected, teachers noted that additional planning often takes place during lunch or unstructured time. Middle school teachers reported meeting with grade-level peers once per six-day cycle and participating in monthly department meetings. High school teachers described limited formal collaborative time at the department level, although some informal opportunities exist through shared lunch, early-release Wednesdays, and monthly department flex blocks led by chairs. Ninth-grade teams benefit from twice-weekly planning time focused on student support, with team leaders coordinating agendas, but other grade levels and departments reported insufficient common planning time. In addition to having scheduled time, teachers across levels described a collaborative culture that includes informal peer observations and feedback. As one teacher shared, “We’re in each other’s classrooms a lot. We do peer observations. We give feedback. We meet regularly. And we’re just always talking about instruction.” Similarly, high school teachers reported participating in co-observations, cross-grade visits, and structured peer learning opportunities, and they also explained that they use a shared Google Form to guide classroom observations and debriefs.

Professional development in the districts is offered through a structured and diverse set of opportunities. All grade levels (across districts) have three shared professional development afternoons each year where teachers can choose from a variety of sessions to best fit their needs. According to the districts’ 2024-2025 professional development calendar, session topics include DEIB, culturally responsive teaching, the science of reading, special education, and family engagement. Teachers at all levels agreed that these professional development sessions were well organized, aligned to district goals, and supportive of instructional practice. Survey exit slit data from 2024-25 professional development sessions show that teachers valued the variety of sessions, teacher-led workshops, and opportunities to explore topics such as student mental health and DEIB. As one respondent noted, “Loved the mix of strategies shared,” whereas another responded, “Appreciated the space to process with colleagues and reflect on student needs.

At the elementary level, there are three additional building-based professional development afternoons, and school leaders noted that they also “squeeze in professional development” during their monthly faculty meetings. These sessions typically address specific student needs. For example, one teacher shared that “an outside provider came in to teach us about trauma-informed best teaching practices due to the fact that [our school] houses . . . students from the shelter.” They also noted having the opportunity to choose a year-long pathway “based on [their] interests as a teacher,” with one teacher explaining, “I signed up for responsive classroom because that’s something I was just trained in and something that I wanted to keep working on this year.”

At the secondary level, there are five additional days earmarked for professional development. However, school leaders noted that not all these days are actually used for professional development and that the timing is not optimal for engaging teachers. For example, one school leader noted that there is time dedicated to professional development on the first day of school, but that it is hard to “squeeze [professional development] in” because teachers want to set up their classrooms, and that another one of these days is used for conferences instead. As a result, school leaders felt that “the hours [for PD] are just not enough” at the secondary level. Secondary teachers agreed, with one explaining, “the six hours of professional development in the year, the three days of the PD pathway just doesn't seem adequate enough, like you don't really barely start scratching the surface of something.” Providing sufficient time for professional development at the secondary level is an area for growth for the districts.

The districts offer a well-established, multilayered system of support for new educators—including a formal mentorship program and the Concord Fellows professional development series—which is another strength. The districts require all educators new to the district or the profession to participate in a three-year mentoring program. During focus groups, elementary, middle, and high school teachers described the mentorship program as structured and supportive, offering new educators either a mentor or, for experienced teachers new to the districts, a guide. Mentors must have professional status and at least a proficient evaluation rating and are expected to meet weekly with their mentees, attend monthly meetings, observe classes, debrief lessons, and provide nonevaluative feedback. Guides—introduced for the first time this year—offer similar support but are not required to attend monthly mentor meetings. As one teacher explained, “The guides still have to meet regularly. . . . They still have to go through all the process of peer observations and discussions, bringing work samples.” New hires are often matched with someone on their teaching team to help them “get the lay of the land a little better.” In addition to receiving ongoing mentorship, new educators participate in a two-day orientation before the school year begins and attend at least five group sessions throughout the year on district procedures and instructional topics. Mentors receive an annual stipend of approximately $1,200 to $1,300, whereas guides are compensated $500.

In addition to participating in the mentorship program, new educators receive support through Concord Fellows, a professional development series run by the districts targeted to early-career teachers in their first three to five years. One educator described it as “a series of in-house professional development specifically targeted to teachers in their first three years to help them learn new skills and acquire PDPs [professional development points] from our own providers.” The program also helps teachers meet the state’s requirement of 50 additional hours of mentor-type learning, offering a range of relevant course options—“mostly really relevant to what we’re seeing with education today.” District documents further reinforce these supports, outlining mentor responsibilities, training expectations, and a yearlong schedule of structured sessions—all signaling a sustained commitment to educator development and professional growth.

### Recommendations

* *The districts should continue their efforts to diversify their teaching staff and explore additional opportunities to recruit and retain teachers whose racial and/or ethnic background reflects those of their students.*
* *The districts should set expectations around incorporating greater levels of constructive feedback in teacher evaluations.*
* *The district should issue guidance and provide additional oversight around administrator evaluations to increase the percentage of administrators receiving feedback, both positive and constructive, in their evaluations.*
* *The districts should set consistent expectations and provide resources to support administrators in conducting classroom walkthroughs and providing meaningful and timely feedback to teachers.*
* *The districts should work with the middle and high school principals to identify additional time to provide professional development to teachers throughout the school year.*

## Financial and Asset Management

This section focuses on the extent to which, through their policies, systems, and procedures, the districts strategically allocate and use funding and other resources in alignment with applicable laws to improve all students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes. It also focuses on how the districts collaborate with their partners to run daily operations, manage their assets, and develop long-term plans for sustainability.

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

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) | * Strong relationships exist between district leaders and town officials, which have been facilitated through regular communication. |  |
| [Budgeting and Budget Process](#_Budgeting_and_Budget) | * The districts’ office of finance and operations effectively manages grants and plans for sustainability. | * Improving communication about how teacher/principal and department head requests are evaluated |
| [Operations](#_Operations) | * The districts’ office of finance and operations engages in strong procurement practices and contract oversight. |  |
| [Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning](#_Managing_Capital_Assets) | * The districts’ office of finance and operations actively monitors and manages its inventory of assets and supplies. | * Developing and formalizing a multiyear capital plan for CCRSD |

### Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure

CPS and CCRSD share an office of finance and operations, with one assistant superintendent of finance and operations, one assistant business manager, one staff accountant, a payroll coordinator, a payroll specialist, and two staff members responsible for accounts payable and accounts receivable. The office also has a director of facilities, a director of food services, and a director of transportation. According to district leaders, the team is made up of a well-qualified, credentialed staff, with appropriate business management licenses and procurement certifications, and is prepared to support daily operations and annual planning.

The districts have policies and processes in place for financial management. The districts’ school committees share an online policy manual, available on the districts’ website, that includes a fiscal management section with comprehensive written policies and procedures that outline ongoing work, that are designed to promote compliance with state and federal requirements, and that establish an internal system of checks and balances. Policies addressed include guidance on the annual budgets (i.e., planning, deadlines and schedules, adoption), fiscal accounting and reporting, audits, purchasing, and procurement requirements. The districts also use the ERP Pro (Tyler Technologies) financial management system to monitor and control resources, which district staff described as aligned with the Uniform Massachusetts Accounting System and in compliance with the DESE chart of accounts. In addition, financial records and accounts payable invoices are managed by retaining and digitizing them, storing them on a server. They maintain compliance with the Massachusetts statewide retention schedule by having the staff accountant monitor record dates and when they should be destroyed.

The towns of Concord and Carlisle established a formal regional agreement governing the Concord-Carlisle High School under Chapter 71 of the Massachusetts General Laws in 1957 and amended this agreement in 1973 and 1974. The agreement outlines the structure and governance of CCRSD and details how capital and operating costs are classified and apportioned between the member towns. Town officials described the agreement as “pretty high level,” referring to it as vague. As noted in Leadership and Governing Structures, although there is no formal agreement outlining the Town of Concord’s role in CPS, CPS falls under the Town of Concord’s financial reporting structure, so the district office of finance and operations must make reports to the town, and the town is the treasurer for CPS. A strong relationship exists between districts and town officials, facilitated through regular communication, which is a strength of the districts. District leaders and town officials reported having a good working relationship with both Concord and Carlisle town officials. District leaders explained that they maintain this relationship through frequent communication. One district leader said, “They’ve had some turnover in the finance office in [CPS], so we’re working to build relationships with the new people and make sure things go smoothly.” Town officials agreed, sharing that they are in frequent communication with district leaders, although to a lesser degree for the Carlisle town manager. One town official noted that although there is “almost no” involvement of the towns in CCRSD, they do communicate on a regular basis with the superintendent, and both towns “come together [with the school committees] on capital and budget on a regular basis.”

### Budgeting and Budget Process

The districts employ a transparent budgeting process, publishing detailed budget documents, including budget presentations, reports on enrollment, revenue and expenditure projections, and line-item budgets, on their website. Although the districts do not publish an annual budget calendar that lays out critical meeting dates and milestones for the budget on its website, the school committee posts meeting agendas and notes.

District leaders and school committee members believe that the review and budget approval process is transparent and timely and culminates in an easily accessible, publicly available budget book. District leaders shared that they start the budget process in September with the budget timeline document. It gets shared initially with the superintendent and the administrative leadership team and then with each school committee for approval. After the timeline is approved, the office of finance and operations sends planning documents to principals and subject area department heads at the middle school (CPS) and high school (CCRSD). The principals and department heads prepare detailed line-item budgets, whereas the office of finance and operations staff budgets items such as salaries (based on requested staff), benefits (based on existing contracts and staffing), and electricity (based on prior usage). School leaders described having the opportunity to request positions and supplies or to solicit other budgetary adjustments. Middle and elementary school teachers also said that they can make budget requests, but explained that it is unclear how final decisions are made. A middle school teacher shared,

As a department, we come up with a list of the things that we think we’re going to need for the following year. That list is then shared with administration at the district level, and it’s gone through line item by line item and things are either accepted or rejected. But there’s not a lot of transparency about why certain things are rejected. And, so, I know personally I spend out of my pocket every year on materials and subscriptions.

An area for growth is to improve communication about how teacher and department requests are evaluated.

To develop budgets, in addition to reviewing feedback from principals and department heads, district leaders reported that they review per-pupil spending relative to other districts, vendor costs, student performance data, alignment with the districts’ strategic plan, student enrollment data, year-over-year comparisons, and multiyear trends. With this information in hand, the office of finance and operations consolidates the budgets. At this point in the process, the towns’ finance committees recommend budget guidelines with likely revenues; the director of finance compares this with their “first pass,” and there is a reconciliation to create a preliminary budget, noting that the preliminary budget may be above town guidelines. District leaders call the preliminary budget “the superintendent’s recommended budget.” Leaders said that they try not to include “a ton of new investments” unless a need arose but noted that “if there’s something we felt was important, we potentially would add it.” School committee members noted being well informed about the budget process and “looking at the budget all year,” with a formal presentation to the school committees that compares the superintendent’s recommended budget, after it has been developed, with the towns’ guidelines.

According to the Chapter 70 district profile, both districts exceeded net school spending requirements for fiscal year 2024. In fiscal year 2024, the actual net school spending for CCRSD was $13,420,682, or 73.3 percent over required net school spending. Similarly, the actual net school spending for CPS was $25,492,478, or 110.5 percent over required net school spending. Fiscal year 2024 per-pupil expenditures in CCRSD ($30,709) and CPS ($27,658) were also considerably higher than the state average. Average teacher salaries in fiscal year 2024 were $126,051 in CCRSD and $114,372 in CPS, both higher than the state average of $91,014. This was an increase over fiscal year 2023, when average teacher salaries were $121,500 in CCRSD and $112,727 in CPS.

According to school leaders and teachers, the districts’ budget provides appropriate levels of funding for key instructional resources. A teacher shared that, compared with other districts, her school was very well-resourced. District leaders said that resources are distributed based on student needs. School committee members agreed and reported that they did not see competing needs between schools. One member said, “That’s not the culture we have here. . .  I don’t feel like people are fighting for anything. . .  It’s just not an issue here.” District leaders added that the districts’ budget for anticipated out-of-district special education placements and related transportation costs relies on the general fund, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) special education grant, and circuit breaker funds to cover unexpected increases. A district leader explained that if there is an additional need,

we look to offset it somewhere else in the budget to see if we cannot incur a cost that we might be able to avoid or make a decision not to do something. We do have a little bit of flexibility built into the budget.

The leader went on to explain that there are often savings due to teacher retirements and carryover from circuit breaker reserves.

District budget documents clearly identify funds associated with grants, student activities and organizations, fees, and revolving funds. District leaders reported that the districts apply for a variety of state and federal grants that align with the districts’ strategic plan. These include both entitlement grants, such as Title I and IDEA, which provide formula-based, noncompetitive funding, and competitive grants that support strategic initiatives. For example, the districts use entitlement grant funding to support participation in the METCO program, and they recently applied for a competitive grant to fund teacher hiring incentives (such as paying for coursework) and professional development courses, aligning with the districts’ goal of improving teacher retention.

The assistant superintendent of finance and operations has systems in place to support timely adherence to grant terms and requirements. A district leader explained that the office of finance and operations staff use workflow software to approve requisitions and maintain compliance with grant requirements. Staff review requests, check for discrepancies, and make adjustments, if needed. They also monitor variances between grants and budgets. The leader also described staff roles regarding oversight of grants: (a) The assistant business manager monitors and reviews payment requests; (b) the assistant superintendent manages the Every Student Succeeds Act grants—Title I, Title II-A, and Title IV—to make sure that spending is consistent with grant requirements; (c) the director of student services, who oversees special education, manages the IDEA grants and the early childhood special education grant; and (d) the director of DEIB is responsible for the METCO grant.

District leaders further explained how the districts blend restricted and unrestricted funds to maximize benefits to students. One leader stated,

I’m fully aware of what the rules are for each fund. And that’s another way that we [offset unexpected expenses], by using some of the restricted funds. And it might not be for that unexpected expense. It might be that I use more of my circuit breaker for an out-of-district tuition, which frees up the budget. And that means they can manage the budget to pay for that unrestricted expense.

In addition, another strength of the districts is their effective grant management and sustainability planning. District leaders described sustainability plans that have been developed to continue grant-funded programming even after grants end. For example, regarding the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) grants, one central office leader explained that the districts “gradually built one of the [ESSER-funded] positions into the budget over time.” To prepare for sustainability, the districts chose to absorb half of the cost of this position into the main district budget (and pay for only half of it with ESSER funds) after the first year of the grant and moved all costs for the position into the standard district budget after the second year of the grant.

In addition to planning for sustainability for grant-funded items, the districts each have a current five-year financial plan that incorporates projected enrollment and required staffing, the cost-of-living adjustments that are set in its collective bargaining agreements, and anticipated increases in its service contracts.

School committee meeting minutes and feedback from school committee members indicate that the districts provide budget updates to their respective school committees regularly and work with budget managers to track and adjust current year spending. One school committee member shared, “we get quarterly reports. We do budget transfers, if necessary, quarterly,” and noted that CPS is currently in a budget freeze, primarily due to the unexpectedly high cost of transporting homeless students, so “everything needs to be approved—and not just approved by the principal. . . . Everything goes to the superintendent and assistant superintendent of finance and operations. So, I do feel like they are budget hawks throughout the year, and we know exactly where we’re at throughout the year with the budget.”

A district leader provided additional details:

We typically do a quarterly review. [We] share it in the same format: administration, teaching, instruction. And then other services, maintenance, fixed costs. And then out-of-district tuitions. We have some community service as well, which is the private school tuition we charge to that district. We show what our transfers are, and [school committee members] actually formally approve those. And we provide a narrative on what’s driving changes in the budget.

The districts hire an independent financial auditing service each year and implement recommendations from those audits. District leaders provided an example and explained that the auditors had recommended that the school committee officially approve budget transfers.

### Operations

The districts’ joint website aims to provide families with clear, accessible information about school assignment by posting school district attendance areas for CPS’s elementary schools. The website also provides clear guidance on registering for school, with contact information for support, in an effort to lower the burden for families to register for school. However, family focus group respondents had mixed views on how accessible school assignment information is, with some noting direct communication from the districts regarding school assignment, and others noting that they had to seek out information regarding school assignment.

District leaders reported that the districts provide transportation services in-house so that students can safely get to and from school on time. The transportation department manages and operates district-owned buses, providing daily transportation for approximately 3,000 students and transportation for field trips, athletic events, and extracurricular activities.

Similarly, the districts’ facilities department maintains all buildings and grounds for CPS and CCRSD. Neither school nor district leaders mentioned a formal process for requesting and responding to maintenance services and other assistance, and regularly reviewing the districts’ preventative maintenance plan. However, middle school teachers shared that the custodial staff is very good. One teacher said, “They’re so attentive, and if you need anything, they’ll help you with anything. They’re wonderful.” Teachers also explained that, to request maintenance, they just send an email to school leadership, and school leaders put in a work order.

A strength of the districts’ office of finance and operations is its strong procurement practices and contract oversight. District staff explained that the districts have an established process for purchasing supplies and services in alignment with state laws and procurement regulations, using sound business practices for smaller purchases and formal bidding processes for larger projects. Smaller items are often covered by purchase orders, and larger items are purchased through formal contracts that are reviewed by specific personnel. The districts seek bids for services costing more than $100,000 to secure competitive pricing and vendor reliability. According to district finance staff, some core district services, such as curriculum and software maintenance, are exempt from certain regulations and are typically reviewed every three years. Other services such as copier support and gas supply usually have three-year contracts to streamline the bidding process and potentially secure better rates. Finance staff also shared that the assistant superintendent of finance and operations serves as the chief procurement officer for both districts and approves all spending. The districts aim to create fair and open competition by adhering to the state’s Uniform Procurement Act and other relevant bidding statutes and regulations.

A district finance staff member explained how their office effectively manages those contracts with vendors:

The only people who can sign a contract are . . . the assistant superintendent of finance and operations and the superintendent, and the assistant superintendent reviews the terms to make sure there’s nothing in there like we’re going to pay interest if we paid late or pay penalties, make sure the terms are acceptable, and also make sure that deliverables that they provide to us are clear and that the expectations on them are clearly laid out as well.

District finance staff added that the districts have established timelines to proactively track the end of contracts, providing sufficient time for renewal or rebidding for core district services. Town officials explained that they delegate procurement authority to the assistant superintendent of finance and operations for both districts.

### Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning

The districts actively monitor and manage their inventory of assets and supplies, which is a strength of the districts. District staff explained that the districts have an efficient system to manage and track their inventory of capital assets and critical supplies. The districts have faced challenges with managing critical supplies, such as a backlog on buses that took two years to resolve. They have since accelerated orders to address this issue. For capital assets such as school buses and HVAC systems, the districts maintain an inventory and replacement cycle. Technology is also considered a capital asset, with a regular replacement budget for devices based on age.

According to district leaders, the capital plans for each district incorporate input mostly from the superintendent, the director of facilities, the director of information technology services, and the director of transportation for capital items. The office of finance and operations also engages consultants for advice on certain projects, such as feasibility studies and an existing conditions analysis of CPS buildings. School leaders have much less involvement in the capital plan, except when a major project is happening at their school. Major upcoming projects include improving accessibility at the high school with ADA-compliant restrooms, building and enhancing outdoor spaces at CPS, and the recently constructed middle school building that opened in CPS during the 2024-2025 school year. Other projects include repairing a fire alarm panel, replacing an elementary school roof, and implementing sustainability measures such as switching to LED lighting. District leaders reported that ongoing facility assessments inform future capital needs.

Regarding long-term planning, district leaders stated that CPS has “a campus improvement plan that is going to be over half a million dollars” that aims to improve the outdoor spaces. The plan includes a new playground, improving landscaping retention to avoid runoff, and the addition of a soccer field. CPS’s 10-year capital plan is available on the town’s website. CCRSD, however, does not appear to have a multiyear capital plan. One town official said, “I’ve been here three years, and I haven’t seen [a capital plan].” Another town official agreed, saying, “My inclination is that it doesn’t actually exist like the way you would like a formal capital plan, and that we need to build one.” Upon review, the superintendent shared that the district plans to conduct a facility review and develop a capital plan. Developing and formalizing a multiyear capital plan for CCRSD is an area for growth.

### Recommendations

* *Where feasible, the districts should increase transparency around the process for evaluating budgetary requests and provide feedback when requests are denied.*
* *CCRSD should develop a formal multiyear capital plan that outlines upcoming maintenance and capital projects.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following as part of the district review activities in CPS and CCRSD. The team conducted 84 classroom observations during the week of April 14, 2025, and held interviews and focus groups between April 16 and May 22. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the districts:

* 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, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
* Data on the districts’ staffing and finances
* Published educational reports on the districts by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
* District documents such as district and school improvement plans, the CCRSD regional agreement, school committee policies and meeting minutes, job descriptions, the professional learning plan, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the districts’ 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 Concord Public Schools and Concord-Carlisle Regional School District during the week of April 14, 2025. Observers conducted 84 observations in a sample of classrooms across five schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 84 | 5.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 34 | 5.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 5.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 30 | 5.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 2] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 36] + [6 x 29] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 84 observations = 5.4

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 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 | 84 | 6.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 34 | 6.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 20 | 6.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 30 | 5.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 7] + [5 x 17] + [6 x 27] + [7 x 33]) ÷ 84 observations = 6.0

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\*: 4.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 84 | 4.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 34 | 4.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 30 | 4.1 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 2] + [2 x 11] + [3 x 18] + [4 x 18] + [5 x 23] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 84 observations = 4.0

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\*: 6.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 34 | 7.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 30 | 6.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:   
([5 x 1] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 80]) ÷ 84 observations = 6.9

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\*: 6.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 84 | 6.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 34 | 6.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 20 | 6.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 30 | 6.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 1] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 28] + [7 x 45]) ÷ 84 observations = 6.4

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\*: 6.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 84 | 6.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 34 | 6.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 6.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 30 | 6.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:   
([5 x 6] + [6 x 32] + [7 x 46]) ÷ 84 observations = 6.5

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 5.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 84 | 5.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 34 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 5.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 2] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 47] + [6 x 21] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 84 observations = 5.3

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\*: 3.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 22 | 3.7 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 3.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 2] + [2 x 4] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 22 observations = 3.7

\*\*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\*: 4.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 62 | 4.7 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 5.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 30 | 4.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 21] + [5 x 16] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 7]) ÷ 62 observations = 4.7

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 62 | 2.9 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 2.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 12] + [2 x 13] + [3 x 14] + [4 x 17] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 62 observations = 2.9

\*\*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\*: 3.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 84 | 3.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 3.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 3.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 3.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 10] + [2 x 14] + [3 x 21] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 18] + [6 x 7]) ÷ 84 observations = 3.4

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\*: 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 | 22 | 4.1 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 4.1 |

\*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 7] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 22 observations = 4.1

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 62 | 3.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 3.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 8] + [2 x 6] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 21] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 62 observations = 3.6

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4−12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average\*: 5.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 62 | 5.5 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 5.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 8 | 3 | 30 | 5.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:   
([4 x 5] + [5 x 29] + [6 x 23] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 62 observations = 5.5

\*\*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 | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 33 | 28 | 51 | 136 | 5.7 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 34 | 5.6 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 34 | 7.0 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 34 | 6.0 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 34 | 4.1 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 31 | 43 | 102 | 6.1 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 34 | 6.4 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 34 | 6.4 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 34 | 5.5 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 12 | 16 | 28 | 25 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 114 | 3.6 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 3.7 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.2 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2.3 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 3.5 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 4.1 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3.0 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 5.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 2] + [5 x 16] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 34 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 34]) ÷ 34 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 | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 17 | 9 | 60 | 5.1 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 5.2 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 20 | 6.3 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3.8 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 36 | 60 | 6.6 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 20 | 6.3 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 6.5 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 3 | 10 | 18 | 24 | 27 | 13 | 5 | 100 | 4.2 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 5.3 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 5.3 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.3 |
| Quality of Feedback | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 3.6 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.7 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 5.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 8]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.2

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([5 x 1] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.9

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

|  | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 1 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 25 | 22 | 16 | 90 | 5.1 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 30 | 5.3 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 30 | 5.9 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 30 | 4.1 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 63 | 90 | 6.6 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 30 | 6.5 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 30 | 6.5 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 30 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 17 | 15 | 18 | 38 | 46 | 14 | 2 | 150 | 3.9 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 4.9 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 30 | 4.6 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 6 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 2.8 |
| Quality of Feedback | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 3.2 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 5 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 3.8 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 8 | 3 | 30 | 5.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 30 observations = 5.3

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 28]) ÷ 30 observations = 6.9
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) a | 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. |

a 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 Tool](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: Online Platform for Teaching and Informed Calibration](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 |
| --- | --- |
| [DESE Spending Comparisons Website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) | A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public. |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grant 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: Fueling the Commonwealth 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 D1a. Concord: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All students | 1,914 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | 0.1 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 146 | 7.6 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 103 | 5.4 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 156 | 8.2 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 147 | 7.7 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 1,361 | 71.1 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D1b. Concord-Carlisle: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All students | 1,191 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | 0.1 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 116 | 9.7 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 52 | 4.4 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 73 | 6.1 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 83 | 7.0 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 3 | 0.3 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 863 | 72.5 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D2a. Concord: 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 | 552 | 100.0 | 28.6 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 71 | 12.9 | 3.7 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low Income | 206 | 37.3 | 10.8 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 388 | 70.3 | 20.1 | 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 placement is 1,928; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 926,057.

Table D2b. Concord-Carlisle: 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 | 315 | 100.0 | 25.6 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 10 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low Income | 112 | 35.6 | 9.4 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 244 | 77.5 | 19.8 | 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 placement is 1,230; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 926,057.

Table D3a. Concord: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All students | 2,024 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 7.7 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 103 | 41.3 | 36.6 | 23.3 | 22.5 |
| Asian | 157 | 14.0 | 15.6 | 4.5 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 170 | 21.1 | 22.4 | 16.5 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 148 | 7.1 | 9.0 | 4.7 | 20.6 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 1,443 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 6.2 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 629 | 21.0 | 20.9 | 15.3 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 252 | 32.3 | 32.7 | 22.2 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 75 | 30.2 | 26.4 | 13.3 | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 438 | 17.6 | 18.5 | 14.4 | 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 D3b. Concord-Carlisle: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All students | 1,270 | 15.3 | 13.7 | 10.2 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 47 | 33.9 | 31.6 | 14.9 | 22.5 |
| Asian | 112 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 4.5 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 81 | 26.3 | 24.4 | 14.8 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 93 | 13.6 | 9.5 | 10.8 | 20.6 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 934 | 14.3 | 12.9 | 10.3 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 314 | 26.0 | 23.4 | 19.1 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 118 | 33.3 | 31.9 | 18.6 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 9 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 33.3 | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 238 | 27.6 | 23.2 | 21.8 | 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 D4a. Concord: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $39,782,882 | $41,592,564 | $42,778,487 |
| By municipality | $4,537,392 | $4,969,930 | $5,207,435 |
| Total from local appropriations | $44,320,274 | $46,562,494 | $47,985,922 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $3,097,138 | $3,831,329 | $3,836,795 |
| Total expenditures | $47,417,412 | $50,393,823 | $51,822,717 |

*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 D4b. Concord-Carlisle: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $28,616,035 | $30,746,005 | $31,121,986 |
| By municipality | — | — | — |
| Total from local appropriations | $28,616,035 | $30,746,005 | $31,121,986 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $2,843,307 | $3,062,574 | $4,325,839 |
| Total expenditures | $31,459,342 | $33,808,579 | $35,447,825 |

*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 D5a. Concord: 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 | $3,737,831 | $3,797,771 | $3,916,391 |
| Required local contribution | $17,621,204 | $17,520,320 | $18,427,522 |
| Required net school spending b | $21,359,035 | $21,318,091 | $22,343,913 |
| Actual net school spending | $41,840,241 | $44,273,390 | $45,530,988 |
| Over/under required ($) | $20,481,206 | $22,955,299 | $23,187,075 |
| Over/under required (%) | 95.9% | 107.7% | 103.8% |

*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 D5b. Concord-Carlisle: 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 | $2,747,217 | $2,885,882 | $3,213,909 |
| Required local contribution | $12,951,170 | $13,560,896 | $14,333,307 |
| Required net school spending b | $15,698,387 | $16,446,778 | $17,547,216 |
| Actual net school spending | $26,727,863 | $29,214,053 | $29,671,802 |
| Over/under required ($) | $11,029,476 | $12,767,275 | $12,124,586 |
| Over/under required (%) | 70.3% | 77.6% | 69.1% |

*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 D6a. Concord: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $587 | $480 | $558 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,631 | $1,973 | $2,074 |
| Teachers | $9,182 | $9,899 | $10,260 |
| Other teaching services | $3,208 | $3,454 | $3,755 |
| Professional development | $230 | $265 | $355 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $515 | $502 | $656 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $625 | $687 | $819 |
| Pupil services | $1,771 | $1,920 | $1,906 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,900 | $1,506 | $2,022 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $2,543 | $2,529 | $2,813 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $22,190 | $23,214 | $25,217 |

*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.

Table D6b. Concord-Carlisle: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $735 | $610 | $658 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,505 | $1,694 | $2,053 |
| Teachers | $8,957 | $9,460 | $10,000 |
| Other teaching services | $1,428 | $1,617 | $1,613 |
| Professional development | $209 | $165 | $159 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $573 | $616 | $729 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $1,309 | $1,357 | $1,389 |
| Pupil services | $2,584 | $3,154 | $3,091 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,707 | $2,005 | $2,102 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $2,401 | $2,380 | $2,725 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $21,407 | $23,059 | $24,518 |

*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. Concord: 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 | 1,314 | 67 | 73 | 70 | 39 | 28 | 23 | 25 | 40 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 57 | 26 | 32 | 30 | 24 | 52 | 45 | 42 | 46 | 22 | 23 | 28 | 31 |
| Asian | 97 | 81 | 78 | 84 | 62 | 14 | 18 | 12 | 29 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 103 | 46 | 49 | 43 | 20 | 46 | 41 | 40 | 44 | 9 | 10 | 17 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 97 | 75 | 79 | 72 | 46 | 22 | 18 | 25 | 37 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 958 | 70 | 77 | 73 | 47 | 27 | 20 | 23 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 13 |
| High needs | 402 | 32 | 39 | 35 | 22 | 54 | 46 | 47 | 45 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 33 |
| Low income | 148 | 27 | 36 | 30 | 21 | 55 | 41 | 46 | 45 | 19 | 22 | 24 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 60 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 17 | 53 | 49 | 38 | 43 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 292 | 24 | 33 | 27 | 11 | 57 | 48 | 50 | 40 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 50 |

Table E2. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 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 | 321 | 86 | 85 | 85 | 57 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| African American/Black | 12 | 62 | 40 | 75 | 42 | 38 | 60 | 25 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Asian | 30 | 95 | 89 | 97 | 78 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | 57 | 67 | 94 | 36 | 39 | 33 | 6 | 38 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 21 | 92 | 82 | 95 | 61 | 8 | 14 | 5 | 30 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 14 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 58 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 8 |
| White | 240 | 88 | 89 | 83 | 65 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| High needs | 77 | 56 | 56 | 60 | 37 | 40 | 37 | 30 | 41 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 23 |
| Low income | 24 | 57 | 50 | 63 | 38 | 40 | 46 | 25 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 62 | 53 | 54 | 52 | 21 | 44 | 38 | 35 | 45 | 4 | 8 | 13 | 34 |

Table E3. Concord: 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 | 1,314 | 65 | 68 | 70 | 41 | 29 | 26 | 25 | 42 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 57 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 22 | 52 | 43 | 54 | 49 | 26 | 34 | 21 | 30 |
| Asian | 97 | 86 | 86 | 90 | 71 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 103 | 50 | 52 | 46 | 20 | 40 | 41 | 45 | 48 | 11 | 7 | 10 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 97 | 75 | 79 | 78 | 47 | 18 | 16 | 18 | 37 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 16 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 958 | 67 | 70 | 73 | 49 | 29 | 26 | 23 | 40 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 11 |
| High needs | 403 | 35 | 37 | 39 | 23 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 48 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 28 |
| Low income | 149 | 33 | 33 | 37 | 21 | 42 | 41 | 48 | 49 | 26 | 26 | 15 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 60 | 45 | 50 | 52 | 21 | 39 | 35 | 35 | 46 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 293 | 27 | 26 | 30 | 13 | 46 | 50 | 49 | 43 | 27 | 24 | 21 | 44 |

Table E4. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 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 | 321 | 80 | 80 | 85 | 48 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 39 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| African American/Black | 12 | 0 | 27 | 50 | 27 | 100 | 73 | 42 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 |
| Asian | 30 | 90 | 89 | 97 | 79 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | 42 | 78 | 81 | 25 | 54 | 22 | 19 | 50 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 21 | 96 | 82 | 95 | 51 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 39 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 33 | — | — | — | 54 | — | — | — | 13 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 52 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 10 |
| White | 240 | 85 | 83 | 84 | 58 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 35 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| High needs | 78 | 40 | 41 | 55 | 27 | 51 | 52 | 38 | 51 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 23 |
| Low income | 24 | 39 | 46 | 50 | 27 | 55 | 50 | 42 | 50 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 40 |
| Students w/disabilities | 63 | 39 | 33 | 49 | 14 | 48 | 59 | 43 | 51 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 35 |

Table E5. Concord: 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 | 452 | 72 | 72 | 76 | 42 | 23 | 23 | 18 | 38 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 26 | 19 | 35 | 27 | 21 | 62 | 41 | 38 | 46 | 19 | 24 | 35 | 33 |
| Asian | 31 | 88 | 74 | 94 | 64 | 12 | 19 | 6 | 26 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 31 | 63 | 46 | 52 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 22 | 79 | 80 | 82 | 49 | 21 | 17 | 9 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 17 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 341 | 75 | 75 | 80 | 51 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 36 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| High needs | 123 | 45 | 42 | 42 | 24 | 42 | 39 | 36 | 44 | 13 | 19 | 22 | 32 |
| Low income | 47 | 40 | 37 | 23 | 22 | 48 | 33 | 45 | 44 | 13 | 30 | 32 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 20 | 62 | 29 | 45 | 17 | 33 | 47 | 40 | 41 | 5 | 24 | 15 | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 96 | 38 | 36 | 40 | 15 | 44 | 41 | 32 | 38 | 18 | 23 | 28 | 46 |

Table E6. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 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 | 303 | 79 | 77 | 83 | 49 | 18 | 20 | 14 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 12 | 10 | 27 | 42 | 28 | 80 | 53 | 50 | 53 | 10 | 20 | 8 | 19 |
| Asian | 27 | 95 | 81 | 96 | 77 | 5 | 16 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 41 | 53 | 80 | 26 | 55 | 47 | 20 | 52 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 21 | 96 | 80 | 86 | 53 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 37 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 47 | — | — | — | 45 | — | — | — | 8 |
| White | 226 | 83 | 81 | 84 | 58 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 36 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| High needs | 70 | 45 | 39 | 56 | 28 | 45 | 48 | 33 | 52 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 20 |
| Low income | 21 | 42 | 46 | 52 | 28 | 52 | 38 | 38 | 51 | 6 | 15 | 10 | 20 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 13 | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 57 | 42 | 34 | 51 | 18 | 46 | 50 | 35 | 52 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 31 |

Table E7a. Concord: 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 | 212 | 78 | 75 | 62 | 42 | 19 | 22 | 32 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| 4 | 217 | 63 | 72 | 63 | 37 | 33 | 24 | 31 | 45 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 19 |
| 5 | 225 | 74 | 74 | 70 | 38 | 24 | 23 | 26 | 46 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 16 |
| 6 | 224 | 61 | 83 | 72 | 40 | 35 | 13 | 21 | 35 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 25 |
| 7 | 211 | 62 | 65 | 78 | 36 | 31 | 29 | 17 | 42 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 22 |
| 8 | 225 | 66 | 70 | 72 | 43 | 28 | 23 | 23 | 34 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 24 |
| 3-8 | 1,314 | 67 | 73 | 70 | 39 | 28 | 23 | 25 | 40 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 21 |

Table E7b. Concord-Carlisle: 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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 321 | 86 | 85 | 85 | 57 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 |

Table E8a. Concord: 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 | 213 | 71 | 67 | 65 | 44 | 23 | 28 | 25 | 35 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 20 |
| 4 | 216 | 71 | 75 | 75 | 46 | 24 | 18 | 21 | 38 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 16 |
| 5 | 225 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 40 | 20 | 18 | 19 | 46 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 |
| 6 | 223 | 66 | 69 | 74 | 40 | 30 | 26 | 23 | 43 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 17 |
| 7 | 211 | 59 | 66 | 74 | 37 | 32 | 27 | 21 | 44 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 19 |
| 8 | 226 | 48 | 53 | 55 | 38 | 43 | 39 | 40 | 42 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 19 |
| 3-8 | 1,314 | 65 | 68 | 70 | 41 | 29 | 26 | 25 | 42 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 18 |

Table E8b. Concord-Carlisle: 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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 321 | 80 | 80 | 85 | 48 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 39 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13 |

Table E9a. Concord: 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 | 225 | 72 | 73 | 75 | 45 | 25 | 22 | 17 | 36 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 20 |
| 8 | 227 | 73 | 70 | 76 | 39 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 41 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 452 | 72 | 72 | 76 | 42 | 23 | 23 | 18 | 38 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 20 |

Table E9b. Concord-Carlisle: 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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 303 | 79 | 77 | 83 | 49 | 18 | 20 | 14 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 11 |

Table E10. Concord: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 1,050 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 44 | 43 | 48 | 46 | 49 |
| Asian | 78 | 63 | 62 | 65 | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 78 | 48 | 53 | 59 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 76 | 57 | 66 | 56 | 51 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 773 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 50 |
| High needs | 291 | 48 | 54 | 54 | 48 |
| Low income | 112 | 44 | 46 | 51 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 41 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 204 | 48 | 55 | 52 | 45 |

Table E11. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 276 | 63 | 61 | 58 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 12 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Asian | 23 | — | 67 | 70 | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 15 | — | — | — | 47 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 20 | 63 | — | 65 | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| White | 204 | 62 | 61 | 55 | 51 |
| High needs | 66 | 67 | 55 | 57 | 47 |
| Low income | 20 | 61 | 55 | 59 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 54 | 69 | 55 | 55 | 44 |

Table E12. Concord: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 1,053 | 46 | 51 | 54 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 47 | 38 | 46 | 51 | 49 |
| Asian | 80 | 55 | 55 | 60 | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 78 | 39 | 53 | 51 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 76 | 49 | 56 | 54 | 50 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 771 | 46 | 50 | 54 | 50 |
| High needs | 293 | 40 | 50 | 52 | 48 |
| Low income | 116 | 36 | 47 | 56 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 43 | 37 | 55 | 60 | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 204 | 40 | 49 | 50 | 46 |

Table E13. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 276 | 65 | 69 | 77 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 12 | — | — | — | 47 |
| Asian | 22 | — | 64 | 70 | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 61 | — | — | 45 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 20 | 71 | — | 83 | 49 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 50 |
| White | 205 | 65 | 71 | 77 | 52 |
| High needs | 66 | 59 | 63 | 73 | 47 |
| Low income | 20 | 51 | 56 | 68 | 46 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | — | 46 |
| Students w/disabilities | 54 | 63 | 64 | 71 | 47 |

Table E14a. Concord: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 209 | 59 | 58 | 52 | 50 |
| 5 | 215 | 63 | 59 | 58 | 50 |
| 6 | 210 | 46 | 65 | 60 | 50 |
| 7 | 200 | 47 | 53 | 61 | 50 |
| 8 | 216 | 55 | 63 | 64 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 1,050 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 50 |

Table E14b. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 10 | 276 | 63 | 61 | 58 | 50 |

Table E15a. Concord: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 208 | 59 | 61 | 57 | 50 |
| 5 | 215 | 61 | 63 | 65 | 50 |
| 6 | 212 | 37 | 34 | 51 | 50 |
| 7 | 203 | 43 | 51 | 56 | 50 |
| 8 | 215 | 31 | 43 | 42 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 1,053 | 46 | 51 | 54 | 50 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 50 |

Table E15b. Concord-Carlisle: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 10 | 276 | 65 | 69 | 77 | 50 |

Table E16. Concord-Carlisle: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 347 | 98.4 | 98.5 | 97.4 | 89.2 |
| African American/Black | 18 | 100.0 | 93.3 | 88.9 | 85.6 |
| Asian | 33 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 95.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 87.5 | 78.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 93.3 | 89.3 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 89.9 |
| White | 265 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 98.9 | 93.0 |
| High needs | 110 | 95.1 | 94.6 | 91.8 | 82.8 |
| Low income | 50 | 100.0 | 92.3 | 88.0 | 82.2 |
| English learners | 5 | — | — | — | 67.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 77 | 93.8 | 92.3 | 90.9 | 76.4 |

Table E17. Concord-Carlisle: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 (%) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | State 2022 (%) |
| All | 337 | 99.0 | 99.4 | 99.7 | 91.9 |
| African American/Black | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 90.1 |
| Asian | 25 | 100.0 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 96.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 18 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 84.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 23 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 90.8 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 87.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 255 | 99.1 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 93 | 97.8 | 97.6 | 98.9 | 86.8 |
| Low income | 52 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 86.3 |
| English learners | 2 | — |  | — | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 65 | 97.2 | 96.9 | 98.5 | 81.8 |

Table E18. Concord-Carlisle: Annual Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| All | 1,303 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 55 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 114 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 77 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 4.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 83 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 3.9 |
| White | 971 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 288 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 3.5 |
| Low income | 101 | — | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.8 |
| English learners | 5 | — | 0.0 | — | 8.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 217 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.0 |

Table E19a. Concord: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 2,014 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 101 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 157 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 170 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 146 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 1,438 | — | — | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 634 | — | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| Low income | 252 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 78 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 441 | — | 0.5 | 1.6 | 2.4 |

Table E19b. Concord-Carlisle: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 1,246 | 0.2 | — | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 48 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 108 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 80 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 94 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 913 | — | — | 0.1 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 312 | — | — | 0.6 | 1.9 |
| Low income | 114 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 10 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 239 | — | — | 0.4 | 2.4 |

Table E20a. Concord: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 2,014 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 101 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 157 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 170 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 146 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 1,438 | — | — | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| High needs | 634 | — | 1.0 | 0.9 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 252 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 78 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 441 | — | 1.2 | 1.4 | 4.5 |

Table E20b. Concord-Carlisle: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 1,246 | 0.5 | — | 0.6 | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 48 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 108 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 80 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 94 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 913 | — | — | 0.4 | 1.5 |
| High needs | 312 | — | — | 1.3 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 114 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 10 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 239 | — | — | 1.7 | 4.5 |

Table E21. Concord-Carlisle: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group,   
2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 635 | 84.2 | 92.4 | 83.3 | 67.2 |
| African American/Black | 28 | 46.7 | 92.9 | 50.0 | 58.2 |
| Asian | 55 | 92.9 | 98.1 | 89.1 | 86.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 43 | 66.7 | 75.6 | 65.1 | 53.7 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 45 | 89.2 | 92.7 | 88.9 | 68.4 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 57.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 59.8 |
| White | 463 | 86.1 | 93.1 | 86.0 | 71.9 |
| High needs | 154 | 53.3 | 75.5 | 53.9 | 52.0 |
| Low income | 63 | 48.5 | 76.6 | 57.1 | 53.1 |
| English learners | 6 | — | — | 33.3 | 31.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 115 | 48.0 | 67.9 | 45.2 | 38.5 |

Table E22a. Concord: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Concord Public Schools (district) | 83 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Alcott Elementary School | 75 | 95 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Thoreau Elementary School | 96 | 97 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Willard Elementary School | 82 | 90 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Concord Middle School | 81 | 88 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |

Table E22b. Concord-Carlisle: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Concord-Carlisle Regional School District | 95 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Concord-Carlisle High School | 95 | 99 | 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](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) (retrieved November 2024).  [↑](#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-E9: M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)