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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 comprehensive review of Medway Public Schools (hereafter, Medway) in January 2025. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews and were focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.[[1]](#footnote-2) The resulting report provides an in-depth look at district systems, structures, 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 Medway during the week of January 13, 2025. The observers conducted 64 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[2]](#footnote-3) guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12).

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

In Medway, strengths include professional and productive relationships among the town employees, the district, and the school committee. In addition, district leaders described an effective and inclusive leadership teaming structure led by the superintendent. Furthermore, all schools developed school improvement plans (SIPs) in 2024-2025 that align with the district’s improvement plan. District leaders and the teachers’ association also work collaboratively to address issues in a timely manner. However, the district faces challenges in communicating a clear and consistent vision for student learning at all levels across the district, which is an area for growth. The district has made efforts to engage community members and constituents, but parents reported a lack of opportunities for meaningful involvement.

### [Curriculum and Instruction](#_Curriculum_and_Instruction)

Medway is beginning to implement high-quality instructional materials in some content areas, including ELA and mathematics across grades. Currently, individual schools and content teams determine the instructional models used. The instructional models used in elementary literacy classes and at the middle school level align with the district’s improvement plan and strategic priorities.

However, the district faces several areas for growth. A clearly articulated and cohesive instructional vision that encompasses the needs of all students has yet to be developed for all grades and subjects. The district also does not have a cohesive system for implementing and monitoring instructional models, which leads to misunderstandings, especially at the high school level. Although the district has a document for a curricular review process, teachers noted that they do not follow it. Furthermore, most of the selected district curricula are not currently vertically aligned, particularly to and through the secondary level. Although some schools offer some academic interventions, there is no districtwide approach that consistently connects students at all levels to academic interventions. Finally, teachers noted the need for the district to provide support for all educators to implement evidence-based instructional practices.

### [Assessment](#_Assessment)

The district has several strengths related to data collection and use. Medway is building a data-centered culture, as evidenced by the wide-ranging data collection efforts that help develop a comprehensive view of student performance. The district is committed to a shared understanding of data use and providing data team meeting training. Despite this, teachers reported needing more support to administer assessments to students with a variety of needs, and high school teachers reported needing more support with data analysis. Finally, data from multiple participants suggest that the district should increase the frequency and consistency with which teachers share data with families.

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

In the past one and a half years, Medway has made some significant changes to its human resources department, creating a human resources manager as a new position and hiring a half-time human resources assistant. Following this restructuring, the district has been able to demonstrate several strengths in human resources. These strengths include using more data, particularly from exit interviews, to inform human resources policies, procedures, and practices. In addition, the district’s evaluation process highlights areas of strength for teachers and administrators. Medway administrators have also made efforts to create a more positive staff culture.

However, Medway has several areas for growth related to human resources. The town and district share use of MUNIS, but not all needed and relevant human resources modules are available to the district. District and school leaders and teacher focus group participants all reported challenges with recruiting diverse candidates. Currently, according to DESE data, 10 percent of the students are Hispanic or Latino, but only 2 percent of the teachers are Hispanic or Latino. In addition, no administrators are Hispanic or Latino. The district, therefore, is working to diversify the teaching staff to be more reflective of the student body. In addition, a review of teacher evaluations indicates that the district needs to focus on articulating areas for improvement and actionable feedback more consistently in the evaluation process. Similarly, respondents noted the following additional areas for growth: improve the consistency of walkthroughs and actionable feedback, increase the opportunities for educators to select appropriate professional development opportunities to build their skills, and protect collaboration time and optimize the time. The mentoring program for new teachers can also be restructured to be more effective.

### [Student Support](#_Student_Support)

Medway has established a school climate and culture in which students generally feel welcome, respected, and safe in their schools. At the elementary and middle school level, there is a variety of mental and behavioral health services across Tier 2 and 3 for students. In addition, the district has put significant effort into developing a wraparound service program, which is made up of a district social worker, a therapeutic mentor, a parent coach, and access to Care Solace. The wraparound program at Medway supports all students and their families with their needs that extend beyond the school.

However, although schools have some supports that operate in silos, Medway is lacking Tier 2 behavior supports and systematizing access to mental health services for students at the secondary level. In addition, students reported that most teachers do not ask for their feedback; if they do provide feedback, changes are not made based on that feedback. Medway also does not have a multitiered system of support (MTSS) guidebook that clearly defines the system’s three tiers of support and details how the district applies an adaptable MTSS to implement interventions. In addition to the lack of a guidebook, the district also lacks specificity in the MTSS process, which includes no districtwide expectations around monitoring the effectiveness of an MTSS program, having consistent districtwide progress monitoring procedures, and supporting schools in creating schedules that provide time for teachers to implement Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Lastly, Medway does not provide sufficient guidance to help staff support students, especially English Learners, who receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 services.

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

Medway has several financial and capital management strengths. For example, the district tracks the budget consistently throughout the year, and leaders have worked collaboratively with the school committee and district leadership to improve financial awareness and avoid overspending. In terms of partnerships with municipal officials, both district staff and town officials describe a strong, professional working relationship focused on fiscal planning and shared services. The budget development process is well structured, involving multiple stages and constituent input. Presentations and documents from the budget process are publicly available on the district’s website. District and town officials focus on building maintenance, and the town provides significant support for capital expenses, such as replacing roofs and purchasing school vans.

Medway has several areas for growth related to finances and capital management. Even though budget development is a collaborative process, not all constituents agreed that resources are sufficient to support the trajectory of core operations, and addressing concerns about funding levels for the coming years is an area for growth. In addition, in relation to capital planning and operations, addressing concerns about the maintenance and support of student technology is another area for growth.

## Medway Public Schools: District Review Overview

### Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management. Reviews provide the state, district leaders, and the public with an in-depth look into the systems, structures, and practices of a district and how they affect student experiences and opportunities. District reviews provide information and recommendations to support districts in implementing systemic improvements and advance equitable student outcomes and experiences.

### Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data prior to conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of constituents, 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, as well as 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 provides 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 Medway occurred during the week of January 13, 2025. The site visit included 20 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 90 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with 11 elementary school teachers, seven middle school teachers, and 11 high school teachers; two focus groups with eight middle school and 17 high school students; and two family focus groups with 18 parents or caregivers. Data collection also included distributing a questionnaire to each principal to gather information on district and school processes and operations; respondents in Medway completed the district questionnaire and 4 of 4 principal questionnaires.

The site team also conducted 64 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

The Town of Medway is southwest of Boston and borders the towns of Bellingham and Holliston. According to [census data](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/medwaytownnorfolkcountymassachusetts%2CMA), Medway’s median income from 2019 to 2023 was $174,357, which is above the state median income of $101,341. In 2023, Medway had an estimated 13,560 residents.

The superintendent of the Medway Public Schools is Dr. Armand Pires, who was appointed in 2015. Governance of the district is through a five-member school committee who are elected for three-year terms.

In the 2024-2025 school year, the district served 2,158 students across its four schools. Since the 2020-2021 school year, total enrollment has increased by 84 students. 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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| John D. McGovern Elementary School | Elementary | PK-1 | 353 |
| Burke-Memorial Elementary School | Elementary | 2-4 | 506 |
| Medway Middle School | Middle | 5-8 | 677 |
| Medway High School | High | 9-12 | 622 |
|  |  | Total | 2,158 |

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

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



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



Figure 3 shows the percentage of all Medway 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 Medway than for the state in Grades 3-8 (ELA and mathematics), 5 and 8 (science), and 10 (ELA, mathematics, and science).

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

Medway’s High Needs students, who comprise 30.8 percent of the district, met or exceeded expectations on the 2024 MCAS assessments at rates 5 percentage points to 26 percentage points above High Needs students across the state (see Figure 4).

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

In fiscal year 2023, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Medway was $18,502, which is $945 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($19,447), and $168 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures in districts of similar wealth ($18,670).[[3]](#footnote-4) In-district per pupil expenditures for Medway were $2,754 less than the average state spending per pupil ($21,256). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D5 in Appendix D.

### Classroom Observations

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Medway during the week of January 13, 2025. The observers conducted 64 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

In Medway, 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 Medway is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

Figure 5. CLASS Domain Averages by Grade Band



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

## Leadership and Governance

This section examines the extent to which school committee members, 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 Medway.

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) | * Professional and productive relationships exist among town employees, the district, and the school committee.
* The district has effective shared, distributed, and inclusive leadership structures.
 |  |
| [Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring](#_Strategic_Planning,_Implementation,) | * All schools developed school improvement plans (SIPs) in 2024-2025 that align with the district plan.
 | * Communicating a clear and consistent vision for student learning across the district
 |
| [District Culture](#_District_Culture) | * The district and teachers’ association frequently work collaboratively to address issues in a timely manner.
 | * Involving parents in more shared decision-making
 |

### Leadership and Governing Structures

Appointed in 2015, Armand Pires serves as the superintendent of Medway, and was an administrator in the district prior to his appointment. The school committee consists of five elected members serving staggered three-year terms, along with a student member. Together with the superintendent, the committee governs the district.

A review of the school committee website—including meeting minutes, policies, and goals—as well as interviews with committee members, indicates that the committee has a functioning governance structure. It sets educational goals and implements policies aimed at providing equitable opportunities for student success. In interviews, committee members emphasized their main responsibilities, which include advocating for students, approving the budget, overseeing the superintendent’s evaluation, negotiating collective bargaining agreements with teachers and paraprofessionals, and creating district policies. The website and interviews reveal the school committee’s 2024–2025 goals as follows:

* Supporting approval and implementation of a new five-year strategic plan.
* Continuing efforts to improve, support, and guide the district’s approach to technology.
* Collaborating with the Select Board, the superintendent, and the director of finance and operations to develop the fiscal year 2026 budget, ensuring it meets all students’ needs.

In May 2021, the school committee concluded a multiyear review of district policies. This effort resulted in a revised and approved policy manual that reflects best practices and current legal guidelines in governance, operations, school administration, fiscal management, support services, facilities, personnel, negotiations, instruction, students, community relations, and education agency relations. The manual is available online.

The school committee also emphasized transparency and public engagement. In interviews, members highlighted the importance of community outreach so that the public has accurate information about the district’s challenges and goals. Strategies include holding office hours and sending public communications, such as a December 2024 letter inviting community collaboration.

Professional and productive relationships among the town’s professional employees (e.g., town manager, public works), the district, and school committee are a strength of the district. The superintendent described his relationship with the school committee as favorable, being “fortunate” to have a good relationship with the school committee. He explained that“I really do view them as collaborators and partners in this work.” The superintendent also described his relationship with the town manager as a “really positive, collaborative working relationship” in which they meet regularly to discuss issues. Similarly, municipal officials added that their working relationship with the school committee is “very good overall.”

Multiple participants reported that the town’s elected Select Board and advisory finance committee play a more involved role in district finance and operations than in many other districts. Medway hosts multiple tri-board meetings involving the school committee, the town finance committee, and the Select Board, particularly during winter budget discussions. In addition, the school committee’s Budget Advisory Board—comprising the superintendent, the director of finance and operations, two finance committee members, two Select Board members, and the school committee budget subcommittee—provides guidance throughout the budgeting process.

The district’s shared, distributed, and inclusive leadership structures are effective and are a strength of the district. The district operates two leadership teams:

* The central office administrator team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the director of student services, the director of wellness, the director of community education, the director of human resources, the director of facilities, and the director of technology. This team meets biweekly to address operational matters.
* The executive leadership team (ELT) comprises the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the director of student services, the assistant director of student services, the director of wellness, and four school principals. ELT meetings focus on strategic planning, resource allocation, staffing, program implementation, and operations. Recent topics, per ELT agendas, include safety and security, technology, information technology (IT) needs, the use of artificial intelligence (AI) , staff evaluation, budget planning, school improvement plans, strategic planning, and student assessments.

The ELT also holds quarterly meetings with assistant principals, and district leaders meet monthly or as needed with school leaders and staff to review data and debrief instructional leadership team (ILT) meetings. Different central office leaders, including the director of student services, the director of wellness, and the assistant superintendent are responsible for ensuring compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act, overseeing special education needs and supports, managing English Learner needs across schools, and overseeing health and wellness programs in the district.

In focus groups with staff from across the district, participants agreed that the district empowers school ILTs to establish an inclusive environment and foster positive and collaborative learning. Staff noted that the level of autonomy granted to these teams enhances their effectiveness in implementing school initiatives aligned with the district’s educational vision and strategic goals. School leaders consistently reported having autonomy to make decisions about staffing, scheduling, and budgeting. The leaders emphasized the importance of having structures in place, such as protocols for hiring, that guide their decision-making. For instance, school leaders form committees to advise them when hiring for a position. One leader explained that “because we have such a structure in place for how we make decisions, we’re given the further autonomy because we’re able to make good decisions that tend to prove out fairly well most of the time, and so it builds trust in our relationships.” Another leader explained the importance of understanding the superintendent’s expectations and having a rationale for their decisions. School leaders also reported a range of teams or committees that are active at schools across the district, which include ILTs, school councils, student support teams (SSTs), administrative leadership teams, and data teams at some schools.

District leaders reported that Medway expects all schools to have representative school and parent advisory councils, including school councils and parent-teacher organizations. School councils—comprising principals, teachers, caregivers, and, at the high school, students—meet quarterly at three schools and monthly at one. According to school leader questionnaires, although there is a district Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC), the district did not have an ELPAC at the time of the onsite. Massachusetts law requires ELPACs in districts serving a population in which more than 5 percent of the students are English Learners. According to Medway’s 2024-2025 DESE profile, 4.4 percent of the students are classified as English Learners (with slightly more than 6 percent having a first language that is not English), although this population is growing in the community, up from 1.5 percent of students five years ago.

### Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring

According to the district’s public website, the district’s mission is as follows: “The Medway Public Schools, in partnership with our community, creates an academically challenging, safe, and supportive learning environment that promotes the pursuit of excellence for all.” The district’s vision is as follows:

The Medway Public Schools aspires to provide all students with a comprehensive, equitable academic program that engages, challenges, and supports all students to apply knowledge, develop talents and skills, think independently, work collaboratively, and become informed, responsible, and productive citizens of a global community.

However, focus group responses indicate that the mission and vision are not widely understood across the district. Educator focus group participants reported inconsistent and frequently changing visions guiding their work. Several educators described shifting priorities and initiatives, resulting in a lack of continuity. One educator expressed uncertainty about whether the vision would remain consistent year to year. Other educators stated that their school had a vision, but the district lacked a clear guiding vision. Evidence from focus groups shows that communicating a clear and consistent vision for student learning across the district is an area for growth.

The district developed a strategic plan for 2019-2024 titled “Excellence for All: A Medway Mindset.” The plan has four overarching goals: improved learning, social and emotional wellness, innovative teaching and leadership, and a positive learning culture. According to the superintendent, the strategic plan includes long-term priorities, such as the mission, vision, and core values. District leaders supplement this plan with an annual District Improvement Plan (DIP), which outlines specific steps and activities supporting the goals each year. For example, in the 2024-2025 DIP, the district has 12 action steps to work toward the four goals of their strategic plan. For example, one action step is to “leverage new instructional vision for Grade 6-12 mathematics to enhance educator practice, standards alignment, and student learning/outcomes (i.e., new resource implementation, focus on research-based strategies from NCTM [National Council of Teachers of Mathematics], *Building Thinking Classrooms,* clarify criteria for student placement, etc.).” The DIP also includes data-based measures, such as the percentage of Grades 6-10 students “at Grade Level+” in ELA (IXL).

In January 2024, the district began to develop the next strategic plan. The superintendent described the process for creating the next three-year plan as starting with outreach to the community to encourage them to participate and offering three specific ways to get involved: participate on the strategic plan steering committee, attend a focus group session, and/or complete a survey. To facilitate the process, district leaders formed a steering committee of staff, teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, parents, other community members, and school committee members. After establishing the steering committee, the district sent surveys to the community, including staff and students, to ask their views about what is working well and opportunities for improvement. They also conducted focus groups and interviews with key constituents. Since May 2024, the steering committee has met multiple times, reviewed data, and identified priorities. At the time of the district review in January 2025, the district was in the middle of presenting the near-final draft to each school’s faculty to get feedback and was hoping to get final approval from the school committee in February 2025. In the DIP submitted as part of the district review, data for 2023-2024 were included, but it did not include any data 2024-2025. In addition, no specific data-based goals were in that draft at the time of the visit in January 2025.

All schools developed school improvement plans (SIPs) for 2024-2025 that align with the DIP, which is a strength of the district. The SIPs reflect the DIP and set school-level goals in one-year time frames. In focus groups, school leaders emphasized the collaborative process of aligning SIPs with district goals. A school leader explained that they develop SIPs by “looking at our district improvement plans, looking at our current student data and collecting the voices of the school council, of the community, as well as our staff as well to identify those priorities using that kind of alignment.” One leader highlighted the importance of concise documents (e.g., four pages) to make it easier for staff to read and comprehend and facilitate progress monitoring. The SIPs include instructional priorities and strategies for reducing disparities in student opportunities and outcomes, such as one school’s priority to “enhance equitable instructional practices across content areas in order to improve cognitive engagement with a focus on questioning and accountable talk.” Each SIP lists data indicators, although none of the beginning-of-the-year or midyear data for the most recent school year were provided to the review team.

A review of school committee meeting agendas revealed that several meetings include updates of the DIP and the SIPs as agenda items. Similarly, focus group participants stated that the district provides data updates to the school committee several times per year. For instance, the school committee meeting on November 14, 2024, included a presentation of student assessments for the two elementary schools. The presentation included beginning-of-the-year diagnostics for mathematics and reading as well as next steps. The presentation also included strategies for improvement from the SIPs but did not include specific goals for improvement. The materials for the June 6, 2024 school committee meeting included a review of the end-of-year progress and a summary of goals and actions as they relate to the DIP.

### District Culture

The school committee and district administrators actively foster collaboration and shared decision-making to enhance opportunities and outcomes for all students. In interviews, school committee members and district leaders explained how the district engages with constituents to build support for the schools. For example, the school committee sent a letter to the broader community in December 2024, inviting interested individuals to provide their contact information via a Google form. Thirty-eight people responded. In January 2025, the school committee held a forum to discuss the district’s financial challenges, its needs for the coming year, and ongoing support requirements. According to interview participants, the forum aimed to dispel rumors and promote partnership. One focus group participant noted their objective as “getting them to partner with us so when we have our tri-board [involving the school committee, the town finance committee, and the Select Board] meeting this week, we hope people show up and support the schools.”

The roles of the town manager, town employees, and district and school leaders are clearly defined, as confirmed in interviews with representatives of each group. For example, a town official, when asked about collaborating with the superintendent to determine resource utilization in schools, stated, “I don’t. And, quite frankly, I learned this a long time ago. It is really not my place. My job is to identify revenue sources and provide it to them.”

The school committee, the Select Board, and the parks commission have a formal written agreement regarding exterior maintenance that was updated several years ago. Staff described efforts to resolve maintenance needs and other support requests beyond the scope of this written agreement. Multiple focus group participants described a complicated relationship between the district and the Select Board. One participant explained that the Select Board “regularly gets into the weeds on things that are not their concern or responsibility.” Another participant described trust between the school committee and the Select Board as “a little rocky” because of competition for resources.

The teachers’ association and district and building leaders can easily reach resolutions on some issues but have a more difficult time on others, according to interview participants. Despite some challenging topics, staff report always being able to reach a solution. Focus group participants characterized the union’s working relationship with the superintendent, district leaders, and school leaders as “inconsistent.” According to one participant, the discussions can go “really well,” “really bad,” or “be in the middle somewhere.” Nonetheless, participants highlighted strong communication and close collaboration to advance policies that support students. For example, the teachers’ association and the district have signed multiple letters of agreement to address issues that arose during a contract period, rather than waiting for the period to end. One such letter guarantees half-day preparation periods for middle and high school teachers. The district and teachers’ association’s ability to work collaboratively to address issues in a timely manner is a strength of the district.

The district’s culture is guided by an administrative team that uniformly expresses a commitment to all students. However, leadership lacks representation from certain student groups. According to DESE data, in 2023, the district had no Hispanic or Latino administrators and only two Hispanic or Latino teachers, whereas Hispanic or Latino students accounted for 10 percent of the population in 2025. Following an equity assessment in 2022, district leaders formed an equity steering committee. This committee created the *Medway Public Schools Equity Plan*, which was presented to the school committee on June 15, 2023, to address findings related to climate, instruction, and human resources practices. As part of these efforts, district leaders updated staff recruitment processes, attended job fairs they previously had not, and reached out to local colleges and universities to encourage a more diverse applicant pool for open positions.

Although Medway partners with key constituents, these partnerships do not always provide opportunities for shared decision-making. Respondents described some efforts to communicate information to parents, as well as some committees, as not sufficiently communicative or receptive to parent feedback. Parent focus group participants identified communication from the district and schools as an area for improvement. One participant described receiving frequent emails from the district but criticized the content as “a lot of fluff” that is more reactive than proactive. Another participant observed that district communications highlight activities and sports but “don’t necessarily tell us what is actually happening in the buildings.” A different participant characterized the tone of communication as “all glows, no grows.” Regarding other parent collaboration efforts, such as the strategic planning participation initiative, parents similarly did not feel their input was incorporated. Parents who have participated in committees, including the strategic planning process, described the experiences as “a box checking exercise, not something where [the district or school was] sincerely looking for input or participation.” One participant called these experiences “really disappointing,” a sentiment echoed by other parents. Evidence from family focus groups suggests that parents feel excluded from meaningful shared decision-making, making this an area for growth.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should further disseminate its vision amongst students, staff, and families.*
* *The district should evaluate its current family engagement methods and develop strategies for authentically including families in school- and district-level decision-making.*

## Curriculum and Instruction

This section examines the extent to which district leaders have established a shared instructional vision, anchored in culturally and linguistically sustaining practices, that guides all curricular and instructional decisions toward equitable outcomes for all students. It also focuses on the extent to which the district pairs high-quality curricula and instructional materials and high expectations for all students with individualized supports so that every student can engage in deeper learning and develop the knowledge and skills that will prepare them to succeed in college and/or the workplace.

Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction in Medway.

Table 3. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Curriculum and Instruction Standard

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Instructional Leadership](#_Instructional_Leadership) | * The instructional models used in elementary literacy and at the middle school level align with the district’s improvement plan (DIP) and strategic priorities.
 | * Developing a districtwide instructional vision, particularly to address literacy at the high school level and other subjects (e.g., mathematics at all levels)
* Establishing a clearly defined and consistently monitored instructional model at the high school level to improve alignment across the district
 |
| [Curriculum and Instructional Materials](#_Curriculum_and_Instructional) | * The district uses materials consistently rated as meets expectations in ELA and mathematics across grades.
 | * Consistently implementing and following the established districtwide process for curricular review and selection
* Adopting vertically aligned curricula in all subjects to ensure coherent student learning
 |
| [Equitable Practices and Access](#_Equitable_Practices_and_1) |  | * Creating a districtwide approach that consistently connects students at all levels to academic interventions
 |
| [Effective Instruction and Curricular Implementation](#_Effective_Instruction_and) |  | * Requiring teachers to identify both content and language objectives for all lessons
 |

### Instructional Leadership

The superintendent and district leaders described a broad vision for the district that includes making schools and classrooms engaging for students. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent focus on this broad vision as they lead curriculum and instruction initiatives in the district. However, school leaders and teachers stated that the district does not have a clear, districtwide instructional vision that is guiding all instruction. For example, teachers in focus groups noted that “there’s not a clear vision that is known to everyone and that is posted.” Teachers further commented that this can lead to inconsistency.

Staff noted that priorities are clearer in some departments and grades and less so in others. Through interviews, school-based staff described instructional models that vary based on grade level and content. Elementary level teachers highlighted “guiding principles for literacy,” but noted the absence of similar principles for mathematics. District leaders and elementary school leaders and teachers described significant efforts in recent years to define a cohesive vision for elementary literacy, including acquiring materials, undergoing professional development, and obtaining aligned measurement tools.

At the middle school level, school leaders and teachers reported that deeper learning is guiding instruction across all subjects. Middle school leaders described the work they have done in the past two years to develop deeper learning, including an audit done by DESE, data analysis to identify priorities, and support for teachers to implement the priorities. These implementation priorities include framing student learning, increasing student discourse and rigor for students, and feedback. Furthermore, middle school teachers identified some commonality in K-8 ELA but stated that they lacked connection with high school ELA instruction. However, middle school mathematics teachers noted that they collaborate with the high school level regarding the implementation of a new curriculum. In all, the instructional models used in elementary literacy and at the middle school level align with the DIP and strategic priorities and are a strength of the district.

At the high school, teachers reported inconsistencies in the implementation of instructional models across classrooms. For example, high school teachers noted that “there is a commonality, which is deeper learning, and the other term that’s thrown around a lot is personalized learning, but nobody has a common definition of what [those concepts] are.” Some teachers in the mathematics department described adopting an instructional approach using vertical whiteboard teaching—a key tenet of the program Building Thinking Classrooms—and undergoing professional development on this approach. However, other departments stated that they participated in the professional development but lacked guidance on applying the concept in their classrooms. High school teachers also reported inconsistency in concepts such as project-based learning. Developing a districtwide instructional vision, particularly to address literacy at the high school level and other subjects (e.g., mathematics at all levels), is an area for growth for the district.

Elementary and middle schools in Medway have established systems to implement and monitor instructional models. Elementary teachers described aligning curriculum pacing and student learning goals to support common guiding principles, particularly in literacy. Middle school teachers highlighted a focus on deeper learning. Staff reported the district supported deeper learning as an instructional model with resources such as professional development led by curriculum instructional leaders, a mathematics consultant assisting with the new curriculum, and district-provided materials—like multiple or individual whiteboards in math classrooms—to promote student discourse.

However, Medway High School lacks a consistent approach to identifying, implementing, and monitoring instructional models. Unlike the elementary and middle school levels, the high school does not have a clearly defined or communicated instructional model, either school-wide or within departments.

The district has established monitoring systems for elementary literacy and middle school mathematics, supported by content instructional leaders and a math consultant. However, no such monitoring system exists at the high school level. This absence of structured implementation and oversight contributes to inconsistency and a lack of vertical alignment in instructional models across schools in the district. An area for growth is establishing a clearly defined and consistently monitored instructional model at the high school level to improve alignment across the district.

All schools have leadership teams, and these teams have broad autonomy. The leadership teams differ in composition, meeting frequency, and the level of cohesiveness of the instructional vision at each school level. School leader questionnaires confirmed that each school has an ILT with varying members and meeting schedules:

* At John D. McGovern Elementary School, the ILT includes special educators, general educators, and administrators, and they meet twice per month.
* At Burke-Memorial Elementary School, the ILT includes special educators, English as a second language (ESL) teachers, general educators across all grade levels, and administrators, and they meet monthly.
* At Medway Middle School, the ILT includes the principal, instructional coaches, and members of the deeper learning team (which includes teachers) and they meet twice per month.
* At Medway High School, the ILT includes special educators, department heads, guidance counselors, and administrators, and they meet twice per month.

### Curriculum and Instructional Materials

District staff reported primarily using CURATE[[4]](#footnote-5) and EdReports to evaluate potential curricula and inform curricular decisions. According to interviews and focus groups, stakeholders included in the curricular review and selection processes include the assistant superintendent, department heads, curriculum instructional leaders, and teachers.

A review of the curriculum review process documents revealed that Medway uses a five-phase approach:

1. The planning and preparation phase establishes a review committee, sets goals, and gathers resources.
2. The curriculum analysis phase reviews the current curriculum for alignment, quality, and effectiveness.
3. The constituent feedback phase solicits input from teachers, students, and families/community members.
4. The recommendation and revision phaseprovides curriculum recommendations.
5. The implementation phase includes piloting the curriculum, delivering professional development, rolling out the new curriculum, and monitoring its effectiveness.

Teachers reported varied experiences with the curricular review and selection process. K-5 teachers reported being involved in the ELA curricular review process but did not pilot the curriculum, despite being previously involved in piloting the mathematics curricula as part of its review process. Middle school mathematics teachers reported not being involved in the curricular review or selection process whereas middle school ELA teachers participated in the curricular review and selection process as part of the district’s partnership with HILL for Literacy. Middle school science teachers currently use locally developed curricula but explained that “there’s been talks of potentially going through a curriculum review to actually get [a published curriculum].” High school teachers indicated that curricular decisions varied by subject. For instance, ELA and mathematics teachers felt the curricula were prescribed by the district with little to no teacher input. Meanwhile, social studies and science teachers reported creating their own curricula, with varying levels of district support. Consistently implementing and following the established districtwide process for curricular review and selection is an area for growth for the district.

Table 4 summarizes the status of all districtwide curricula being considered or used in Medway. The use of materials consistently rated as meets expectations in ELA and mathematics across grades is a strength of the district.

Table 4. Summary of Districtwide Curricula Being Used

| Grade level(s) | Subject | Curriculum | Type | CURATE rating | EdReports rating |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K-5 | ELA | MyView | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| K-1 | History | Homegrown | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| K-1 | Science | Science Specialist | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| K-1 | SEL | CASEL | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| 2-4 | Science | Project Lead The Way  | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 3 | History | Open Source/Homegrown | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 3-7 | History/Social Studies | Investigating History a | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 2-4 | SEL | Responsive Classroom | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 2-4 | SEL | Everyday Speech | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| 5 | Science | STEMScopes | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 6-8 | ELA | Amplify ELA | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| 6-8 | Science | Teachers’ Curriculum Institute | Comprehensive | NR | DNME |
| 8 | History/Social Studies | Democratic Knowledge Project | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 9-12 | ELA | StudySync | Comprehensive | PM | ME |
| 6-12 | Mathematics | Illustrative Math | Comprehensive | ME | ME |

*Note*. ELA = English language arts; CURATE = CUrriculum RAtings by Teachers; ME = meets expectations; NR = not rated; CASEL = Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning; DNME = does not meet expectations; PM = partially meets expectations. Investigating History is DESE developed or informed.

a Grades 3-4 are currently piloting Investigating History.

In Medway, not all subjects have vertical alignment because the district is still undergoing curricular review in some subjects. For example, ELA and mathematics are vertically aligned in K-5, but history and science are not yet vertically aligned. In focus groups, teachers reported having some vertical alignment efforts in recent years, but these efforts were limited to a few grades and subject areas. Elementary and middle school teachers reported alignment efforts in literacy that involved elementary teachers and Grade 5 middle school teachers. These efforts included a districtwide training day (though not all staff believed it supported vertical alignment) and monthly before-school meetings for elementary staff. One teacher commented on the limitations of alignment efforts: “It would be great if we could have time with the people [in the grades] below us and even the people above us in [the other middle school grades], but it just doesn’t exist.” Regarding literacy in the upper grades, one middle school respondent said, “I don’t know what happens once you get to the high school.” At the high school, teachers have a highly rated ELA curriculum[[5]](#footnote-6) but reported being dissatisfied with several aspects of it, with one remarking that it “is not rigorous, it is not engaging.” On the other hand, middle and high school mathematics curricula are reported as fairly well aligned, aided by the adoption of new curricula and collaboration with a consultant. Teachers reported that the upper grades social studies curricula are entirely teacher-created (except for Advanced Placement [AP] courses using approved textbooks), and science materials are chosen based on individual subdisciplines. Adopting vertically aligned curricula in all subjects to ensure coherent student learning is an area for growth for the district.

### Equitable Practices and Access

The availability and provision of academic interventions varies by grade level, as reported by staff in interviews and focus groups, as well as in questionnaires. In particular, staff reported that at the lower elementary level (McGovern Elementary School), leaders reported Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in ELA and mathematics, including reading support, phonemic awareness bootcamp, and Title 1 mathematics. At the upper elementary level (Burke-Memorial Elementary School), staff reported that the school offers Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in ELA and mathematics, including reading and mathematics support and classroom interventions for both subjects. At Medway Middle School, leaders reported Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in ELA, including Language Live, Wilson, and Hill Foundational Skills Routines for students in Grade 5. They also offer one unspecified Tier 2 mathematics intervention. Medway High School staff did not specify any available academic interventions. In addition, Medway Community Education, a self-sustaining department that offers year-round learning and enrichment programs outside regular school time, runs a What I Need (WIN) program districtwide that offers afterschool ELA and mathematics support at the elementary level and homework help at the secondary level.

Medway does not have an MTSS guidebook that details how the district applies an adaptable MTSS to implement academic interventions for students. Elementary and middle school principals and teachers agreedthat student assessment data and progress monitoring inform the selection of academic intervention materials, which align with the common curriculum. The district also leverages student support teams to match students to interventions that meet students’ needs. At the high school level, school leaders reported the absence of in-class tiered interventions, unlike the elementary and middle schools. Teachers and students indicated that students can access academic support during a flex block and after school; however, this support is voluntary. Although teachers are expected to identify students who need support, the choice to attend is at the students’ discretion. Creating a districtwide approach that consistently connects students at all levels, especially at the high school, to academic interventions is an area for growth for the district.

Medway makes several concerted efforts to guarantee access to learning opportunities for all students. The district makes some efforts to ensure that students who are historically underserved, particularly those who are marginalized based on race, ethnicity, disability status, and linguistic background, receive the individualized supports and services they need to access the material. However, at the time of this district review visit, staff continued to report some challenges with access to supports for English Learners, particularly those who are dually identified as both English Learners and Students with Disabilities, at the secondary level.

Across the district, the growing population of English Learners has created a need for student support across levels. The district provides English Learners access to services, but the services vary by school. For example, at the elementary and middle schools, there is a Sheltered English Immersion program, but this program does not exist at Medway High School. High school teachers noted that in some of the English language development (ELD) classes, English Learners have described feeling like they do not belong in the school.

School leaders and teachers explained that for dually identified students, scheduling constraints often prioritize services for individualized education programs (IEPs) over English Learner services. One specialist noted that “when a student is very high needs and needs special ed[ucation] classes and supports and EL [English language support], special ed[ucation] always takes precedence. In fact, someone told me once it trumps EL [English Learner] support.” Teachers also reported that professional development has not addressed how to develop supports for English Learners in general education classrooms. District leaders mentioned that the English Learner education coordinator is a new districtwide position created this year. Staff reported that although the district is responding to both increased English Learner student needs and teachers’ need for support, these needs are not always met.

The district offers advanced learning opportunities at both the middle and high school levels, but there are some barriers to accessing these courses. For example, at the middle school level, accelerated mathematics classes require teacher recommendations, although families can request placement. School staff review data midyear to assess whether students can move to different mathematics classes.

At Medway High School, interview data and documents indicate that students generally have equitable access to learning opportunities. A review of Medway High School’s course catalogue indicated that the school offers a range of rigorous coursework in all grades. This coursework includes advanced courses, electives, and career and technical education courses. Principals reported that the school aims to “raise the bar for all students to a college prep level because our expectation is [that] our students are either going to go to college or be prepared for a career once they leave Medway High School.” AP courses are available to any student, and the school’s “challenge by choice” program allows students to take electives at an honors level. High school student focus group participants noted the Innovation Career Pathways program, which allows students to take technical courses in specific industries and culminates in an internship or capstone to prepare students for a career in their selected industry. Teachers at the high school noted that Students with Disabilities have access to honors and AP classes, but English Learners do not always have the same access due to a lack of supports for them in advanced learning classes.

While the district does provide opportunities for students to pursue advanced learning, teachers at the secondary level expressed concerns about inconsistencies in expectations and rigor across classes. Some teachers noted that grading practices do not align with student readiness, citing the statistic that 70 percent to 80 percent of the freshman class earned all A’s despite many reading below grade level. Data supports this statistic: a 94.6 percent passing rate for ninth-grade courses, which is 15.9 percentage points higher than the state average. Grade 9 course passing was higher than the state rate for each student group except for Students with Disabilities. According to teachers in focus groups, the lack of rigor has resulted in students graduating from Medway not being fully prepared for college, regardless of the advanced learning opportunities they have the opportunity to pursue.

### Effective Instruction and Curricular Implementation

Teachers across Medway generally agreed that the district has developed a safe and supportive learning environment in which most students can engage in academic content. At the elementary level, staff reported that their efforts include posting more student work and welcome signs in multiple languages. Most notably, elementary staff said that the district provided training on Responsive Classroom and coteaching models, along with similar support for school-based instructional leads.

In contrast, middle and high school staff reported no formal efforts. Despite this, middle and high school students reported having at least one trusted adult in the building whom they would feel comfortable going to for support (see Student Support). High school students explained that the classroom environment is normally supportive, but they have encountered some situations in which class discussions or the inconsistent ways that some staff enforced school expectations made them uncomfortable.

Classroom observation scores in the middle range for dimensions in the Emotional Support domain support these depictions. These ratings suggest that teachers and students may share some warm and supportive relationships, but these are not observed in all cases. Teachers are sometimes aware of student needs, and student choice in lessons is limited. Classroom observation scores in the high range for the Negative Climate dimension suggest that classrooms have no display of negativity.

According to district leaders, the district has expectations for—and supports educators in—implementing lessons that reflect grade-level standards and the WIDA English Language Development (ELD) standards. In general, teachers at all levels described being in the early stages of including language objectives for lessons, but they also want more time and training. At the elementary level, for example, staff reported that some but not all staff have their Sheltered English Immersion endorsement. In general, staff are in the early stages of working on language objectives: “We’re dipping our toes and starting to get better at aligning those to the WIDA 2020 standards.” A colleague echoed that these goals are part of common planning time, but they would like more time with coteachers and colleagues to do more work in developing language objectives. Middle school teachers noted that they are working to incorporate WIDA standards based on needs in the classroom, but it is not a universal expectation from the district. Staff at the middle school level reported having “pockets of attempts” to support language objectives and correspond with “pockets of need,” in contrast to higher levels of need at the elementary level. High school teachers agreed and explained that the district created personalized documents for all the English Learners, but teachers are not always able to access the student documents, so they do not have accurate ELD levels, and support is lacking from the district about how to best educate English Learners. High school teachers expressed frustration at the lack of resources and support for incorporating English Learners into their classrooms, expressing a desire for more curricular resources and support. One teacher described trying to accommodate a range of language needs in their classroom but lacking the training and resources. Consequently, this teacher is “feeling like I’m failing my EL [English Learner] students.” Teachers, in general, disagreed that the district requires teachers to identify both content and language objectives for all lessons, which is an area of growth for the district.

Elementary and middle school teachers indicated that their schools mostly support them in implementing evidence-based instructional practices by providing professional development and offering professional learning communities (PLCs) led by coaches, consultants, or instructional leaders. However, middle school teachers noted that it would be beneficial for the district to “give time to build [on] the things we learn at [professional development].” As previously mentioned, high school teachers reported that instructional practices are discussed, but they do not have a common understanding of expectations for instruction. One teacher said, “I’m not really sure [that good instruction has] ever been defined for us in a meaningful way and that’s a usable way.”

Middle school students agreed that instruction varies and shared that some classes offer hands-on and engaging work, but other classes are more lecture-based and individual work. Students reported not liking the “new DKP [Democratic Knowledge Project] program for history” because of its emphasis on listening over hands-on learning. In contrast, high school students praised the mathematics program (Illustrative Math) as “really great because it brings a lot of people that wouldn’t usually work together, together to do math.” However, high school students explained that the classroom experience varies based on the class. For example, they noted being asked to explain thinking in classes such as statistics, psychology, or AP classes but not as often in other courses. High school students also noted that “certain teachers could probably be told to just like help a little bit more, like, . . . explain stuff and just interact with students more instead of just like giving out work.”

Classroom observation scores in the low to middle range for dimensions in the Instructional Support domain illustrate these depictions and suggest that teachers sometimes facilitate engagement in lessons. Students have few opportunities to create or generate ideas. The focus of the class is sometimes on meaningful discussion and the explanation of broad, organizing ideas, but students do not always engage in higher-order thinking skills. Teachers sometimes facilitate feedback loops to allow students to elaborate and expand on their thinking, but there are no or few discussions in class.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should develop and widely distribute a vision of instruction for the district.*
* *The district should work with high school leaders to identify, define, and monitor an instructional model that allows for alignment across the district.*
* *The district should implement and follow a consistent district-wide system for reviewing and selecting high-quality instructional materials across grade levels and content areas.*
* *The district should adopt high-quality instructional materials that are vertically aligned to support curricular coherence across grade levels.*
* *The district should examine its MTSS and implement a consistent approach to identifying student needs and connecting students to interventions.*
* *In partnership with school leaders and teachers, the district should set expectations around identifying content and language objectives for all lessons.*

## Assessment

This section examines the extent to which, through the establishment of strategic data and assessment systems, the district supports a robust, data-centered culture that advances equitable student experiences and outcomes. It also addresses how the district collects an array of data and uses it to inform decisions at the classroom, school, and district levels. By analyzing assessment results and other data, educators develop an understanding of the whole student, examine trends across student groups, and adjust their instruction accordingly.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment in Medway.

Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Assessment Standard

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Data Collection](#_Data_Collection) | * The district established comprehensive data collection efforts.
 | * Developing supports for teachers to administer assessments to students with a variety of needs
 |
| [Data Use and Culture](#_Data_Use_and) | * The district has a commitment to a shared understanding of collaborative data use among teachers.
 | * Providing data analysis support at the high school level
 |
| [Sharing Data](#_Sharing_Data) |  | * Consistently reviewing data, sharing results, and setting goals with students at the secondary level
* Increasing the frequency and consistency with which teachers share data with families
 |

### Data Collection

According to school and district staff, Medway strategically selects and implements formal and formative, teacher-created assessments that align with instructional content. This assessment system allows teachers to collect multiple types of academic and nonacademic data about each student. Table 6 outlines the standardized assessments used districtwide.

Table 6. Summary of Districtwide Assessments

| Assessment  | Grades | Time of Administration |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Panorama | Kindergarten to Grade 12 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| iReady Reading | Kindergarten to Grade 10 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| iReady Math | Kindergarten to Grade 10 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| DIBELS | Kindergarten to Grade 5 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| IXL Reading | Grades 6-10 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| IXL Math | Grades 6-10 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| MCAS | Grades 3-8 and 10 | Spring |
| PSAT | Grades 10 and 11 | Fall |
| SAT | Grade 11 | Spring |

In focus group discussions, district staff expressed that collected data provides a comprehensive understanding of each student. For example, district staff mentioned that in instructional support team (IST) meetings, staff integrate nonacademic and academic data to understand students’ needs. District leaders described Medway as “a very data-rich district,” and teachers at all levels reported reviewing data regularly. District staff said that they use standardized assessments as well as opportunities to assess students’ knowledge and skills through art gallery showcases, culminating presentations in the Pathways program, and science fair participation. An elementary teacher shared that “I can pinpoint exactly what the students need to work on in both content areas . . . because of all of the data that we’re constantly collecting.” Middle school teachers also discussed collecting formative data through strategies such as exit tickets. At the high school level, teachers reported using standardized tools such as IXL as well as “authentic and meaningful assessments” in multiple academic departments. As one high school teacher explained, “I think the school has actually, as a whole, done a really good job with assessments.” The comprehensive data collection efforts that the district has established are a strength of the district.

According to district leaders, Medway administers standardized assessments such as iReady, DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), and IXL three times per year, typically in September, January, and May. According to the superintendent, Medway does not publicly share the assessment plan or schedule, but school leaders reported that families receive updates when formal assessments, such as iReady and IXL, are happening. Elementary teachers reported that parents are aware of when assessments take place because they receive benchmark reports.

Teachers reported having to sometimes revise planned assessments to make them accessible for all students. For example, middle school teachers noted that in the new mathematics curriculum (Illustrative Math), a consultant advised that they limit activities in one unit to support English Learners, and teachers had to modify a subsequent assessment to reflect just the material taught. Middle school teachers also noted that they worked to simplify the language of Amplify assessments for English Learners. Elementary teachers agreed with them, noting that “some of the lesson quizzes aren’t accessible to all, including some of our special ed[ucation] population and our EL [English Learner] population . . . [because] it’s very language based.” At the high school level, teachers reported high confidence in their data work in general, but they were frustrated with supporting English Learners in scaffolding assessments, with some departments voicing unhappiness with the resources available and others not having supports to accommodate different needs. Developing supports to help teachers create scaffolds for administering assessments to students with a variety of needs is an area for growth for Medway.

### Data Use and Culture

Medway’s articulated vision for data use includes district and school teams using a combination of academic and other kinds of information to inform the development and monitoring of priorities. According to the superintendent, Medway collects and disaggregates student group data from multiple sources to inform district planning, decision-making, policies, and practices. According to district leaders, district staff regularly use grades; attendance; SST reports; IEPs; behavioral evaluations; office referrals; suspensions; MCAS, ACCESS, AP scores, and SAT/ACT scores; and data from iReady, IXL, DIBELS, and Panorama to evaluate students’ academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs. Drawing from district and school staff focus groups and interviews, it is evident that Medway has the beginning of a shared data vision, which positions the data use as an important and necessary activity for all staff in the district.

In addition to the districtwide data vision, district staff create specific data visions at the school level in Medway, and each school is expected to have data teams and leadership teams that use information to identify student needs and make decisions. Schools at all levels indicated at least some level of collaborative activity in data use, although this varied by department. In focus groups, school staff explained that the district sets expectations regarding student data review and developed structures to facilitate regular data review cycles and adjustments to instruction. According to the superintendent, the district invested in data team trainings for all teachers a few years ago. Medway’s commitment to a shared understanding of collaborative data use among teachers is a strength of the district.

Principals and other district staff agreed that they use data to regularly monitor the experiences and outcomes of all students and use disaggregated data to adjust coursework offerings, such as supporting literacy work at the elementary level.Principals reported that staff have “strong data practices and data meetings,” including related to instructional planning, assessing the implementation of deeper learning efforts, and conducting the teacher evaluation process. However. school leaders also said that the needs of English Learners do not garner enough attention in their data reviews, with one noting that “we have a lot of work to go there.” As a district, staff reported that data sources for English Learners included REACH Higher in Grades K-4, Our World in Grades 2-4, and National Geographic for English Learners in Grades 5-7.

Elementary teachers reported using DIBELS and iReady data to support literacy, as well as some additional information on early literacy, such as letter and sound awareness at the preschool level. Teachers characterized the team’s use of data at this level as “robust” and tied closely to their extensive literacy work. Elementary teachers also reported using iReady to assess mathematics proficiency, but they characterized that system as “not as robust.” All middle school teachers discussed the assessments that they use and how they scaffold assessments for their learners, including iReady and DIBELS data, as well as teacher-created and curriculum-embedded exit tickets. Teachers reported meeting multiple times per six-day cycle in cross-department teams (e.g., mathematics and science teachers at a grade level) to discuss data in PLC meetings. High school teachers stated having some use of IXL at their level, but they more frequently rely on assessments that come with curricular materials or common assessments in each department. High school staff also reported looking at this information frequently, often with colleagues. Additionally, focus group participants from the high school reported that examining common assessments occurred more often in science and social studies and less often in the English department. Across all schools, teachers generally agreed that their schools are supporting them with data use.

According to school leaders and teachers, Medway provides educators with access to relevant data; however, school leaders explained that the district currently does not have data dashboards that allow all staff to access and analyze relevant data efficiently. As a result, although schools have “strong data practices and data meetings,” staff are analyzing data by hand (i.e., creating spreadsheets). District leaders noted that Medway is planning to partner with a software developer to create a data platform to address this need. School staff, particularly at the high school level, explained using a significant amount of their planning and collaborative time to organize data, so they do not have as much time to analyze data or discuss implications of the results. Providing data analysis support at the high school level is an area for growth in the district. Elementary and middle school teachers noted that the district provides them with access to Continuum, a data tool from HILL for Literacy, which helps them “make informed decisions using DIBELS, iReady, and a few other literacy measures in a really systematic way.”

### Sharing Data

District and school leaders in Medway expect teachers to communicate with families about student performance, and teachers and families noted that the district shares evidence of student, school, and district performance. However, staff shared that district expectations are not specific, and, in practice, staff do not consistently share data with parents and students at all levels within the district.

Medway uses the Infinite Campus system to allow families to monitor student academic data, including grades on assignments, overall course grades, and assessment scores. District staff reported that care with student data is a high priority. According to district leaders, digital platforms that collect, store, and share student data are reviewed and monitored to ensure ongoing compliance with student data privacy laws and regulations, but the frequency of this review varies by the platform. District leaders also reported that the district does not offer professional learning for staff about student data privacy laws, policies, and best practices for safeguarding student information. Medway is a member of The Education Collaborative (TEC), an interdistrict partnership, and participates in the Student Data Privacy Alliance.

Elementary school leaders and teachers reported that they send home “a color copy report of [students’] DIBELS and iReady [results] to every parent twice a year” with an explanation about how to read the results. Elementary teachers reported that they share data with students if “they have a goal that they’re tracking,” and students have some access to see their iReady and Panorama data. Staff, however, noted that students, particularly in the younger grades, may not have been instructed how to track goals or understand the kinds of information available to them in benchmark programs. Parents receive updates on benchmark assessment results three times per year, as well as “a cover letter that explains [the data] and . . . how to interpret it.” The letters also invite parents to contact teachers with additional questions.

At the middle and high school levels, teachers rely primarily on Infinite Campus for parents and students to see grades, but interview and focus group respondents described its use as inconsistent. Middle school students reported that “it really depends on the teacher whether you can understand” what grades are based on, if work is missing, or when tasks are due. In addition, when teachers do communicate with students, it is more about grades or missing assignments, not broader goals. Students said teachers “won’t necessarily tell you ‘I think you’re doing really great, or I see you’re struggling with this specific topic, [so] maybe you should stay after school or something to help out.’”

At the high school, both teachers and students agreed that the communication they receive from teachers regarding their achievement and progress varies. Staff said they have expectations to update electronic gradebooks every few weeks. In practice, however, teachers said “not everybody does it.” High school teachers generally agreed that staff care about students and will reach out if “a student is struggling [or] they’ve been out sick, and we’ll work one-on-one with them.” High school students agreed with this, noting that teachers informed them about grades and missing assignments with varying levels of consistency. High school students explained that their grades are accessible through an app, but not all teachers post grades in a timely manner. Teacher and student focus group participants reported that the district does not set expectations for engaging all students in goal setting and data review. Therefore, consistently reviewing data, sharing results, and setting goals with students at the secondary level is an area for growth.

Additionally, families reported that the level of communication they receive varies. For example, a family noted that “they do a much better job in elementary school. I think we get more progress reports on those kids. Once they get older, it’s less and less, and I think you kind of are finding out when it’s too late.” Increasing the frequency and consistency with which teachers share data with families is an area for growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should have coaches, curriculum instructional leaders, and department heads partner with teachers to implement the necessary accommodations and scaffolds on assessments for English Learners and Students with Disabilities.*
* *The district should empower teachers with tools, such as the Open Architects platform, to efficiently organize and analyze student data so that it can be used to inform instruction.*
* *The district should reinforce expectations around sharing data with students and should provide professional learning opportunities to support teachers in engaging students in developmentally-appropriate data reviews and goal-setting.*
* *The district should further investigate the barriers that prevent consistent data sharing with families and work with school leaders to establish consistent expectations for family engagement around sharing assessment results and information on academic progress.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

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

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development in Medway.

Table 7. 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](#_Infrastructure) | * The district is using more data, particularly from exit interviews, to inform human resources policies, procedures, and practices.
 | * Transitioning to electronic records to create more efficiencies for staff in accessing accurate human resources information
 |
| [Staffing](#_Staffing_1) | * The evaluation process excels in highlighting areas of strength for teachers and administrators.
* The district’s efforts to create a more positive staff culture.
 | * Diversifying staff to be more reflective of the student body
* Articulating areas for improvement and actionable feedback more consistently in the evaluation process to support all staff in continuous instructional and professional improvement
 |
| [Professional Learning](#_Professional_Learning) |  | * Improving the consistency of conducting walkthroughs and offering actionable feedback that guides professional learning
* Increasing the opportunities for educators to have input on professional development opportunities, particularly in self-identified areas of need like support for multilingual learners
* Protecting collaboration time and optimizing the use of this time
* Restructuring the teacher mentoring program
 |

### Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices

Researchers at the University of Massachusetts–Boston studied Medway’s central office organizational structure and released a report in October 2023 titled “Medway Public Schools: Central Office Organizational Study.” Regarding the district’s human resources department, the researchers concluded that “the human resources department is in transition with several key areas of responsibility unsettled. Decision-making authority for staffing needs, compensation, and procurement lacks clarity.”

According to interviews and documents, the district has implemented changes to address the findings of the study, including creating a human resources manager position in 2023 and hiring a part-time human resources assistant in 2024. District staff state that they now have the necessary staff to post job positions, support the hiring process, onboard new employees, and assist employees with workplace issues. In addition, the human resources department is in the process of digitizing employee records, transitioning from paper records to electronic storage.

The district partners with the town to use the MUNIS system to maintain some financial and human resources records. The town pays for the system, but it does not purchase all modules, which the town considers unnecessary. However, according to district leaders, the needs of the town and the district differ, in part as the town has approximately half the number of employees compared to the district, and town staff are spread over more departments, each with its own lead who can manage hiring without the support of the MUNIS system. For example, onboarding and registering employees remains a time-consuming, paper-based process given the number of employees. There is a module within MUNIS that could streamline this process, but the town sees this function as unnecessary and has decided not to purchase this functionality.

The town maintains W-2s, tax, and payroll records for employees. One area that town systems are deficient in, according to central office staff, is employee access to specific electronic documents. Consequently, Medway is in the process of developing an employee portal so that employees can access tax documents both on paper and electronically within the town’s MUNIS portal. District staff said that employees will receive W-2s in both paper and electronic form for the second time for 2024 taxes.

Another area in which the district recognizes inefficiencies is in tracking staff attendance. Currently, the human resources office tracks staff attendance as well as accrued sick and vacation time for staff. Currently, staff can see this information on paystubs or by logging on to the Frontline System, according to district staff. MUNIS can track these data points. However, district and municipal staff were still trying to get the system to accurately report sick time at the time of the site visit, given challenges in getting accurate information into the system. Despite ongoing improvements, teacher focus group participants reported challenges in getting consistent information from the human resources department. Thus, the transition to electronic records to create more efficiencies for staff in accessing accurate human resources information remains an area for growth for Medway.

Medway uses data collected in exit interviews to inform human resources policies, procedures, and practices, which is a strength of the district. The human resources manager has created structures for conducting exit interviews with departing staff and capturing their resignation reasons in MUNIS, creating different categories, which allows the district to capture and analyze this information. As a result, district leaders reported learning the specific reasons why people leave. For example, one district leader reported that data collected within the past year showed that salaries for nonunion staff and teacher working conditions are among the reasons why staff leave the district. In one case, two middle school specialist teachers resigned because of high workloads in which they taught 10 sections of students each. As a result, the middle school is working on changing its schedule and the structure of those specialist teaching positions in an attempt to stem the losses of other staff who may have similar concerns.

### Staffing

District leaders provided a clear picture of the policies and processes in place to recruit, hire, and onboard new staff. The process begins with the human resources manager working with hiring managers, who are usually principals, to post jobs and assist with recruiting. The hiring managers conduct interviews, and the superintendent meets with the final candidate recommended by each principal. School leaders confirmed the process outlined by district leaders and agreed that they have primary responsibility for hiring people in their buildings. In terms of using data, district leaders described using information about the grade levels of Students with Disabilities and English Learners to project needs for additional student services as students advance to different school buildings.

District leaders described changes to staffing priorities resulting from the University of Massachusetts–Boston report, in addition to changes to the structure of the human resources office. The report highlighted the fact that the staff does not reflect the student body, which was “incredibly painful for the community,” according to one district leader. As a result, the Medway Public Schools Equity Plan, which was presented to the school committee on June 15, 2023, identified employing and retaining a diverse faculty and staff as the first objective under the third priority: Develop a professional climate in which adult and student diversity and perspectives are valued. (Currently, according to DESE data, 10 percent of the district’s students are Hispanic or Latino, but only 2 percent of the teachers are Hispanic or Latino as 2025, with no Hispanic or Latino administrators as of 2023.) The district is trying to expand its recruiting efforts to diversify its staff by attending different job fairs and more actively reaching out to local state colleges and universities. District and school leaders and teacher focus group participants reported continued challenges with recruiting diverse candidates, and several respondents reported that such recruitment is still a current goal. Diversifying the staff, including teachers and leaders, to be more reflective of the student body is an area for growth.

Despite efforts to move more human resources processes online, district leaders stated that onboarding remains paper-based. After completing the onboarding process, if the person is hired prior to the start of the school year, they attend a two-day staff orientation in August led by the assistant superintendent. All district staff and building leaders attend at least part of the orientation to begin building connections between new and returning staff. According to an onboarding presentation provided by the district, the agenda includes the district’s values and priorities, followed by information about human resources, wellness, student support, supervision, evaluation, and equity. At the start of the 2024-2025 school year, the district also developed an onboarding process for staff hired after the school year begins, which was a major need according to district leaders. The district also offers a mentoring program to help support new hires.

District staff described the district’s approach to educator evaluation as following DESE’s model for evaluation language, standards, and indicators. According to DESE data, 5.9 percent of evaluated educators in Medway were rated as “needs improvement,” which is twice the state rate of 2.7 percent. District leaders attributed this discrepancy to the fact that they have high expectations of their teachers, and they are not willing to mark everyone as proficient. In contrast, several educators attributed the lower ratings to a “lack of support” with difficult classrooms, sometimes with multiple students who struggle with behavior issues.

District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently completed using Vector Solutions. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample of 10 percent of 109 teachers (11 teachers) due for summative evaluations for the 2023-2024 school year. All teachers selected for review (100 percent) had a summative evaluation available for review. However, one teacher evaluation available for review was incomplete and omitted required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. Nearly all evaluation documents reviewed (91 percent) included a student learning SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goal and a professional practice SMART goal. All the teachers’ progress toward their student learning and professional goals were evaluated. All evaluations reviewed (100 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 included feedback for each standard and overall feedback related to the teacher’s overall rating. All teacher evaluations also included feedback naming strengths or practices that the teacher should continue; however, three quarters of the evaluations (73 percent) included feedback indicating areas of improvement, and about one quarter lacked this feedback.

District records suggest that administration evaluations are also completed using Vector Solutions. Of the 11 administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2023-2024 school year, all evaluations (100 percent) were available for review; however, only 10 evaluations (91 percent) were complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Nearly all evaluations (91 percent) included student learning, professional practice, and school improvement SMART goals. All the evaluations reviewed (100 percent) included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards and included feedback for each standard. Nearly all administrator evaluations reviewed (91 percent) included comments with specific, actionable feedback naming each administrator’s strengths; however, only eight of the evaluations reviewed (73 percent) identified areas of improvement for administrative district staff.

Taken together, the review of teacher and administrator evaluations indicates that the district excels in highlighting areas of strength through the evaluation process for teachers and administrators, which is a strength of the district.

Despite this strength, district leaders acknowledged that the lack of consistency in providing evaluation feedback to teachers across the district is “really problematic.” These leaders reported continuing to work with administrators to make teacher feedback consistent and actionable. In interviews and focus groups, district leaders discussed how they are using educator input to modify the feedback process, specifically how they formalized the practice that a leader who leaves feedback for a teacher

will actually have a face-to-face conversation with them before they put it into the TeachPoint system, because of feedback [the district] got about how impersonal it felt to wait three days and then, poof, something pops up in TeachPoint and you haven’t had, as a teacher, the opportunity to sort of explain the context or anything.

In addition, a review of documents indicates that feedback processes for supervision and evaluation were addressed through an undated PowerPoint presentation for leaders titled “Educator Supervision and Evaluation in 2024-2025.”

Similar to district leaders, teacher focus group participants reported inconsistencies with the evaluations. A teacher stated, “We need consistency in the district, from the McGovern school to the high school, on ‘this is what an exemplary teacher looks like.’” Teachers provided mixed opinions about the usefulness of the feedback process. One teacher reported the feedback as “helpful and collaborative,” whereas other teachers did not find the feedback to be supportive, with some noting that feedback was infrequent and not substantive. Another teacher explained, “I feel like there’s a disconnect between evaluation and teacher improvement, and one is not used to improve the other, which is why it feels like a gotcha, even if that’s not what they intend.” Providing timely, consistent, and actionable feedback through the evaluation process is an area for growth for the district.

Despite the inconsistency with evaluation feedback, district and school leaders focus on recognizing outstanding educators and providing opportunities for teachers to excel. According to interviews with district leaders, the superintendent publicly recognized teachers and staff at a recent districtwide meeting. One building leader reported having a ritual of providing teachers with a bronze Mustang trophy to recognize staff who contributed extra efforts on special projects.

In terms of developing pathways for advancement, district staff and school leaders reported trying to create opportunities in the district to support staff who are seeking to advance in their careers. District leaders pointed out that the union contract has provisions for course credit or reimbursement. District staff also described a willingness to discuss alternate roles with teachers if there were needs in other areas of the district. In addition, teacher leadership opportunities, including serving as literacy specialists (elementary schools), curriculum instructional leaders (middle schools), and department heads (high school) are all available to current staff.

 District leaders described their approach to retaining educators as multifaceted, including both personable approaches and supports for staff. In trying to balance formal human resources systems with individual interactions, leaders reported using a personal touch to reach out to new staff members to determine if they need assistance and let them know that district leaders are available to support them. The superintendent also sends note cards to new staff a few times during the year.

To improve staff culture and climate across buildings, district leaders reported that principals are working to create informal activities and events that “highlight joy in buildings.” They are intentionally working to create positive staff cultures and connections. Principals within the district agreed that their district fosters a positive, productive, and inclusive work environment. They also described working to promote a sense of belonging and build trust among their respective staff. One leader reported that they are “leaning into some of the more difficult conversations and really trying to make sure that people feel truly valued and supported and heard.” Another leader stated, “I think all of us [as principals] have worked really hard to have these thoughtful discussions about providing opportunities to include our faculty in decision-making and to ensure that we have wellness programs for our staff as well.” Another leader offered an example of a staff-led initiative on each payday, when departments take responsibility to host a breakfast throughout the year. Another school has afterschool gatherings and celebrates staff birthdays. A leader summed up their efforts: “We know that if we put the investment into making them feel good about coming to work, having access to things that they need, they can perform better in the classroom for the kids.” Leaders cited as an example that the district has a fee-for-service daycare for the children of employees, which leaders said they hope helps with retention. These efforts to create a more positive staff culture are a strength of the district.

District leaders described their approach to retaining educators as multifaceted, including both personable approaches and supports for staff. In trying to balance formal human resources systems with individual interactions, leaders reported using a personal touch to reach out to new staff members to determine if they need assistance and let them know that district leaders are available to support them. The superintendent also sends note cards to new staff a few times during the year.

According to DESE data, teacher retention increased from 77.4 percent in 2022 to 87.6 percent in 2024, which is above the state rate of 85.8 percent. Despite the efforts to retain staff and create more positive environments, district leaders explained that, while staff retention is improving, it remains very challenging. Student focus group participants also recognized the high turnover of their teachers, particularly in the mathematics department and among some athletic coaches in the high school. Participants in a teacher focus group shared that many of the culture and retention efforts are not always factors in teachers’ retention decisions. These staff reported relationships with colleagues as the main reason they stay: “I love the people I work with, and that’s probably why I’ve never left.” For others, staff said that the common reason(s) that staff leave the district is a lack of support from the administration. Another principal agreed on the challenge of staff turnover, but attributed part of the reason to the district’s “strong focus on teaching outcomes for students,” which can create pressure on teachers.

Teacher focus group participants indicated that the health and wellness supports that the district provides are inconsistent across buildings and do not necessarily meet the needs of all educators. Several focus group participants reported not being asked what they need to be successful, suggesting that the current district wellness programming, such as yoga classes, is not what educators want. They suggested that teachers need to feel supported and feel as if they can go to their respective administrator and “just vent if they need to vent or ask for help if they need help.” Currently, some teachers feel that such opportunities are not open to them. For example, two teachers shared that some newer teachers are afraid to speak up because of the fear of retaliation; for some staff, this fear reduces participation even in anonymous staff surveys. One teacher described reporting an issue to human resources that a staff member understood to be confidential, but was relayed back to their administrator and the union. Some teacher focus group participants shared that they believe that the district’s newer leaders are trying to improve these issues.

### Professional Learning

District leaders reported primarily using observations and feedback from the walkthrough process to provide educators with guidance to support all students. Principals similarly reported that they co-observe classrooms periodically with district leaders. For their observations, district and school leaders reported using a “claim, evidence, inference, judgment” model. They emphasized the importance of transparency and communication as well as prioritizing in-person meetings with teachers before putting anything in writing. In contrast, teachers stated that any guidance provided through the walkthrough process is inconsistent with wide variation in the number of times that teachers are observed. For instance, if teachers are implementing a new program, they might be observed in 10 to 15 walkthroughs, while other teachers might have only one walkthrough. One educator who teaches a non-tested subject and reported no walkthroughs in the past year, and stated that “it makes me feel like I’m not a valued employee because no one comes to my room.” Another teacher echoed, “I barely ever see anybody come through my room.” With regard to feedback, a different teacher reported not getting feedback until April or May. Other educators described “sometimes” receiving feedback from these walkthroughs, which is shared as trends across classrooms, rather than individual feedback. Other teachers reported wanting more actionable and nuanced feedback. As described in the preceding section (see Staffing), the district is actively working to improve individualized feedback through the formal evaluation process. Similarly, improving the consistency of conducting walkthroughs and offering actionable feedback that guides professional learning for teachers, grade levels, or departments is an area for growth.

Other forms of professional learning in the district heavily focus on the use of directed PLC time. Among teacher focus group participants, staff at the elementary level more often reported taking part in professional development that was recent, impactful, and shared with other staff. This was particularly true in elementary literacy. In 2023-2024, professional development offerings included Building Thinking Classrooms in Mathematics, Intellectual Preparation by TNTP (formerly The New Teacher Project), and Supporting Student Writing by HILL for Literacy. The district also provides one-on-one coaching that, in recent years, has been offered primarily at the elementary level in conjunction with the district’s early literacy efforts. Elementary teachers reported general levels of satisfaction with their support from HILL for Literacy, including PLC time; these staff did note, however, a preference for more collaboration with specialists, such as special education teachers. Among teacher focus group participants, secondary (middle and high school) teachers more commonly reported being dissatisfied with professional development, including PLC time. At these levels, more teachers voiced dissatisfaction with the utility of the professional development. One secondary teacher stated, “We haven’t had useful PD [professional development] in a very long time.” Another secondary teacher reported frustration with the level of direction during PLC time, saying that “there’s just a lack of trust that we’ll use that [PLC] time appropriately,” suggesting that they “have a lot of PD time that we could use more effectively.”

District leaders said that Medway uses multiple sources to select, develop, and monitor the effectiveness of its professional development offerings. District leaders reported using surveys, exit tickets, and informal discussions to get feedback on sessions. However, teachers reported that the district does not incorporate their input into determining the professional development offerings. Concerning their input into the topics, a secondary teacher explained that “we fill out Google forms about what we would like to have for PD session. [We] never get what we ask for.” For example, multiple teachers stated that they have not received sufficient professional development about how to support English Learners, despite the recent demographic changes. Another secondary teacher suggested that it would be useful to have dedicated time on professional development days or half days for cross-department collaboration. Increasing the opportunities for educators to have input on professional development opportunities, particularly in self-identified areas of need such as support for multilingual learners, is an area for growth for the district.

District and school leaders described the PLCs as a key part of their professional learning strategy, giving teachers time to collaborate within their subject area or grade level and across subjects at various grade levels. Leaders reported that PLC time helps teachers examine different assessments, analyze data, identify standards in which students performed well or did not perform well, and determine how teachers will address gaps. At the same time, school leaders described PLCs as “fairly autonomous” with “varying levels of administrative or leadership support.” Leaders described PLCs as teacher-driven, with a reporting structure in which teachers give administrators notes on what they are doing. In contrast, one school leader maintained that the PLCs in their particular school are co-constructed by administration and teachers and are “less autonomous than in any other building.”

Teacher interviews confirmed that the amount of collaboration time for educators is inconsistent across buildings. A teacher explained that “it just depends on the building you’re in, and how it’s utilized, and how the administrator likes to utilize it.” Some teachers shared the perspective that PLC agendas should be teacher-driven and focused on “talking about [student] behavior, grades, curriculum, and how we can best support our students and achieving success.” They voiced frustration that administrators sometimes use the time for other topics. However, other teachers felt that the lack of guidance for PLCs is a hindrance to using the time effectively. One teacher described the challenge of persuading colleagues to use PLC time to look at data, explaining that “getting them on board to see that PLC [time] is not a prep period” has been a challenge for some of them. Furthermore, the regularly scheduled collaborative time does not always happen, and the time is sometimes used for IEP and Section 504 meetings, according to focus group participants. One teacher recalled attending only one PLC meeting in January, when the expectation is that PLCs meet more than monthly. Teachers also described the inability of special education and English Learner specialists to attend their PLCs as a “missed opportunity,” and district leaders agreed that this opportunity varies across schools. Protecting collaboration time and optimizing the use of this time is an area for growth for Medway.

The district supports new educators through a two-day orientation in August (which all staff and building leaders attend), a mentoring program, and new educator professional learning. According to a district leader, the purpose of the mentoring program is to make sure that new teachers have a safe home base where they can feel celebrated and appreciated. According to the *New Educator Induction Handbook*,

The purpose of the Medway Public Schools Mentoring Program is to provide a framework ofprofessional support for educators new to the district. In a collegial environment, experienced and new educators will be working together to further their professional growth. The expected results of the Mentoring Program will be effective teaching and enhanced Medway student learning.

To identify mentors, district leaders reported that the positions are posted in the spring, and building leaders make recommendations for teacher mentors. According to a district leader, the district has faced challenges in getting people to commit to the position. In some cases, they have had to assign mentors from a different building, particularly when a new employee is in a specialized field, such as English as a Second Language (ESL). All mentors receive training, which includes a discussion of the roles and responsibilities. During the year, district leaders convene mentors and mentees, both separately and jointly.

### Despite these supports, teachers shared several concerns about the ability of the district to adequately support new teachers. Several teacher focus group participants reported that the district could provide more effective mentoring, particularly at the secondary level. A teacher explained that “we are not a district that can support new teachers. If you are here and you need a lot of support, we don’t have the manpower to get that done.” Another teacher stated that questions from new teachers go into a “black hole.” A different teacher stated that the mentor program is “not run as effectively as it can be.” In addition, they questioned the process for choosing mentors, stating that some people who would like to be part of the program are not chosen. District leaders disputed this perspective, stating that Medway provides a mentor for all first-year teachers, and that staff who are new to the district (but not new to teaching) are assigned mentors, depending on the level of support they need. Given the challenges described by staff, restructuring the teacher mentoring program is an area for growth.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should collaborate with the town to leverage MUNIS, potentially with additional modules, to increase efficiency and accuracy in hiring, tracking employee time, and managing employees’ tax information and paystubs.*
* *The district should continue its efforts to diversify its teaching staff and explore additional opportunities to recruit and retain teachers who identify as Hispanic or Latino.*
* *The district should find ways to provide actionable, constructive feedback through the evaluation process.*
* *The district should identify the barriers school leaders face in consistently observing classrooms and providing useful feedback and work with school leaders to identify solutions.*
* *The district should systematize its selection of professional development opportunities and sincerely consider teacher feedback and requests when selecting and developing its offerings.*
* *The district should guide school leaders to protect scheduled PLC time and to work collaboratively with teachers to design PLC agendas that both meet teachers’ needs and optimize the limited time available for collaboration.*
* *The district should critically examine the efficacy of its teacher mentoring program and make adjustments so that it provides effective support for new teachers at all levels.*

## Student Support

This section focuses on the extent to which the district supports the whole student by creating safe and supportive environments, meeting students’ health and well-being needs, and engaging all families. It also focuses on the extent to which these supports are built on a robust MTSS that flexibly assesses and addresses each student’s academic, social-emotional, and behavioral strengths and needs.

Table 8 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support in Medway.

Table 8. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Student Support Standard

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture](#_Safe_and_Supportive) | * Students generally feel welcome, respected, and safe in their schools.
 | * Establishing more Tier 2 behavior supports
* Developing a consistent process for gathering student feedback
 |
| [Health and Well-Being](#_Tiered_Systems_of) | * The amount of mental health services across Tier 2 and 3 at the elementary and middle school offered for students
 | * Systematizing access to mental health services for students at the secondary levels
 |
| [Family and Community Partnerships](#_Family_and_Community) | * Medway has a wraparound service program consisting of a district social worker, a therapeutic mentor, a parent coach, and Care Solace.
 | * Creating meaningful opportunities for family members to share feedback and impact decision-making
 |
| [Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)](#_Multi-Tiered_Systems_of) |  | * Adding specificity to the MTSS process, which includes creating an MTSS guidebook, monitoring the effectiveness, having consistent districtwide progress monitoring procedures, and supporting schools in scheduling to provide time for Tier 2 and 3 interventions
* Developing districtwide guidance for staff regarding how to support students, especially English Learners, who are receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 services
 |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

Medway has several plans in place to support and monitor students’ sense of well-being. According to students and their families, students generally feel welcome, respected, and safe in their schools, which is a strength of the district. High school students in a focus group all indicated having a trusted adult at their school. However, a majority of these students said that the degree to which they feel welcome, respected, and safe in general at school “depends on the situation and the teacher.” Middle school students reported feeling welcomed, especially when the “principal and vice principal come outside every day when we’re going into school to stand outside, greet us, and ask about our day.” Students also reported that the extracurricular options, including theater, jazz band, and afterschool programs, provide a welcoming environment for students to find their place in the school. A review of district documents indicated that the district also has a crisis plan, which includes evacuation information, an emergency response plan,and a bullying prevention plan.

According to district leaders, the district collects and uses Panorama triannually and the MetroWest Adolescent Health Survey biennially to regularly monitor school and district culture. The superintendent and other district leaders added that teachers use some additional assessments to collect information on classroom and school culture. All schools within the district reported conducting a school climate survey, but high school students reported that the Panorama survey was long and that “a lot of people don’t do it.”

District leaders reported having a districtwide student discipline policy. Middle school students noted having consistent rules and consequences, but sometimes the consequences get applied to all students instead of just those who are breaking the rules. However, high school students reported that, although there are expectations, consequences are not consistent across students. Students said that, for example, some students damage the bathrooms or have poor attendance with seemingly few consequences, whereas other students are held to a high standard. One high school student said, “The school’s almost like separating the two parts,” between students who follow the rules and do their work and students “who are skipping class and in the bathrooms all the time.” State data show that both in-school and out-of-school suspension rates are below the state rate.

According to the district leaders, the director of wellness, and student support staff, Medway provides some resources to address intensive behavioral support needs. For example, Medway has a LINKS program, which is a Tier 3 safe space and behavior pull-out program, at Burke-Memorial, Medway Middle School, and Medway High School, and two Board Certified Behavior Analysts shared across the district at the time of the review. However, staff noted a need for more Tier 2 behavior supports at all levels, which is an area for growth for the district. In particular, school-level staff reported that multiple, previously available, small-group nonacademic supports are no longer available to students, including a learning lab to support executive functioning, groups to support students dealing with stress and anxiety, and supports for students with extended absences for medical reasons. Staff said in focus groups that an increase in overall student needs has overwhelmed counseling staff who previously provided these small-group supports. As one staff member said, “A lot of this could be nipped in the bud if we had more Tier 2 interventions.” In response, district leaders highlighted the shifting of select responsibilities to free up counselor time; unique staffing, including an adjustment counselor dedicated to Tier 2 supports; and overall staffing levels exceeding those recommended by professional organizations.

According to the student policy manual, the district implements attendance policies to increase attendance and engagement to prevent and mitigate the effects of chronic absenteeism. District leaders reported that Medway is working on attendance issues, especially at the secondary level. The director of student services noted that last year they worked with high school counselors to address barriers students face when accessing schools, “whether it’s transportation, whether it’s food, whether there’s some kind of other services needed at home—those teams help identify what is part of that.” In addition, district respondents noted that they have a school avoidance task force that reviews data related to attendance and factors for absenteeism, reporting that the district has “seen improvement in our attendance since starting that task force.” State data support this perspective. The chronic absenteeism rate for all students in Medway was 8.7 percent for 2023-2024, down from 12.3 percent in 2022-2023 and 12.6 percent in 2021-2022. The chronic absenteeism rate for each student group except Asian students was also below the state rate (19.7 percent overall) in 2023-2024, in most cases by at least 10 percentage points.

High school students noted having a few teachers who ask for their feedback on their classes, but it is not often, and they do not feel as if they have seen many changes as a result of providing feedback. Students noted that they have requested the principal to add the student club Distributive Education Clubs of America to their school, but limited staffing prevented adding the club. Middle school students reported that they have never been asked about changes they would like to see in their school. Developing a consistent process for gathering student feedback on the learning environment is an area for growth for the district.

### Health and Well-Being

According to school leaders and teachers, Medway offers health and physical education to all students at their schools. Elementary teachers noted that students have access to recess, but staff noted that they think students would benefit from having another recess break. One teacher stated that after returning from the pandemic, they had two recesses during the day, and “the benefits were so high” for students’ “ability to stay focused [and] their ability to connect and feel part of the classroom with their peers or with their teachers.” Middle school students reported that they have recess, which they enjoy, but they felt it was too short.

The district maintains a local wellness policy, as required by law. The policy provides protocols that establish an environment that prioritizes student health, well-being, and the ability to learn. District principals reported that Medway has tiered mental and behavioral health services that differ by school and support most students’ mental and emotional wellness. District staff reported that, in general, the district is trying to connect students more with “outside clinical staff who basically are seeing kids during the school day.” Elementary school leaders reported that they offer tiered counseling support, Responsive Classroom practices, Everyday SEL lessons, and social-emotional learning groups. Middle school leaders reported that they offer small-group counseling, one-on-one counseling, in-school outpatient therapy, an emotionally based school avoidance task force, and Cartwheel Teletherapy. The amount of mental and behavioral health services across Tier 2 and 3 at the elementary and middle school offered for students is a strength of the district.

High school leaders reported that they offer a flex block during which students can access Tier 2 supports, but high school teachers noted the challenge of aligning some of these supports with the flex block. In addition, teachers noted that there are not many Tier 2 services available at the high school and for students who do not qualify for an IEP they may not be getting the services they need, with one teacher saying,

We have a program for IEP students with social and emotional needs, but you have to have the IEP to be qualified for that program… anything that doesn't hit that IEP benchmark, I don't really know how we're servicing them anymore.

In addition, high school students reported that the flex block is helpful but is a time used for academic support, nonacademic support, and some assemblies. Students generally were quite happy with the flex block structure and complimentary of several individual counselors, but neither students nor staff reported a systematic effort that could connect students with counseling if needed. Systematizing access to mental health services for students at the secondary levels is an area for growth for the district.

### Family and Community Partnerships

Although Medway does not provide guidance for staff on family communication, school leaders noted having a commitment “to informing families about where their child stands,” indicating some school-level standardization around sharing assessment results. School leaders also reported that Medway has a commitment to “ensuring that not only students but [also] their families have access to appropriate care for their mental health,” which district staff agreed with.

District leaders reported gathering family feedback through surveys, noting that the strategic planning process included student and family surveys on a variety of different areas, including classroom instruction, school programming, and student feelings about their school day. In addition, during the equity planning process, district leaders conducted several surveys with families to gather their perspectives on equity in the district, and some parents reported serving on a diversity, equity, and inclusion committee.

Communication takes place primarily at the school level in Medway. Teachers at the elementary schools reported communicating with parents on how their student is doing academically, but noted the need for more translation services. High school teachers said, “There are very high expectations of communication with parents regarding failing students, or students who are in danger of failing.” The district also has a “spotlight on excellence” monthly video series that they share internally and externally to highlight special things happening across the district. The most recent spotlight focused on a community garden at one of the elementary schools and the partnership with a local food pantry. Families in the focus groups reported that the communication they receive from schools differs across grade levels, noting that “there’s no standard communication to parents when there’s an issue with your child or there’s an issue in the classroom.” Families also felt as if they had to advocate to get the supports their child needs and reported concern for families that may not have the time for advocacy or be as savvy. Parents serving on committees and school site councils similarly said that being part of these efforts was the only time they felt informed, but they also felt that their input was limited. For example, one parent said, “I find that you have to be part of committees in order to even be mindful of what’s going on half the time . . . [but] I don’t know how much say we did have in those committees.” Another parent agreed, saying, “I was frustrated to know [that I was] sitting at the same table that I had years ago as a teacher, [now] sitting on the other side as a parent, and seeing that our input was basically not included.” Creating meaningful opportunities for family members to share feedback and impact decision-making is an area for growth for the district.

District staff and school leaders reported that the district maintains relationships with the Medway Village Food Pantry and the YMCA to provide services and enriching experiences to students and families both during and outside the school day. District staff reported that the director of student services reported working closely with the special education parent advisory council (SEPAC) to provide community events for students, such as “sensory-friendly haunted hayrides” and demonstrations by Medway police and firefighters. Staff also indicated that the Medway Community Education team, a self-sustaining department that offers year-round learning and enrichment programs outside regular school time, reaches out to families to invite them to free after school programs for students across the district.

According to district leaders, the district identifies and connects students and families with wraparound services. Medway has a wraparound service team consisting of a district social worker, a therapeutic mentor, a parent coach, and an external mental health provider, which is a strength of the district. A district staff member explained that the director of wellness helps the district proactively identify the needs of students and families through their school counselors or at an SST meeting and then the district social worker connects them with the appropriate out-of-school resources. These same district staff also agreed that their systems and available services meet the needs of their student population; however, they noted that with changing student demographics, the district's needs also are changing. Staff reported that they are working to adapt to meet these changing needs.

### Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

District staff reported attempting to define and clarify their support process in recent years. However, although schools across Medway offer both nonacademic and academic interventions (see Curriculum & Instruction standard, along with Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture and Health and Well-Being indicators), the district does not have an MTSS guidebook that clearly defines the systems’ three tiers of support, details how the district applies an adaptable MTSS to implement interventions for students, or details how to implement components of an MTSS system. According to district leaders, school leaders, and teachers, the district offers all students Tier 1 academic, social-emotional, and behavioral supports, with offerings that vary by grade level, including a social-emotional learning curriculum used in Grades K-4. Medway schools also providesome Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for students who need additional support to access the curriculum or learning environment, but approaches to assessment and assignment do not result in all students getting connected to supports across the district.

The district does not (a) monitor the effectiveness of its MTSS process, (b) have consistent districtwide progress monitoring procedures that support access to and movement throughout the three tiers of instruction, or (c) support schools in developing schedules that provide teachers with sufficient time to support students who receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Because interventions vary by school, school leaders noted different data for identifying students for interventions. Elementary school leaders noted that, specifically in literacy, teachers review data every six to eight weeks to determine student deficits. Middle school leadership revealed that they review data quarterly to assess where students stand. High school leaders reported that they “do not have the staffing nor the time built into our schedule to offer these wonderful resources that’s happening in the other schools.” Adding specificity to the MTSS process, which includes creating an MTSS guidebook, monitoring the effectiveness, having progress monitoring procedures, and supporting schools in scheduling to provide time for Tier 2 and 3 interventions, is an area of growth for the district.

Medway engages families and students in decision-making and the delivery of some but not all tiered supports. For example, community education leaders reported that they communicate with families after students have been identified for WIN programming. For Students with Disabilities, district leaders indicated that Medway makes sure that these students receive the necessary services. For example, district leaders reported that SST meetings include Students with Disabilities, and they are creating social-emotional groups tailored to the students in the group. However, for English Learners, district leaders reported additional challenges as the population increases in the district. Translation services are available, but the population has not yet grown enough to have Spanish-based counseling groups. In addition, district student service leaders reported that English Learners often are dually identified, and there is a “need to identify is it a language acquisition issue or is it really a cognitive issue?” High school teachers noted a need for more resources to support the English Learners in their school. Based on the increase in students in need of services, developing districtwide guidance for staff regarding how to support students, especially English Learners, who are receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 services is an area for growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should further assess the need for Tier 2 behavioral supports across the district and work with school leaders to select and implement interventions that meet students’ behavioral needs.*
* *The district should develop a system for gathering and responding to student feedback on the learning environment and create authentic opportunities for students to be involved in decision-making at the school level.*
* *The district should develop a clear and accessible system for matching students to mental health supports, particularly at the secondary level.*
* *The district should leverage its existing school councils, committees, and communication tools to create meaningful avenues for families to provide feedback to the district. Once feedback is collected, the district should proactively communicate the ways in which this feedback is being implemented to influence district and/or school decision-making.*
* *The district should add specificity to its MTSS by defining its tiers of instruction, regularly reviewing its efficacy, and assisting leaders in implementation with scheduling support.*
* *When refining its multi-tiered systems of support, the district should carefully consider the needs of its English Learner population, identify strategies for determining students’ needs, and implement interventions that effectively support all students, including English Learners.*

## Financial and Asset Management

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

Table 9 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management in Medway.

Table 9. 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) | * The district tracks the budget consistently throughout the year and works collaboratively with the school committee and department leadership to improve financial awareness and avoid overspending.
* District staff and town officials describe their professional working relationship related to fiscal planning and shared services as strong.
 |  |
| [Budgeting and Budget Process](#_Budgeting_and_Budget) | * The budget development and approval process is well structured, involving multiple stages and constituent input.
* Budget presentations and documents are available on the district website.
 | * Addressing concerns about funding levels for the coming years
 |
| [Operations](#_Operations) |  | * Addressing concerns about how town and school staff can more effectively collaborate about the maintenance and support of student technology infrastructure
 |
| [Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning](#_Managing_Capital_Assets) | * The town provides significant support for capital expenses, such as replacing roofs and purchasing school vans, which helps maintain district facilities.
 |  |

### Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure

According to reports from district leaders, the business office has sufficient staff to support daily operations and annual planning. Key staff reporting to the director of finance and operations include an assistant business manager, a payroll coordinator, and an assistant who supports the business office for half of their time. Medway also has a transportation coordinator and a director of facilities. Food services, however, are contracted out.

The school committee facilitated a multiyear review of all policies, including financial policies, at Medway, which concluded in May 2021. The resulting revised and expanded policy manual includes a comprehensive fiscal management section that details policies covering 16 areas, including budget planning, audits, purchasing authority, procurement requirements, and payment procedures. These policies specify compliance with state and federal requirements, establish an internal system of checks and balances, and provide continuity to operations when staffing disruptions arise.

The district uses the MUNIS financial management system to monitor and control resources. This system aligns with the Uniform Massachusetts Accounting System through a long account code that includes the DESE function codes, organizational codes (i.e., department, location, or unit where the transaction occurred), and object codes (i.e., type of expenditure, revenue source).

According to district staff, the process for managing financial records is thorough and involves multiple levels of review to ensure accuracy. Staff also reported that they track the budget consistently throughout the year and work collaboratively with school and department leaders to improve financial awareness and avoid overspending, which is a strength of the district. Tracking includes the director of finance and operations providing monthly updates to the school committee. These updates include a memo, with the budget broken into categories, as well as the director attending meetings to answer questions about the memo and budget tracking. Staff at the district level reported that the school committee and the finance director instituted this process in the past year.

District staff did not specify a system for preserving, categorizing, or destroying financial documents. Central office staff did convey a sense of confidence in the district’s financial management and a commitment to responsible budgeting, citing processes such as regular updates and reconciliations and the number of staff involved in tracking and approving regular expenses. Multiple staff, including the assistant shared between finance and human resources, as well as the director of finance and operations, participate in the invoice approval process and assemble related costs into regular warrants for the school committee. Following the internal processes, staff present the budget to the school committee for approval. According to district leaders, the business manager and an administrative assistant handle all accounts payable, including scanning invoices for the school committee to review, securing approval for payment from district staff and the school committee, and paying approved bills.

According to district staff and town officials, the district and town agree on the process and timeline for incorporating the school committee’s budgeting process into the municipality’s budgeting process, as well as the roles, responsibilities, and costs assumed by each party. Although there is no formal agreement available on the district’s website, budget presentations do publicize the budget timeline, including school committee and town meetings during which budget approvals take place.

District staff and town officials describe their professional working relationship related to fiscal planning and shared services as strong, which is a strength. A district leader shared, “We’ve been blessed here with an excellent relationship with the municipality. The finance director is top notch in the town, and we work well together.” The leader went on to say, “There are functions that the district relies on the town for, but the town manager is very responsive. It’s very collaborative and [a] positive relationship [between the two departments].” Another district staff member described a positive relationship between the district and the municipality’s Department of Public Works (DPW), explaining, “I’m in constant contact with them. We meet weekly. It’s a good relationship.” District staff also mentioned effective collaboration with the police and fire departments and the Building Commission. When asked about the town’s relationship with the school committee and the finance committee, a town official responded that there is “complete trust.” He went on to say, “We have our moments, and I think that just comes from working together for [many] years. It’s more of like a family type environment where, you know, even families will battle with each other once in a while.” A town official pointed out that the town is responsible for identifying revenue sources and providing them to the district.

### Budgeting and Budget Process

According to the Chapter 70 district profile, Medway exceeded net school spending requirements for fiscal year 2024 by 20.5 percent, or $6,180,090 above the required fiscal year 2024 net school spending requirement. In addition, total per pupil funding in fiscal year 2023 was $21,885, which is slightly higher than the state average of $21,377.

Some district leaders and teachers feel that the district’s budget does not provide adequate levels of funding for key instructional resources. For example, one district leader spoke of having to cut positions, particularly between fiscal years 2023 and 2024. They said, “I think we have done that in a smart way without deep impacts to student experience,” but nonetheless described removing 14 staff from a district of this size as a difficult process. Teachers seemed to feel the cuts more strongly, and several teachers reported the perception that cuts occurred in teaching positions, whereas central office staffing grew. A teacher shared their belief that the district’s budget too heavily focuses on administrative and central office staff, arguing that many teachers perceive that the number of staff in the central office has increased significantly during the past several years, whereas support for school-level staff has decreased. Another teacher shared, “We’re fighting to get tissues and pencils in our classroom. And, teachers, we need help. But we’re funding central office staff.”

Despite these perceptions, a review of the district’s budget books from fiscal years 2020 through 2025, which include staffing levels going back to fiscal year 2015, indicate that central office staffing levels have been relatively stable. At the central office, there was no change in the last five years in the number of staff in the office of the superintendent, the business office, or curriculum, and the number of central office staff in student services and curriculum program coordination roles during the time period reviewed decreased. District staff added that they adjusted the responsibilities of some staff in finance and operations in recent years and, as a result, feel they are now in a good place with staffing. In total, there were 306 positions in the district in fiscal year 2015 and 317 positions in the budget in fiscal year 2025. In roughly this same time frame, some increase occurred in the number of paraprofessionals in the district, with a decrease in the number of teachers, particularly at the high school, from slightly more than 48 total positions in fiscal year 2018 to 39 total positions in fiscal year 2025. During this same period, a review of budget documents indicates roughly the same number of teachers at the elementary level, two fewer Grades 7 and 8 teachers, a similar number of special education teachers, and an additional English Learner teacher. Additionally, the average teacher salary in fiscal year 2023 was $94,749, which is higher than the state average of $89,576.

Regarding overall staffing and the budget, district leaders voiced concerns about funding levels for the coming years, and addressing this funding issue is an area for growth. One leader shared, “I do believe that our staffing is anticipated to not meet student needs for next year . . . an 8.4 percent increase [in funding] that we are looking for for next year.” Another district leader echoed this sentiment, saying, “We’ve been living a little bit on borrowed time. . . . So what makes FY26 [fiscal year 2026] really challenging is the pent-up structural funding problem that we’ve had.” Interview participants described some challenges between town and district stakeholders in discussing appropriate levels of budget growth from year to year. Respondents indicated that overall enrollment has been steady for the past five years, but the number of students classified as High Needs increased from 25 percent to 30 percent in that same period. The percentage of students who are English Learners also increased from 1.4 percent to 4.4 percent in the past five years. District officials stated that they were unsure whether staffing across schools was adequate and if budgetary resources were equitably allocated. Beyond staffing, the district is moving to have more equitable funding across schools, such as considering how to deploy a limited number of English Learner specialists.

District leaders added that the district budgets for anticipated out-of-district special education placements and related transportation costs. A district leader explained, “The student services department here has made a really good push at trying to meet the needs of more of our students in [the] district, which helps because of tuition and also transportation.” Despite these efforts, in the past two years, the out-of-district special education budget increased by 20 percent. To be prepared for a continued increase in the special education budget, the district plans for one or two additional students annually as a contingency. Combined with trying to support more students with in-district services, the district also accepts non-resident tuition dollars. District staff reported that, since these funds are more difficult to predict—and may decrease if local enrollment increases--they attempt to budget these funds for more temporary uses, rather than commit them to lines such as additional teaching positions.

District leaders, school-based staff, and school committee members described the budgeting process. Beginning as early as September, district leaders ask the budget manager, all four principals, the director of facilities, the director of special services, the director of technology, and the assistant superintendent (who supports curriculum and professional development) to complete spreadsheets with their budget requests for the following year. The budget managers work with their teams to create budget projections before Thanksgiving. At the same time, the director of finance and operations begins to develop the budget based on salaries and financial expectations related to enrollment projections, school choice, and special education.

Student enrollment and needs data also inform annual planning for budgeting and staffing. According to district leaders, the district primarily uses student projected enrollment (actual and New England School Development Council report) and internal projections of student group populations to assess staffing needs across schools. District staff described how they work with the four principals to understand students with unique needs (e.g., Students with Disabilities, English Learners) and schools’ staffing requirements to meet those needs. This use of student enrollment and needs data helps leaders determine their “absolute” and “minimum” needs for staffing. District staff said that if budget cuts are necessary to offset such additions, they have the most accurate understanding of other needs in the district. In addition, district leaders also have gathered staff perspectives in support of the district’s efforts to diversify its workforce. A leader reported that the district has an equity action plan that focuses on “what it’s like to be an employee here, an employee’s sense of belonging and respect, and those kinds of things.”

From November through February, district leadership reviews budget requests and meets to discuss staffing needs. During this time, the school committee’s budget subcommittee meets monthly and receives budget reports from the district. Also, the district holds virtual listening tours to discuss the budget in all four schools. In addition, in January, the district hosts a triboard meeting with the full membership of the select board, the finance committee, and the school committee. The meeting’s purpose is to share school department expenditures and needs and answer questions from town finance leaders who closely monitor the development of the district’s budget. After the superintendent and the school committee meet to review the budget in mid-February, the preliminary budget is presented formally to the school committee at the end of the month. The school committee holds a public hearing to discuss the budget in mid-March and then votes later in the month. The budget is formally approved by the town in its annual meeting in mid-May. Throughout this process, a budget advisory group consisting of the superintendent, the director of finance and operations, two members of the finance committee, and two members of the town’s Select Board provides guidance on the budget. The budget development and approval process is well structured, involving multiple stages and stakeholder input, which is a strength of the district.

District leaders and school committee members agree that the review and approval process is timely and culminates in an easily accessible, publicly available budget that documents and clearly identifies funds associated with grants, student activities and organizations, fees, and revolving funds. However, district staff reported that the town does not calculate its financial support based on district needs but rather by the limited amount of funds available. Historically, the town provides the “number” that it can contribute to the district. A district leader explained as follows:

[Town officials] would tell us early on what their contribution would be, and it didn’t change, it didn’t change after that. In other words, it’s not a conversation of what the needs are to make sure that we continue to provide what we think is the very best education possible. It was really about, “We have X amount of dollars” . . . which I actually think is a bit stifling to transparency around what our needs are.

District leadership discussed the district’s efforts to raise funds through grants, explaining, “Medway really goes for everything . . . and they are, I think, incredibly successful.” Multiple staff characterized the district’s grant activity as high compared with other districts. Budget documents indicate that state and federal grant funding aligns with district needs. The business manager monitors grant drawdowns to ensure that grant terms and requirements are followed in a timely manner. The business office is also responsible for monitoring contracts and, in recent years, has solicited new bids for service on expired contracts.

District leaders spoke about their efforts to address budget concerns to avoid reductions, especially to staffing. A leader explained as follows:

I think what we’ve really tried to do is identify opportunities to either grow the pie or to become more efficient. So, things like . . . the purchase of minivans for specialized transportation, . . . sign electrical contracts working with the town to make sure that we understand what our electrical rates are, . . . adding solar panels [to district schools], . . . looking at internal [special education programs to reduce] out-of-district [placements].

In the short term (fiscal year 2025), respondents said the financial state is solid. Medway addressed unexpected expenses by not spending 100 percent of the circuit breaker funds in the year the funds are received. Going forward, district-level respondents said there is likely a need to request as much as an 8.4 percent increase in the budget to maintain services. These estimates prompted some respondents to report that the district may be looking to propose an override in the town in a year or two, but they also noted that some local people might not be comfortable with such a proposal. The district does not have a formal multiyear financial plan that incorporates projected enrollment and required staffing, cost-of-living adjustments set in its collective bargaining agreements, and anticipated increases in its service contracts. The superintendent and the school committee are primarily responsible for longer-term planning, including projecting enrollment.

Budget presentations and documents are available to the public on the district website, which is a strength of the district. The school committee webpage of the Medway website includes a link to budget presentations; the fiscal year 2025 preliminary budget presentation includes a “Financial Overview/Timeline” with details on the budget process and dates of meetings, hearings, and votes. Evidence from school committee meeting minutes, school committee members, and interviews with district leaders shows that the district provides budget updates to the school committee monthly and works with budget managers to track and adjust current year spending. According to a school committee member, the district’s finance director provides

an updated memo along with a spreadsheet . . . with the balance of the operating budget, where we are in our revolving accounts, what those balances are, and how we are tracking so that we can catch it early if we’re going to overspend.

Also, the district hires independent financial auditing services each year and implements recommendations from those audits in a timely manner.

### Operations

The facilities department has adequate staffing, and there is a formal agreement with the DPW for maintaining building exteriors, landscaping, and maintaining fields, ensuring well-maintained buildings and grounds.. To maintain buildings and grounds, the Medway facilities department has a director, a half-time administrative assistant, two maintenance staff, and seven custodians. The director also manages a contract with an outside cleaning company. Also, the town has a formal, written agreement with the DPW specifying that the DPW is “responsible for all of [the district’s] fields and parking lots between snow removal and grass cutting.” According to district staff, the district has “a pretty healthy facility usage program at the middle school and the high school,” which provides the district additional revenue by renting space to community members.

However, many concerns arose about the facilities. Parents reported a lack of clean water in several of the school buildings, and others mentioned broken lights and lockers that would not open in the middle school. Some high school students also reported that they avoided the bathrooms given their condition. However, no respondents described a formal process for requesting and responding to maintenance services, though district leaders cited a facilities ticket system and annual water testing upon later review.

District leaders reported that the district has a new contract in place for transportation. According to district policies posted on the school committee webpage of the Medway website, the provision of school bus transportation is in accordance with state and federal law, and all applicable regulations for all eligible students based on distance from school, school grade level, and free or reduced-price lunch eligibility. For those not eligible for transportation, the parent/guardian of the student is responsible for transportation, but the district has a “Pay to Ride” program available. The Medway website provides information on the student transportation policy and a student handbook.

The majority of the district’s transportation expenses come from its general fund. This includes home/school transportation through the school year, late buses, and summer transportation. Athletic and class trip transportation costs are outside the general fund and funded by individual student fees. The district had covered the cost of transportation home for students who stayed late for additional supports or activities, but ended that service in the 2021-2022 school year because of a lack of funding.

The IT department head is a shared position between the town and school departments. Families register new students online, with guidance available on the Medway website. An application for school choice applicants also is on the Medway website. Regarding student technology, according to the district website, Medway provides its students and staff with the hardware, software, and related licenses and support for everyday learning and daily operations. All students in Grades 5-12 receive a school-owned Chromebook that is available to them at school and at home throughout the school year. The district website posts links to policies and procedures regarding technology access and use.

Some teachers pointed out concerns about the support for technology. A high school teacher shared their concern with the maintenance of student technology:

We have one-to-one Chromebooks assigned to every student. At the middle school and high school level, it’s in the student’s possession. They travel with it. At the elementary levels, it’s one-to-one in carts that live in the classrooms. But if a student’s device is misplaced or broken . . ., we may not have anything to lend them while theirs is getting fixed. And I’ve worked in other places where we had a bigger store of loaners, or the repair timeline was quicker, and it wasn’t a problem. But we have students who’ve been without a device that they can reasonably count on for weeks while their device is getting fixed.

Students and parents similarly described a high reliance on technology in classrooms, but they reported fewer concerns about the condition or accessibility of these tools. An Information Technology and Educational Technology Needs Assessment report, published in May 2024, identified several critical areas requiring substantial improvement and provided a series of recommendations aimed at improving the district’s technology infrastructure and capabilities to enhance operations as well as teaching and learning with technology. These recommendations included improving the ticketing system, the device management and tracking process, cybersecurity, and aligning IT decisions more closely with district strategic plans through better communication. Addressing concerns about how town and school staff can more effectively lead and collaborate around the maintenance and support of student technology infrastructure is an area for growth.

District leaders did not discuss food services in interviews, but the Medway website has information about lunch menus and free or reduced-price lunch; qualifying families are eligible for reduced-price or free **breakfast and lunch**. Application forms are available in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Also, neither families nor students discussed the food provided or reported having input into menu development.

The Medway policy manual specifies a process for purchasing supplies and services and effectively managing contracts with vendors in alignment with state laws. District staff added that, with its municipal partners, the district executes and manages contracts with its vendors and established timelines to proactively track the end of contracts and provide sufficient time for renewal or rebidding for core district services. Town officials agreed but explained that they play a very limited role in the procurement of supplies or managing contracts with vendors.

### Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning

The district develops its own five-year capital plan that describes future capital needs based on facility assessments. According to one district leader, there are no major outstanding issues for the district because “there’s nothing really aged.” There was no mention from district staff on collecting input from district or community constituents on short or long-term facility needs, other than the facilities director and collaborators from the town.

The district presents the capital plan to the school committee every November for review. After their line-by-line examination and, if necessary, changes are made, the plan goes to the town manager and the town’s capital improvement committee.

Members of this committee do a walkthrough of the schools annually. As reported by district staff, Medway has a director of facilities who leads annual walkthroughs with a capital improvement committee to identify major needs and then tracks ongoing needs on an as-needed basis. District staff reported good relationships between district facilities management and town staff who support capital improvement. These same respondents described a productive working relationship in identifying annual requests and making plans to address those requests. However, a description of a formal system for tracking needs related to the replacement or disposal of goods, beyond individual expertise, is lacking.

According to district leaders, when it comes to capital expenses, the district does not get all that they ask for, but “there’s a lot of effort to ensure that [the] facilities are well maintained and that [the district has their] needs met.”

A strength of the district is how the town provides significant support for capital expenses, such as replacing roofs and purchasing school vans, which helps maintain district facilities and capital assets. A school committee member described the support provided by the town:

I am very grateful to the town . . . We just had a lot of roofs that have been replaced, and we have not had to go out and borrow for those. [Another example is we told the school committee], “we can save money by purchasing our own school vans and . . . providing some of that specialized transportation for our school district, and this is how much it will save us. Would you consider helping us purchase a van?” And they have said yes.

Several respondents described some disagreement about the overall sufficiency of resources, but participants generally agreed on support for capital maintenance in the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should partner with its municipal stakeholders to proactively identify sustainable, long-term financial plans that address anticipated budget shortfalls while continuing to provide resources for students’ needs.*
* *The district should follow up on the May 2024 report on technology support and implement recommendations, where feasible, to address critical concerns regarding leadership, operations, and tracking.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Medway. The team conducted 64 classroom observations during the week of January 13, 2025, and held interviews and focus groups between January 13 and January 17. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

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

* Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
* Data on the district’s staffing and finances
* Curricular review process and timeline
* Medway curriculum scope and sequence documents
* Published educational reports on the district by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
* District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district’s end-of-year financial reports
* All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations
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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 Medway Public Schools during the week of January 13, 2025. Observers conducted 70 observations in a sample of classrooms across four schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average\*: 4.8

| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 70 | 4.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 34 | 5.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 4.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 4.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 1] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 20] + [5 x 20] + [6 x 13] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 70 observations = 4.8

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.0

| 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 | 70 | 5.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 34 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 4.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 4.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 1] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 19] + [5 x 19] + [6 x 17] + [7 x 9]) ÷ 70 observations = 5.0

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\*: 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 | 70 | 3.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 34 | 3.8 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 3] + [2 x 19] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 70 observations = 3.4

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.[[6]](#footnote-7)

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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 70 | 6.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 34 | 6.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:
([6 x 7] + [7 x 63]) ÷ 70 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\*: 6.6

| 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 | 70 | 6.6 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 24 | 34 | 6.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 6.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 20 | 6.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 2] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 55]) ÷ 70 observations = 6.6

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\*: 6.7

| 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 | 70 | 6.7 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 28 | 34 | 6.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 16 | 6.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 20 | 6.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 2] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 58]) ÷ 70 observations = 6.7

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\*: 4.9

| 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 | 70 | 4.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 34 | 5.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 4.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 4.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 2] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 18] + [5 x 17] + [6 x 19] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 70 observations = 4.9

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K−3

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

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

Concept Development District Average\*: 2.3

| 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 | 23 | 2.3 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 4 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 2.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 4] + [2 x 11] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 1]) ÷ 23 observations = 2.3

\*\*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\*: 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 | 47 | 3.7 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 4.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 3.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 5] + [3 x 14] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 47 observations = 3.7

\*\*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\*: 2.3

| 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 | 47 | 2.3 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 15] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 3]) ÷ 47 observations = 2.3

\*\*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\*: 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 | 70 | 2.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 3.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 11] + [2 x 18] + [3 x 17] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 9]) ÷ 70 observations = 2.9

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.3

| 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 | 23 | 3.3 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 3.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 4] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 23 observations = 3.3

\*\*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\*: 2.7

| 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 | 47 | 2.7 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 11] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 47 observations = 2.7

\*\*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\*: 4.4

| 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 | 47 | 4.4 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 5.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 4.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 4.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 3] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 47 observations = 4.4

\*\*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 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 17 | 26 | 25 | 47 | 136 | 5.4 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 34 | 5.2 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 34 | 6.9 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 34 | 5.5 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 34 | 3.8 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 20 | 58 | 102 | 6.2 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 24 | 34 | 6.5 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 28 | 34 | 6.7 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 34 | 5.4 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 14 | 31 | 25 | 24 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 113 | 3.1 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 4 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 2.3 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 4.4 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2.5 |
| Quality of Feedback | 2 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 3.1 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 3.3 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2.9 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | **0** | **0** | **2** | **1** | **4** | **3** | **1** | **11** | **5.0** |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 7]) ÷ 34 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: ([6 x 3] + [7 x 31]) ÷ 34 observations = 6.9. 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 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 48 | 4.1 |
| Positive Climate | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 4.3 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 4.8 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3.3 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 41 | 48 | 6.6 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 6.5 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 16 | 6.6 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 14 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 80 | 3.1 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 4.8 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 3.8 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1.9 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2.7 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2.4 |
| Student Engagement | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 4.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 16 observations = 4.3

\*\*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 14]) ÷ 16 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 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 22 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 60 | 4.0 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 4.6 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 4.6 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 52 | 60 | 6.8 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 20 | 6.8 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 20 | 6.8 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 15 | 19 | 26 | 27 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 100 | 3.1 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 4.0 |
| Content Understanding | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.4 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 3 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.6 |
| Quality of Feedback | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.7 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.7 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 4.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 2] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 4]) ÷ 20 observations = 4.6

\*\*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: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.9
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf)\* | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision.  |
| [New Superintendent Induction Program (NSIP)](https://www.massupt.org/professional-development/annual-programs/new-superintendent-induction-program/) | In partnership with the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, the New Superintendent Induction Program (NSIP) is a three-year professional development program for superintendents in their first 3 years of their position in a Massachusetts school district. The curriculum is aligned to DESE’s Educational Vision and supports new superintendents with developing the skills and competencies to be effective leaders of their school districts. |
| [Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html) | A series of modules designed to support novice principals and their mentors in the development of antiracist leadership competencies aligned to the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership. |
| [Planning for Success In Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | Planning for Success (PfS) is an inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |

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

Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| Curriculum Frameworks and Resources* [Curriculum Matters Webpage](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/default.html)
* [Curriculum Frameworks Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html)
* [IMplement MA](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/implement-ma.html)
* [CURATE](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate/default.html)
* [Supporting Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/culturally-sustaining/default.html)
 | DESE offers a suite of resources to support the use of high-quality curriculum that is culturally and linguistically sustaining. These resources include the curriculum frameworks and IMplement MA, our recommended four-phase process to prepare for, select, launch, and implement new high-quality instructional materials with key tasks and action steps. Additionally, CURATE convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate curriculum. These ratings are posted publicly to support schools and districts in selected high-quality instructional materials. Finally, the Supporting Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices webpage provides DESE’s definition of these practices and highlights their importance in our schools and classrooms.  |
| [Mass Literacy Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/massliteracy/) | Mass Literacy is a statewide effort to empower educators with the evidence-based practices for literacy that all students need. Evidence-based instruction, provided within schools and classrooms that are culturally and linguistically sustaining, will put our youngest students on a path toward literacy for life. |
| [Foundations for Inclusive Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) | This Guidebook includes tools for districts, schools, and educators that are aligned to the MA Educator Evaluation Framework and promote evidence-based best practices for inclusion. |
| [Guidebook of Culturally Diverse Artists and Artworks](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Finstruction%2Farts%2Fdiverse-arts-guidebook.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | The purpose of this resource is to promote culturally responsive teaching in the arts through the study of culturally diverse artists and their artworks. This guidebook highlights art made by people with racial identities that historically have been and continue to be marginalized. |
| [Massachusetts Blueprint for English Learner Success](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/blueprint/default.html) | Framework for English learner education in MA, with embedded Quick Reference Guides (QRGs) and other resources to support implementation. |
| Massachusetts Curricular Resources * [Appleseeds](https://sites.google.com/view/appleseedsk2/home)
* [Investigating History](https://www.doe.mass.edu/investigatinghistory/)
* [OpenSciEd](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/openscied.html)
 | Free, open-source curricular resources aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. |
| [Massachusetts Dyslexia Guidelines](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/dyslexia-guidelines.pdf) | Clear and practical guidelines for early screening, instruction, and intervention for students with reading difficulties and neurological learning disabilities, including dyslexia. |
| [Next Generation ESL Toolkit](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/esl-toolkit/default.html) | The ESL Toolkit provides a common entry point for educators to learn about Next Generation ESL (NGESL) instruction in Massachusetts. |
| [Synthesized ILT Framework](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsdp%2Fguidebook%2Fappendix-ilt-framework.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | District and school teams can use this resource to reflect and identify specific actions they could take to establish or improve their instructional leadership teams (ILTs). |

Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Assessment Literacy Continuum](https://www.doe.mass.edu/acls/assessment/continuum.pdf) | Tool to help teachers identify what aspects of assessment literacy they should focus on for their own goal setting. |
| [Curriculum-Embedded Performance Assessments](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/assess-resources.html) | Pending funding, this program will provide resources and professional learning for classroom-based, curriculum-embedded performance tasks in K-8 science with implementation and instructional supports aligned to the Innovative Assessment (STE).  |
| [District Data Team Toolkit](http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/toolkit/) | A set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team. |
| [Early Literacy Screening](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/screening-assessments/default.html) | Guidance and support for schools and districts to select and use an approved early literacy universal screening assessment. |
| [Student Assessment](https://www.doe.mass.edu/assessment/) | Statewide assessments help parents, students, educators, and policymakers determine where districts, schools, and students are meeting expectations and where they need additional support. |

Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Early Literacy Observation Tools](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/resources/early-literacy-observation.html) | This tool supports the observation and provision of high-quality feedback to teacher candidates on their practice in evidence-based early literacy. |
| [Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/default.html) | A suite of resources and practical tools for effective and equitable implementation of educator evaluation, including Focus Indicators, a subset of Indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the school year. |
| Induction and Mentoring* [Teacher Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.html)
* [Principal Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html)
* [Induction and Mentoring Annual Report](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.html)
 | Resources that highlight best practices and reinforce the recently updated guidelines and standards for induction and mentoring.  |
| [Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/mtel/) | Information on MTEL exams, MTEL alternatives, and licensure requirements for educators.  |
| [OPTIC](https://www.ma-optic.com/) | A professional development tool that supports Massachusetts educators to build a shared understanding of high-quality instruction and improve the feedback that teachers receive. |
| [Professional Learning Partner Guide](https://plpartnerguide.org/) | A free, online, searchable list of vetted professional development providers who have expertise in specific sets of high-quality instructional materials. Schools and districts can use this guide to easily find PD providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials. |
| [Promising Recruitment, Selection and Retention Strategies for a Diverse Massachusetts Teacher Workforce](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsi%2Fdiverse-workforce%2Fteacher-diversification.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | This guidebook provides a framework to help district and school leaders design and implement a teacher diversification strategy to improve student achievement and create equitable learning experiences. |
| [“What to Look For” Observation Guides](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/observation/) | Observation tools to help district staff observe instruction. |
| [Talent Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/talent-guide/default.html) | An online hub of resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on equity. |
| [WIDA Professional Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/prof-learning/wida/default.html) | WIDA professional development provides great information and strategies to support multilingual learners in Massachusetts public schools, and WIDA PDPs satisfy educator licensure renewal requirements. These DESE Sponsored courses are available at no cost to participants and are perfect for teams of teachers seeking impactful collaboration to support students’ access to rigorous course content. |

Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support

| Resource  | Description |
| --- | --- |
| Dropout Prevention and Reengagement* [Dropout Prevention and Reengagement (DPR) Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/sec-supports/massgrad/default.html)
* [Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/sec-supports/ewis/default.html)
 | DPR efforts are designed to support students at-risk of not graduating or reengage students who have left school with opportunities to gain the academic, personal/social, and work readiness skills necessary to graduate and lead productive lives. EWIS includes tools for districts to identify students who are at risk and help get them back on track. |
| Educational Stability Resources* [Educational Stability for Highly Mobile Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/edstability.html)
* [SLIFE Guidance and Toolkit](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/slife/default.html)
* [Resources for Supporting Immigrant and Refugee Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/resources/immigrant-refugee.html)
 | The linked resources provide guidance, technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, grants, and other supports to ensure that students experiencing homelessness, those in foster care, migrant and refugee students, those with limited or interrupted formal education, and students in military families have access to a consistent and high-quality public education.  |
| Emergency Management Guidance ([Federal](https://rems.ed.gov/?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1) and [State](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/emergencyplan/default.html)) | Guidance and Technical Assistance for districts/schools related to emergency management planning and implementation.  |
| Family Partnerships* [DESE Family Portal](https://www.doe.mass.edu/families/)
* [Strengthening Partnerships: A Framework for Prenatal through Young Adulthood Family Engagement in Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/family-engagement-framework.pdf)
 | Resources for authentically engaging families in their child’s education and centering families voices in school and district decision-making. |
| MTSS Resources: * [MTSS Blueprint, Self-Assessment, and Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/)
* [Massachusetts Tools for Schools](https://matoolsforschools.com/)
 | MTSS is a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that every student receives a high-quality educational experience. |
| Safe and Supportive Schools: * [Safe and Supportive Schools Framework and Self-Reflection Tool](https://www.sassma.org/)
* [Safe Schools Program for LGBTQ Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/lgbtq/)
* [Bullying Prevention and Intervention](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/bullying/default.html)
* [Rethinking Discipline Initiative](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/discipline/)
 | These resources can help guide school- and district-based teams to create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures that allow all students to thrive.  |
| [School Wellness Initiative for Thriving Community Health (SWITCH)](https://massschoolwellness.org/) | SWITCH provides resources that support and advance wellness efforts for Massachusetts students, schools, and communities. |
| Social Emotional Learning:* [SEL/APL Standards (Pk/K)](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fsfs%2Fearlylearning%2Fresources%2FSEL-APL-Standards.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK)
* [Playful Learning Institute, Preschool through 3rd Grade](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/pli.html)
* [Culturally Responsive Social-Emotional Competency Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/sel/sel-all.docx)
 | These resources provide evidence-based and developmentally appropriate guidance around supporting social emotional learning in schools. |

Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

| Resource  | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [DESE Spending Comparisons Website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) | A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public. |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grants resources.  |
| [Office for Food and Nutrition Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/) | Resources for school districts, childcare centers, family day care homes, adult day health programs, Summer Eats community organizations, USDA Foods storage and distribution vendors, food banks, and anti-hunger organizations across the Commonwealth. |
| [Planning for Success (PfS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |
| [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) | RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions. |
| [School Breakfast: Breakfast After the Bell Resources](https://www.projectbread.org/resource-directory/breakfast-after-the-bell-resources) | The Breakfast After the Bell Toolkit Series is designed to help with the launch and implementation of alternative breakfast models.  |
| [School Meals Newsletter](https://us14.list-manage.com/subscribe?u=d8f37d1a90dacd97f207f0b4a&id=d29c4bc847) | Short articles summarizing current events including: changes in federal/ state requirements; current grant opportunities; and notable dates. |
| [Summer Eats | Free Meals for Kids and Teens in MA](https://www.projectbread.org/summer-eats-program?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&gclid=CjwKCAjwzo2mBhAUEiwAf7wjkljB4ngm0uZLSTYsl5hK5QGTkC3mKF_4ae_5AUxyrVs6UiPIIrys1RoCQV0QAvD_BwE) | Summer Eats is a free-of-charge program that provides free meals to all kids and teens, ages 18 and under, at locations all across Massachusetts during the summer months. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

| Group | District | Percentage of District | State | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 2,158 | 100.0% | 915,932 | 100.0% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3 | 0.1% | 2,272 | 0.2% |
| Asian | 111 | 5.1% | 68,608 | 7.5% |
| Black or African American | 52 | 2.4% | 93,245 | 10.2% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 215 | 10.0% | 236,839 | 25.9% |
| Multi-Race, Not Hispanic or Latino | 81 | 3.8% | 42,303 | 4.6% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 3 | 0.1% | 800 | 0.1% |
| White | 1,693 | 78.5% | 471,865 | 51.5% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

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

| Group | *N*(District) | Percentage of High Needs(District) | Percentage of District | *N*(State) | Percentage of High Needs(State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 658 | 100.0% | 30.1% | 517,093 | 100.0% | 55.8% |
| English Learners | 94 | 14.3% | 4.4% | 127,673 | 24.7% | 13.9% |
| Low Income | 327 | 49.7% | 15.2% | 385,161 | 74.5% | 42.1% |
| Students with Disabilities | 349 | 53.0% | 16.0% | 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 2,185; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 926,057.

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

| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 2,248 | 12.6 | 12.3 | 8.7 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 55 | 14.0 | 4.7 | 14.5 | 22.5 |
| Asian | 104 | 10.8 | 17.8 | 12.5 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 224 | 19.0 | 21.0 | 16.5 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 79 | 3.2 | 14.1 | 5.1 | 20.6 |
| Native American | 4 | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 1,779 | 12.5 | 11.2 | 7.4 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 757 | 20.0 | 20.4 | 15.5 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 433 | 24.2 | 25.4 | 18.5 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 124 | 17.9 | 21.6 | 12.9 | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 390 | 19.8 | 18.7 | 15.4 | 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 D4. Total Expenditures Fiscal Years, 2021-2023

| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| By school committee | $28,386,488 | $29,090,359 | $29,776,002 |
| By municipality | $7,607,617 | $8,105,517 | $7,931,947 |
| Total from local appropriations | $35,994,105 | $37,195,876 | $37,707,949 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $3,202,244 | $4,062,669 | $6,102,853 |
| Total expenditures | $39,196,349 | $41,258,545 | $43,810,802 |

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

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

| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $10,501,419 | $10,564,089 | $10,691,349 |
| Required local contribution | $16,885,292 | $17,421,552 | $18,439,545 |
| Required net school spending b | $27,386,711 | $27,985,641 | $29,130,894 |
| Actual net school spending | $34,056,872 | $35,096,750 | $35,361,531 |
| Over/under required ($) | $6,670,161 | $7,111,109 | $6,230,637 |
| Over/under required (%) | 24.4% | 25.4% | 21.4% |

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

a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.
b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

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

| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Administration | $453 | $555 | $526 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,369 | $1,197 | $1,154 |
| Teachers | $6,266 | $6,408 | $6,885 |
| Other teaching services | $1,591 | $1,199 | $1,209 |
| Professional development | $84 | $49 | $117 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $326 | $566 | $608 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $623 | $785 | $852 |
| Pupil services | $1,418 | $1,678 | $2,069 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,820 | $1,813 | $1,778 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,230 | $3,393 | $3,306 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $17,180 | $17,643 | $18,502 |

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

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 1,025 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 39 | 37 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 25 | 53 | 57 | 48 | 24 | 35 | 33 | 36 | 46 | 12 | 10 | 16 | 31 |
| Asian | 52 | 90 | 73 | 67 | 62 | 10 | 22 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 88 | 44 | 36 | 28 | 20 | 36 | 37 | 49 | 44 | 20 | 27 | 23 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 26 | 50 | 52 | 69 | 46 | 42 | 48 | 15 | 37 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 17 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 832 | 55 | 56 | 56 | 47 | 37 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 13 |
| High needs | 338 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 22 | 50 | 49 | 46 | 45 | 23 | 26 | 28 | 33 |
| Low income | 185 | 28 | 30 | 29 | 21 | 53 | 46 | 42 | 45 | 19 | 25 | 29 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 75 | 38 | 26 | 25 | 17 | 38 | 45 | 49 | 43 | 23 | 29 | 25 | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 187 | 16 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 49 | 51 | 47 | 40 | 35 | 38 | 40 | 50 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E2. 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 | 154 | 69 | 68 | 73 | 57 | 30 | 27 | 23 | 31 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 12 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 40 | — | — | — | 18 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 78 | — | — | — | 16 | — | — | — | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | 59 | 45 | 36 | — | 12 | 36 | 38 | — | 29 | 18 | 26 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 61 | — | — | — | 30 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 14 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 58 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 8 |
| White | 126 | 72 | 67 | 74 | 65 | 28 | 30 | 25 | 28 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| High needs | 45 | 41 | 41 | 47 | 37 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 3 | 16 | 11 | 23 |
| Low income | 28 | 60 | 44 | 57 | 38 | 40 | 33 | 29 | 40 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 21 | 21 | 29 | 24 | 21 | 79 | 61 | 67 | 45 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 34 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E3. 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 | 1,023 | 55 | 58 | 61 | 41 | 39 | 34 | 32 | 42 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 24 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 22 | 41 | 32 | 42 | 49 | 12 | 18 | 8 | 30 |
| Asian | 51 | 86 | 79 | 76 | 71 | 14 | 16 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 90 | 40 | 37 | 39 | 20 | 42 | 41 | 39 | 48 | 18 | 23 | 22 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 25 | 63 | 62 | 76 | 47 | 33 | 33 | 20 | 37 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 16 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 831 | 54 | 59 | 63 | 49 | 40 | 34 | 32 | 40 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 11 |
| High needs | 335 | 31 | 29 | 34 | 23 | 50 | 48 | 46 | 48 | 19 | 23 | 20 | 28 |
| Low income | 183 | 34 | 31 | 37 | 21 | 48 | 43 | 40 | 49 | 18 | 26 | 23 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 76 | 38 | 32 | 38 | 21 | 36 | 42 | 38 | 46 | 26 | 26 | 24 | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 184 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 53 | 54 | 52 | 43 | 27 | 31 | 30 | 44 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E4. 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 | 155 | 69 | 67 | 68 | 48 | 28 | 30 | 28 | 39 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 13 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 52 | — | — | — | 21 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 79 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 12 | — | 50 | 50 | 25 | — | 31 | 25 | 50 | — | 19 | 25 | 25 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 51 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 33 | — | — | — | 54 | — | — | — | 13 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 52 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 10 |
| White | 126 | 70 | 66 | 67 | 58 | 26 | 33 | 31 | 35 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| High needs | 47 | 36 | 33 | 32 | 27 | 54 | 56 | 55 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 23 |
| Low income | 29 | 52 | 33 | 34 | 27 | 43 | 52 | 52 | 50 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | 5 | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 40 |
| Students w/disabilities | 21 | 10 | 26 | 24 | 14 | 70 | 67 | 67 | 51 | 20 | 7 | 10 | 35 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E5. 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 | 344 | 60 | 54 | 60 | 42 | 35 | 36 | 33 | 38 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 6 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | 17 | 92 | — | 88 | 64 | 8 | — | 6 | 26 | 0 | — | 6 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 24 | 50 | 20 | 46 | 21 | 46 | 50 | 29 | 43 | 4 | 30 | 25 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 8 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 287 | 58 | 56 | 61 | 51 | 36 | 36 | 34 | 36 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 12 |
| High needs | 110 | 33 | 22 | 35 | 24 | 53 | 50 | 50 | 44 | 14 | 28 | 15 | 32 |
| Low income | 57 | 37 | 23 | 30 | 22 | 52 | 43 | 53 | 44 | 11 | 34 | 18 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 24 | 36 | 18 | 42 | 17 | 45 | 36 | 38 | 41 | 18 | 45 | 21 | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 62 | 20 | 13 | 27 | 15 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 38 | 25 | 32 | 18 | 46 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E6. 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 | 144 | 78 | 66 | 76 | 49 | 19 | 30 | 21 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 28 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 19 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 77 | — | — | — | 19 | — | — | — | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | 50 | — | 26 | — | 33 | — | 52 | — | 17 | — | 22 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 47 | — | — | — | 45 | — | — | — | 8 |
| White | 119 | 79 | 65 | 76 | 58 | 18 | 31 | 21 | 36 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| High needs | 40 | 53 | 29 | 55 | 28 | 35 | 60 | 35 | 52 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 20 |
| Low income | 25 | 71 | 30 | 68 | 28 | 24 | 52 | 28 | 51 | 5 | 17 | 4 | 20 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 13 | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 19 | 13 | 25 | 26 | 18 | 60 | 61 | 58 | 52 | 27 | 14 | 16 | 31 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E7. 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 | 166 | 72 | 67 | 63 | 42 | 24 | 25 | 32 | 40 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 18 |
| 4 | 186 | 58 | 62 | 44 | 37 | 37 | 31 | 47 | 45 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 19 |
| 5 | 163 | 59 | 50 | 59 | 38 | 36 | 43 | 37 | 46 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| 6 | 171 | 56 | 61 | 53 | 40 | 31 | 27 | 32 | 35 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 25 |
| 7 | 159 | 42 | 50 | 53 | 36 | 43 | 40 | 33 | 42 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 22 |
| 8 | 180 | 46 | 41 | 56 | 43 | 46 | 45 | 29 | 34 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 24 |
| 3-8 | 1,025 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 39 | 37 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 21 |
| 10 | 154 | 69 | 68 | 73 | 57 | 30 | 27 | 23 | 31 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 12 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E8. 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 | 166 | 75 | 66 | 70 | 44 | 22 | 26 | 27 | 35 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 20 |
| 4 | 185 | 68 | 71 | 63 | 46 | 28 | 26 | 30 | 38 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 16 |
| 5 | 164 | 54 | 59 | 61 | 40 | 36 | 36 | 34 | 46 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 14 |
| 6 | 169 | 52 | 59 | 56 | 40 | 43 | 32 | 33 | 43 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 17 |
| 7 | 159 | 36 | 44 | 57 | 37 | 51 | 43 | 34 | 44 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 19 |
| 8 | 180 | 46 | 47 | 61 | 38 | 51 | 42 | 34 | 42 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 19 |
| 3-8 | 1,023 | 55 | 58 | 61 | 41 | 39 | 34 | 32 | 42 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 18 |
| 10 | 155 | 69 | 67 | 68 | 48 | 28 | 30 | 28 | 39 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 13 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

Table E9. 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 | 164 | 66 | 52 | 68 | 45 | 26 | 39 | 27 | 36 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 20 |
| 8 | 180 | 54 | 56 | 53 | 39 | 43 | 33 | 39 | 41 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 344 | 60 | 54 | 60 | 42 | 35 | 36 | 33 | 38 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 20 |
| 10 | 144 | 78 | 66 | 76 | 49 | 19 | 30 | 21 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 11 |

*Note*. M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations.

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

| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 817 | 47 | 45 | 50 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 21 | — | — | 61 | 49 |
| Asian | 33 | 57 | 52 | 63 | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 66 | 43 | 42 | 40 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 14 | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 681 | 48 | 45 | 50 | 50 |
| High needs | 252 | 42 | 46 | 48 | 48 |
| Low income | 133 | 40 | 45 | 48 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 48 | 56 | 48 | 48 | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 150 | 42 | 42 | 48 | 45 |

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

| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 138 | 47 | 39 | 51 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Asian | 6 | — | — | — | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 47 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 49 |
| White | 117 | 47 | 37 | 51 | 51 |
| High needs | 35 | 51 | 35 | 48 | 47 |
| Low income | 21 | 52 | 33 | 52 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 17 | — | 37 | — | 44 |

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

| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 820 | 46 | 46 | 53 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 22 | — | — | 58 | 49 |
| Asian | 34 | 68 | 59 | 61 | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 67 | 46 | 43 | 45 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 14 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 682 | 45 | 45 | 53 | 50 |
| High needs | 255 | 45 | 42 | 51 | 48 |
| Low income | 136 | 43 | 41 | 49 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 50 | 53 | 54 | 49 | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 151 | 45 | 37 | 50 | 46 |

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

| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 137 | 58 | 50 | 52 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 47 |
| Asian | 6 | — | — | — | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 45 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 50 |
| White | 116 | 56 | 49 | 51 | 52 |
| High needs | 36 | 58 | 43 | 39 | 47 |
| Low income | 22 | 66 | 44 | 41 | 46 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 46 |
| Students w/disabilities | 17 | — | 39 | — | 47 |

Table E14. MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 174 | 50 | 48 | 45 | 50 |
| 5 | 156 | 53 | 38 | 44 | 50 |
| 6 | 163 | 55 | 49 | 54 | 50 |
| 7 | 150 | 38 | 46 | 56 | 50 |
| 8 | 174 | 41 | 45 | 53 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 817 | 47 | 45 | 50 | 50 |
| 10 | 138 | 47 | 39 | 51 | 50 |

Table E15. MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 175 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 50 |
| 5 | 158 | 37 | 38 | 46 | 50 |
| 6 | 162 | 52 | 49 | 46 | 50 |
| 7 | 151 | 41 | 42 | 54 | 50 |
| 8 | 174 | 57 | 57 | 72 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 820 | 46 | 46 | 53 | 50 |
| 10 | 137 | 58 | 50 | 52 | 50 |

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

| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 167 | 96.8 | 96.6 | 96.4 | 89.2 |
| African American/Black | 1 |   | — | — | 85.6 |
| Asian | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | — | 95.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 90.9 | 78.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | — | — | — | 89.3 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 82.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 89.9 |
| White | 145 | 96.2 | 96.9 | 96.6 | 93.0 |
| High needs | 57 | 88.4 | 90.2 | 89.5 | 82.8 |
| Low income | 36 | 86.7 | 85.7 | 91.7 | 82.2 |
| English learners | 3 |   | — | — | 67.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 27 | 80.8 | 88.9 | 77.8 | 76.4 |

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

| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 (%) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | State 2022 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 179 | 96.9 | 96.8 | 96.6 | 91.9 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — |  | — | 90.1 |
| Asian | 6 | — | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 84.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | — | — | — | 90.8 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 87.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 160 | 97.7 | 96.2 | 96.9 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 61 | 92.3 | 88.4 | 90.2 | 86.8 |
| Low income | 35 | 89.3 | 86.7 | 85.7 | 86.3 |
| English learners | 1 | — |  | — | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 36 | 93.5 | 80.8 | 88.9 | 81.8 |

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

| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 613 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 22 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 47 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 4.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| Native American | 3 | — | — | — | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 3.9 |
| White | 509 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 136 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 3.5 |
| Low income | 76 | — | 1.3 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| English learners | 9 | — | — | 0.0 | 8.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 69 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 |

Table E19. In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 2,235 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 55 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 101 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 226 | — | 1.1 | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 79 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 4 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 1,767 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 751 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.9 |
| Low income | 427 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 2.1 |
| English learners | 125 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 380 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.4 |

Table E20. Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 2,235 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 55 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 101 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 226 | — | 4.3 | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 79 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 4 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 1,767 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 1.5 |
| High needs | 751 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 427 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 4.0 |
| English learners | 125 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 380 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 2.6 | 4.5 |

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

| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 311 | 89.0 | 90.3 | 86.2 | 67.2 |
| African American/Black | 8 | — | 42.9 | 100.0 | 58.2 |
| Asian | 10 | 81.8 | 80.0 | 90.0 | 86.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 31 | 84.6 | 78.3 | 74.2 | 53.7 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 68.4 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 57.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 59.8 |
| White | 252 | 89.3 | 93.0 | 86.5 | 71.9 |
| High needs | 92 | 73.4 | 72.0 | 64.1 | 52.0 |
| Low income | 54 | 73.8 | 76.2 | 64.8 | 53.1 |
| English learners | 7 | — | — | 28.6 | 31.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 48 | 68.1 | 59.5 | 60.4 | 38.5 |

Table E22. Accountability Results, 2024

| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District | 59% | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| John D. McGovern Elementary School | — | — | Insufficient data | Insufficient data |
| Burke-Memorial Elementary School | 54% | 74 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Medway Middle School | 66% | 73 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Medway High School | 76% | 78 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |

1. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.docx>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Districts with similar demographics and similar wealth are based on [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) (retrieved February 2025). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. CURATE: CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. StudySync is rated as ME on EdReports and on CURATE it is rated as ME for standards-alignment, but PM for classroom application. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 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-7)