

# Everett Public Schools

## Comprehensive District Review Report

December 2022

---

### **Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

75 Pleasant Street  
Malden, MA 02148-4906  
781-338-3000  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)

### **American Institutes for Research**

Education Systems and Policy

201 Jones Road, Suite 100  
Waltham, MA 02451  
202-403-5000  
[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)



# Contents

- Executive Summary ..... 1
- Everett Public Schools: District Review Overview ..... 4
- Leadership and Governance ..... 9
- Curriculum and Instruction..... 17
- Assessment ..... 25
- Human Resources and Professional Development ..... 29
- Student Support ..... 36
- Financial and Asset Management ..... 43
- Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities .....A-1
- Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report..... B-1
- Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators .... C-1
- Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures ..... D-1
- Appendix E. Student Performance Data ..... E-1



MASSACHUSETTS

Department of Elementary  
and Secondary Education



Advancing Evidence.  
Improving Lives.

This document was prepared by the American Institutes for Research, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Jeffrey C. Riley  
Commissioner

**Published June 2023**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2023 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

*Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."*

This document printed on recycled paper.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

Phone: 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370

[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)

## 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 Everett Public Schools (hereafter, EPS) in December 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.<sup>1</sup>

### Leadership and Governance

EPS is led by Priya Tahiliani, who was appointed superintendent in March 2020, replacing an interim superintendent. District officials, particularly the superintendent, work with the elected school committee members who represent Everett residents through their oversight of the district. District strengths include a focus on improvement, school committee transparency, and greater autonomy and input into district operations for school administrators under the new superintendent. Areas for growth include fostering a culture of collaboration between the superintendent, the school committee, and city government; providing areas for improvement for teacher and administrator evaluations; and documenting budget development guidelines for school leaders.

### Curriculum and Instruction

EPS has established a clear curricular review process during the current superintendent's tenure. This process is clearly documented in a manual, involves various stakeholders, and was in use at the time of the district visit. The district also has a published instructional vision, which is in use at all levels of the system and incorporates common instructional elements across all levels, such as increased student discourse. District leaders discussed both documents as key to their goals of increasing student achievement. To accomplish its goal of improving student achievement and increasing academic discourse, EPS has used their established process for evaluating curricular materials, to assess or select curricula to ensure that all materials are high quality, and improving collective efficacy of the teaching staff by encouraging professional dialogue and building a collaborative culture of data-driven decision making. Overall, the district is in the early stages of establishing and using this new curriculum review process to assess and select materials and improve instruction.

Eight observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited EPS during the week of December 5, 2022. The observers conducted 144 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,<sup>2</sup> guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper

---

<sup>1</sup> DESE's District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>.

Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). Across all grades, emotional support, instructional support, and student engagement are areas of growth for the district. Overall, in the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest moderate emotional support and student engagement (Grades 4-5), strong classroom organization, and mixed evidence of instructional support. In the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations suggest strong classroom organization, moderate emotional and instructional support, and mixed evidence of student engagement. In the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations suggest mixed student engagement, mixed emotional and instructional support, and high classroom organization.

## **Assessment**

EPS uses multiple assessments and data tools to assess student progress. These assessments vary across school levels to ensure that assessments are appropriate for the grade levels served and align with the curricula used, evidenced by submitted documents and interview data. EPS's strengths include using a variety of data sources to track student progress and identify student needs, using data to inform both academic and socioemotional curricula, and maintaining clear systems for data dissemination to a variety of stakeholders. Areas of growth include better aligning assessments with the taught curriculum; creating additional time for data review, especially at the secondary level; and more effectively communicating results to parents and families.

## **Human Resources and Professional Development**

Under the current superintendent, the human resources and professional development infrastructure in EPS ensures that educators have access to a tailored menu of professional learning opportunities that service district-, school-, and educator-level needs and district priorities. Educators have ample choice for completing their professional development requirements from this menu's offerings. The district also has put in place several systems aimed at recruiting educators from within the community of Everett, including programs that help current and prospective staff complete required courses and degrees at local institutions of higher education. Supervision and evaluation systems are now becoming more collaborative and geared toward constructive criticism. District strengths include several recruitment and retention strategies aimed at creating a more diverse teacher workforce, providing incentives for its mentorship programs, and providing subsidies to incentivize continuing education for teachers and staff. EPS's areas for growth include improving the current human resources system (the current one is shared with the city), providing educators with more actionable feedback through evaluations, and creating clearer opportunities for teachers to become coaches and interventionists.

## **Student Support**

EPS has an established and communicated vision for identifying and supporting student needs through interventions. The district has made efforts in recent years to address school safety in response to parent concerns. In addition, two-way communication with parents remains an area for growth. The district has expressed a commitment to ensuring that all students feel supported and can achieve academic excellence and beyond. Supports for students include those provided by school staff, as well as several community partnerships. Although specific initiatives vary by school, classroom observations indicate the presence of strong behavioral management strategies and an

absence of expressed negativity across all schools. Interviews and observation data suggest various levels of implementation of social-emotional learning supports across school and grade levels in the district. However, areas for growth include addressing concerns surrounding two-way communication with parents, a lack of dedicated space for students who require an individualized education program (IEP), and the development of a District Curriculum Accommodation Plan.

## **Financial and Asset Management**

In recent years, EPS has focused on being transparent with its budget and aligning it to district priorities. The district has a published annual budget that is both detailed and available to the public. District leaders collaborate alongside the school committee to ensure that allocation and use of funding for other resources improves students' performance, opportunities, and outcomes. Net school spending requirements are met, although there is some disagreement on whether current funding levels are sufficient as well as whether they are sustainable once external grant funding is depleted. District leaders also collaborate with town leaders to comprehensively develop the overall budget and complete consistent audits of financial reports and the use of funds. Areas for growth include updating the financial reporting system and collaborating to alleviate the district's school overcrowding issue. In particular, the difficult relationship between school department and city government stakeholders makes the issues of capital and space as well as chargebacks, or fees paid to the city by the school department, additional factors to consider in trying to address areas for growth.

# Everett 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 identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. In addition, the design of the comprehensive district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

## Methodology

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

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

## Site Visit

The site visit to EPS was conducted during the week of December 5, 2022. The site visit included 26 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 88 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school administrators, school staff, students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives, as well as a representative from city government. The review team conducted five teacher focus groups with eight elementary school teachers, eight middle school teachers, and seven high school teachers. The team also conducted two student focus groups, one at the middle school level and one at the high school level. In addition, the team held three virtual parent focus groups, one each in English, Portuguese, and Spanish.

The site team also conducted 144 observations of classroom instruction in seven<sup>3</sup> schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

## District Profile

EPS is led by Priya Tahiliani, who was appointed superintendent in March 2020, as well as a deputy superintendent, a chief equity officer, an assistant superintendent of curriculum and assessment, a chief financial officer, and a communications director. The district is governed by a school committee composed of 10 members, including nine members who are elected for two-year terms, as well as the city’s mayor, who is elected to a four-year term and serves as a voting member of the school committee.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 550 teachers in the district, with 7,285 students enrolled in the district’s 10 schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

**Table 1. Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2022-2023**

School	Level	Grades served	Enrollment
Adams Elementary School	PK	PK	182
Webster School Extension	PK	PK	173
Webster School	Elementary	K-5	329
George Keverian School	K-8	K-8	897
Lafayette School	K-8	K-8	1,020
Madeline English School	K-8	K-8	763
Albert N. Parlin School	K-8	K-8	1,014
Sumner G. Whittier School	K-8	K-8	630
Everett High School	High school	9-12	2,231
Devens Elementary School	Alternative	K-12	46
<b>Total</b>			<b>7,285</b>

Note. Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2020 and 2023, overall student enrollment increased by 228 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high-need populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was similar to the median in-district per-pupil expenditure in fiscal year 2021: \$16,085 for EPS compared with \$16,436 for 29 similarly sized districts and less than average state spending per pupil (\$18,522). Actual net school spending was slightly greater (4.2 percent) than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

<sup>3</sup> DESE exempted the early childhood centers and the alternative education program from instructional observations.



## School and Student Performance

In ELA in grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 17 percentage points, from 38 percent in 2019 to 21 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 41 percent. In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 6 percentage points, from 42 percent in 2019 to 36 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 58 percent. (Tables E1 and E2)

- In grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 20 percentage points for Asian students, by 34 percentage points for and Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, by 9 percentage points for English Learners (EL) and Former EL students, by 16 percentage points for White students, and by 4 to 7 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 17 and 20 percentage points for Asian students and White students, respectively, and by 3 to 9 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

In math in grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 15 percentage points, from 37 percent in 2019 to 22 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 39 percent. In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 11 percentage points, from 35 percent in 2019 to 24 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 50 percent. (Tables E3 and E4)

- In grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 1 percentage point for Hispanic/Latino students. The percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 34 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, by 16 percentage points for White students, by 18 points for Asian students, and by 1 to 8 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 19 percentage points for Asian students, by 28 percentage points for White students, and by 3 to 12 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

In science in grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined by 6 percentage points, from 28 percent in 2019 to 22 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 42 percent. In grade 10, 18 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 47 percent. (Tables E5 and E6)

- In grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was below the state rate by 23 percentage points for Asian students, by 31 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, by 14 percentage points for White students, and by 2 to 8 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was below the state rate by 34 percentage points for White students, and by 7 to 15 percentage points all other student groups with reportable data.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the MCAS assessments in grades 3-8 was 47.7 in ELA and 51.8 in math, which represent typical growth. In grade 10, SGPs were typical in ELA (44.3) and low in math (35.6)<sup>4</sup>. (Tables E7-E10).

- SGPs in grades 3-8 in ELA and math were typical for most student groups with reportable data, ranging from 41.5 to 55.9 in ELA and from 40.7 to 54.5 in math. The SGP in math for Asian students, however, was high (60.0).
- In grade 10, ELA SGPs were typical, ranging from 42.5 to 53.5 for all student groups with reportable data. SGPs in math were typical for Asian students (53.2) and EL and Former EL students (41.2), and low for all other student groups with reportable data, ranging from 32.6 to 37.4.

EPS's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 5.7 percentage points, from 75.5 percent in 2020 to 81.2 percent in 2022. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 8.1 percentage points, from 76.4 percent in 2019 to 84.5 percent in 2021. (Tables E16 and E17)

- The four-year-cohort graduation rate increased between 2020 and 2022 by 28.6 and 22.5 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and Students with Disabilities, respectively. The rate increased by 0.1 to 11 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate increased between 2019 and 2021 by 30.9 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and by 4.0 to 11.5 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

The district's annual dropout rate decreased from 4.0 percent in 2020 to 3.7 percent in 2022, which is above the 2022 state rate of 2.1 percent. (Table E20)

- The dropout rate in Everett was below the state rate by 0.4 to 0.8 percentage points for African American/Black students, Asian students, and Students with Disabilities. The dropout

---

<sup>4</sup> Average student growth percentile (SGP) ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0–29.9, Low Growth = 30.0–39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0–59.9, High Growth = 60.0 or higher.

rate was above the state rate by .0.4 to 4 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

## Leadership and Governance

EPS is led by Priya Tahiliani, who was appointed superintendent in March 2020, replacing an interim superintendent. She receives support from a deputy superintendent; an assistant superintendent; a chief financial officer; a chief equity officer; and directors for communications, security, facilities, instruction and remote learning, ELs, and special education; other key district leaders; and school principals. These district officials, particularly the superintendent, work with the elected school committee members who represent Everett residents through their oversight of the district.

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

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#">School committee governance</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPS district leadership and the school committee demonstrate a commitment to best practices in improvement planning.</li> <li>The school committee facilitates transparent sharing of minutes and meeting participation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly delineating roles and responsibilities between the school committee, the superintendent, and city government</li> </ul>
<a href="#">District and school leadership</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The superintendent fosters an environment of open communication and compromise that is responsive to and inclusive of the views of multiple stakeholders.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#">District and school improvement planning</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District and school improvement plans are created with the input of multiple stakeholders.</li> <li>District improvement action steps align with the superintendent's entry plan.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#">Budget development</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School administrators control their individual school budgets and how they allocate budget funds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More available documentation of the budgeting process</li> </ul>

### School Committee Governance

The school committee partners with district and community leaders to uphold Massachusetts laws and regulations, communicates with multiple education stakeholder groups, and maintains fiduciary responsibilities to the district and the City of Everett. A strength of the district is the committee's transparency regarding school committee meetings. School committee proceedings include both written minutes as well as livestream and recorded videos of meetings. Parent interview participants reported feeling more informed regarding the goings on of the district because of the ease of accessibility to meetings and meeting materials. A strength of the district is the transparent sharing of school committee meeting minutes, materials, and recordings of meetings.

Legal and financial matters (including capital and finance matters discussed later) are a frequent topic in EPS school committee meetings. Budgets and capital planning are discussed regularly in

committee meetings. A review of the eight school committee meetings preceding the visit showed that seven focused substantially on financial matters. District-submitted documents—including the 2021 budget summary, the 2022 EPS Budget, the fiscal year 2023 Presentation to the Budget Committee and Everett High School Student Activity Budget, and Financial and Asset Management—all provide evidence that financial matters are reviewed regularly.

Several district-level documents provide evidence that EPS is committed to focusing on improvement. EPS's Public School Strategy Plan outlines four priorities for the district. The priorities are to: 1) Develop more opportunities and structures to meet the needs of all learners to increase student achievement, 2) Maintain safe, clean, and equitable facilities that promote and accelerate academic achievement, 3) Strengthen an environment and school culture that cultivates a sense of belonging among all students, and 4) Build a school culture that responds to the social emotional experiences of every student – one that leads to personal, communal, and societal well-being. The priorities, generated collaboratively between district leadership and the school committee, align to the district's core standards and their whole child approach. EPS's current strategy plan is part of a multiyear process led by the superintendent to develop specific improvement and strategy documents in conjunction with local stakeholders. This multiyear process is outlined in the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS) entry process for all new superintendents. In interviews, however, school committee members and city government representatives were not familiar with the specific contents of current District Strategy Plan or school-level improvement plans. Nevertheless, a strength of the district is conducting strategy and improvement planning using the collaborative, multi-year process outlined by the MASS.

A review of school committee minutes from July to December 2022 indicates that the superintendent provides an update on district activities at each meeting. Several district documents provide evidence that the district is using a variety of assessment and data review meetings to identify and mitigate student learning gaps, yet presentations and discussions of student data at school committee meetings appear to be rare and limited largely to annual MCAS data. A review of school committee minutes from July 2022 until the time of the visit in December 2022 indicated no discussions were devoted to student outcomes as a main topic.

The school committee evaluates the superintendent's performance annually, as required by law, and rated her as proficient in all areas in August 2022.<sup>5</sup> Interview participants reported that the district's procedure for evaluating the superintendent was recently updated and is in-line with recommendations from the Massachusetts Association of School Committees. However, school committee members further reported that although there are permanent and active committees for matters such as finance and diversity, equity, and inclusion, the committee for the superintendent's evaluation is a three-member ad hoc subcommittee, temporarily assembled to revamp and lead the evaluation process. A review of school committee minutes confirms this, noting that the ad hoc subcommittee convened in August 2022 to conduct the superintendent evaluation process. According to the school committee chair, this ad hoc committee is formalizing the use of the new evaluation procedure for the entire committee because high turnover recently among committee members made continuity in applying the new procedure—as well as experience in doing the

---

<sup>5</sup> The superintendent's evaluation by the school committee also is [publicly available on the district's website](#).

evaluation—difficult to implement. Members reported in interviews that a permanent committee—or a new process used by the entire committee—may be forthcoming in subsequent years.

EPS’s school committee’s most significant area for growth is to cultivate a culture of collaboration. District- and city-level interviews indicated a lack of clear and common understandings of the roles and responsibilities of the school committee, the superintendent and district leadership, the city, and the mayor, as well as a lack of a culture of collaboration among these parties. Interviews across multiple stakeholder groups noted tension between the school committee, the mayor, and the superintendent’s office related to the general direction of the district, and this tension presents challenges in handling some regular school department business. In interviews, school committee said that the committee itself is a “fractured” entity, meaning that interview participants suggested difficulty for the body to effectively work together on some official business. For example, two interview participants noted that it is perceived that several members of the full school committee do not approach their evaluations of the superintendent’s performance fairly. These respondents said that some members do not recognize the challenges to student learning presented by the pandemic and increases in student poverty. Two district officials explained that the school committee does not offer the same amount of input or feedback on the superintendent’s goals and regular presentations as they do with other meeting issues.

In another example of a lack of cohesive working relationships, these and other participants cited difficulty in all parties agreeing on a solution to student overcrowding. Responses from several interview participants and a review of school committee meeting minutes reveal a lack of clear direction on a commonly agreed-upon solution to this challenge. This issue is discussed in greater detail in the Finance section of this report.

In addition, multiple interview participants and contemporaneous news articles highlighted tension among some members of the school committee and between the school department and city government. This tension hampered some aspects of school department operations highlighted in this report (e.g., capital planning related to school overcrowding, discussing renewal of the superintendent’s contract, disputes over control of school finances). Several areas for growth are related to this root issue. For example, several district-level and city government interview participants reported that, recently, the mayor adopted a more active role in the school committee after he, through a city council vote, became a voting member of the committee in 2021 (he was previously ex-officio, a nonvoting member). Further, the mayor’s presence as a voting committee member now makes the school committee’s voting numbers even (with 10 voting members), which several interview respondents said effectively makes measures more difficult to pass because of the possibility of tied votes.

Despite the evaluation subcommittee’s positive evaluations, interview respondents reported that there have been various actions undermining the superintendent, which coincide with the mayor’s presence. A school committee member noted, “The animosity between the city government and the administration is [palpable], and it’s causing a lot of tension. I don’t think that either side of the political arena really see that it’s affecting the educators on a daily basis.” A review of school committee minutes shows that during the November 21, 2022, meeting, members voted 6-4 in favor of negotiating with the superintendent for a new contract (the current contract runs through February

2024, although policy stipulated taking this procedural vote to start negotiations at this time), with four members opposing beginning negotiations with the superintendent to extend her tenure<sup>6</sup>. Previously, in January 2022, a school committee member motioned to remove the superintendent from her role as school committee secretary and motioned to prohibit the superintendent from approving contract extensions for administrators without school committee approval. Also in January 2022, the superintendent filed a complaint against the member who made these motions, as well as the mayor, with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. The district's deputy superintendent filed a similar complaint in November 2022.

## District and School Leadership

EPS's superintendent has established and is supported by a leadership team that includes a deputy superintendent, an assistant superintendent, a chief financial officer, instructional leadership teams, directors for curriculum and instruction, and specialists in ELs and special education. During her tenure, two additional directors have been added: a director for social-emotional learning and a chief equity officer. Interview data suggest that the superintendent has been working to engage multiple groups of stakeholders in the district. Respondents provided information detailing that the district's current improvement plan was created with the input of the entire leadership team and school principals. This collaborative, multi-year process of strategic planning is in line with recommendations from the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents as part of a new superintendent's tenure. District and principal interviews confirm that the superintendent meets with principals once per month. Multiple interviews, as well as school committee minutes, confirmed that the superintendent regularly reports to the school committee, particularly regarding the progress of students and staff, every two weeks. Interviews with union leaders credit the superintendent with contributing to a productive bargaining experience, and teachers finalized their collective bargaining agreement, with teachers' association representatives noting that they received a "fair and equitable deal."

A noted strength of the district is the superintendent's commitment to open dialogue. The July 2022 school committee minutes indicated that family and community engagement and communication (Standard III-C) is a priority for the superintendent; this session was one of several meetings in which the superintendent discussed plans to respond to parents' safety concerns. Multiple interview respondents noted that the superintendent tries to be inclusive of all the views and voices of stakeholders when making recommendations to the committee. For example, one district leader reported the following:

[The superintendent is] very forthright and usually brings in stakeholders as well to show the impact of whatever recommendation she's making . . . Sometimes I wish she'd make stronger recommendations, but at the same time . . . she's an employee of a political body. So I understand that as well . . . for instance, going back to the safety, I was not in favor of a security team being hired for the high school, but she was responding to parents, teachers . . . And this was the best plan that fit all of the stakeholders' input.

---

<sup>6</sup> Data collection for the district review took place in December 2022. Subsequent to onsite visits, the Everett School Committee voted against a motion to approve contract extension negotiations with the superintendent, defeating the measure 4-6 at the March 6, 2023 meeting.



The school committee interviews suggested that the superintendent intentionally works to create a space of open communication and compromise among stakeholders. One school committee member described the superintendent's approach as "unabashedly responsive," further explaining "The superintendent will say, 'You know, I'm coming from this point of view, but I'd like to hear yours.'" According to this school committee member, "[her] relentless responsiveness has won people over. And I think that's a good thing." Several district-level interview respondents noted the efforts to seek input from parents and the community on the new early grades' social-emotional learning materials. These efforts included setting up tables outside schools to easily engage family members during drop off and pick up times.

District-level interviews reported that the superintendent tries to leverage school committee meetings to communicate to the public, build support for schools, and be transparent about their initiatives. District staff also use various modes of communication to engage with EPS stakeholders, such as staff newsletters, principal's newsletters, meeting individually with parents, sharing information via the district website, and creating a Google form that will allow members of the community to submit complaints. School committee meeting minutes from August 2022 provide evidence that the superintendent has advocated for subcommittee meetings to be open and accessible to all stakeholders. In that meeting, she proposed that subcommittee meetings be held at an updated EPS building that complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act and that these meetings be recorded and livestreamed, when warranted.

Principal and district-level interviews indicated that school administrators wield a great deal of autonomy in decision making at the building level. School administrators have control over their budgets, the technology used in their building, professional development, curriculum, books, and assessments. Although principals do not have hiring power, they do interview candidates and make recommendations to the district for positions in their buildings. In addition, greater flexibility in fiscal matters allows principals to tailor their funding to school-level needs and interventions. One school leader noted as follows:

I think this administration has done a wonderful job of really empowering the principals, the administrators to take leadership of their own buildings . . . I think if I had to say the one thing that central administration looks to us for is to take ownership for our buildings . . . it's really not a top-down approach; it's really bottom-up and starts in the classroom.

School committee members and other district staff confirmed what the principals said: the superintendent empowers principals and teachers to take ownership of their buildings and guides and coaches them. As one district leader noted, "[The superintendent] hires leaders and lets them lead with support and guidance and coaching."

The empowerment of EPS school leaders and its commitment to teacher development are marked strengths of the district. The superintendent makes concerted efforts to ensure that school administrators, teachers, and staff have access to leadership development opportunities and opportunities for career advancement. Additional details on leadership and career advancement opportunities are elaborated in the Human Resources section of this report.



## District and School Improvement Planning

The creation of improvement plans in the district appears to be a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders—a noted strength of the district. EPS has two types of improvement plans that guide work in the district: a district improvement plan, detailing districtwide goals, and individual school improvement plans. According to district interviews, the four overarching priorities for the district improvement plan were generated after reviewing 10 different school improvement plans and finding commonalities that aligned to the district’s core values. This plan also was informed by the results from various surveys. School committee and school-level interviews confirmed that building relationships between students, teachers, families, and the community; providing a safe and supportive learning environment; developing students’ socioemotional skills; and recruiting quality and diverse teachers are all priorities for the district improvement plan.

School improvement plans were developed by principals and their instructional leadership teams. Teacher and teachers’ association interviews reported that teacher input was incorporated for school-level improvement plans. In addition, department heads reviewed the trends across all their assessments and incorporated the items that needed improvement into school-level plans.

Submitted documents and interview data confirm that the superintendent and district office staff maintain a strong commitment to improvement. Since taking the position of superintendent in 2020, the superintendent has followed the multiyear entry and improvement planning process suggested by the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents described in the preceding section, beginning with an entry plan and entry report and resulting in a five-year strategic plan.

Alignment between the superintendent’s entry plan and the district improvement action steps are another strength of district. The 2020-2021 Superintendent’s Entry Report provides a comprehensive overview of the district’s four core values (Integrate, Access, Empower, and Cultivate) as well as her entry plan for district improvement. In this document, the superintendent details an entry plan with three steps:

- Engaging and Understanding: met by holding a listening tour with EPS community members
- Synthesizing and Strategizing: summarizing and prioritizing issues from the listening tour
- Aligning and Implementing: connecting budget priorities and core values to district initiatives

The Superintendent’s Entry Plan and budget book outline the core values of the district and efforts to align those values to resource allocation, a claim further supported by district-level interviews and district documents. A few of the priorities mentioned in this plan are as follows: (a) making sure that the budget aligns with their core values and the whole child development approach adopted for the district; (b) providing equitable access to high-quality instruction; and (c) providing culturally responsive instruction. Action steps taken to move toward the goals as a district include conducting curricular reviews to ensure high-quality curricula, adopting the most recent best pedagogical strategies, implementing a culturally responsive framework, and providing multiple pathways for high school students so that they are supported in a myriad of postgraduation endeavors.

The district’s 2022-2023 Instructional Vision outlines EPS’s instructional goals. This document reads:

Our collective goal for the 22-23 school year is to work to improve student achievement in all content areas and for all demographic and ability groups by promoting, monitoring, and evaluating effective instructional practices by all teachers in all classes. We will do this through improving collective efficacy of the teaching staff through encouraging ongoing professional dialogue; facilitating sharing and modeling of best practices; building a collaborative culture of data-driven decision making; and increasing accountability for teaching and learning.

Teacher- and district-level interviews confirm that district-mandated professional development has focused on academic discourse and scaffolding, making this an active goal for the district.

Submitted professional development documents from the educational equity consulting firm BlackPrint provide additional confirmation of the instructional vision's integration into educator learning. Presentations were submitted on culturally responsive schools and how to build a school and professional culturally responsive committee, seven types of bias in instructional materials, and an equity planning tool. The equity planning tool workshop included six steps of equity planning, including analyzing data, stakeholder engagement, strategies for equity, implementation planning, accountability, and communications. The goal of the planning tool is to help school agents identify and dismantle barriers that create student opportunity gaps. The planning tool is supposed to be used in the decision-making process to make sure that an equity lens is always present. Additional district documents that point to a focus on school improvement include the Early Warning Indicator System for EPS, the EPS Conceptual and Operational Frame for Districtwide Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP), the Equity Task Force Working Group Meeting, the EPS SMART Goal Sheet, and several teacher and administrator evaluation forms.

The commitment to district improvement is further evidenced by the creation of a chief equity officer role. District-level interviews reported that the recently hired chief equity officer plans to co-create an equity roadmap for each district school, using an individualized approach with each principal. District leaders reported favoring a bottom-up approach to the development of these plans because student needs and populations are different for every school. A family resource center, located in city hall, was recently created to help EPS families acclimate to the district. The staff at the center are multilingual and are designated for parent needs, community supports, and resources, according to school committee interviews.

## **Budget Development**

Interview participants reported that EPS's budget is developed initially at the district's central office and must be approved by the school committee and the City of Everett council. Within the district office, multiple interview respondents reported that aligning the budget with district priorities and values is an important aspect of their budget development process. Several respondents noted, for example, that the district budget is reviewed for alignment to equity-related principles, including by the chief equity officer.

EPS is moving toward establishing a clearer and more collaborative budget development process. Several interview participants noted that the nature of this process was relatively new—a change that was part of the current superintendent's approach upon her arrival in 2020. A big part of this change

has been increasing the involvement of department heads and school-level leaders in the process, allowing for what multiple participants characterized as greater school-level autonomy and what one participant characterized as greater “transparency” in the budget process. The superintendent has allowed school administrators greater control over their individual budgets and how they allocate budget funds. Several interview respondents reported that principals have been allowed more site-based decisions and engaging in more joint reflection of budget priorities with the central office than under the previous superintendent. Multiple school principals reported in interviews greater control over site-level budgets and more coordination among departments (e.g., literacy, music) across the district. District-level staff noted that this school-level process, in conjunction with department heads, helps inform the districtwide budget process.

According to interviews, school leaders appreciate having greater control over their individual budgets. However, the district review found no evidence of written guidelines, procedures, or systems in place to shape budget planning, although one district- and one school-level participant reported how the district has started to offer guidance based on past spending, enrollment, and other needs determinations. This lack of documentation is an area for growth, especially as the district is trying to relieve school overcrowding and secure funds above net school spending while also allowing for school-level budget autonomy.

## Recommendations

- The district should clearly and formally delineate the roles and responsibilities of the school committee, the superintendent and other district leaders, the city, and the mayor.
- The district should document its budget development guidelines, procedures, and systems.

## Curriculum and Instruction

One of EPS’s goals in the early years of the new superintendent’s tenure has been to work to improve student achievement in all content areas and for all demographic and ability groups by promoting, monitoring, and evaluating effective instructional materials and practices by all teachers in all classes. To accomplish this goal, EPS has committed to establishing a process for evaluating curricular materials, assessing or selecting curricula to ensure that all materials are high quality, and improving collective efficacy of the teaching staff by encouraging professional dialogue and building a collaborative culture of data-driven decision making. Overall, the district is in the early stages of establishing and using this new process to assess and select materials and improve instruction.

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

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#">Curriculum selection and use</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The well-documented curricular review process is thoroughly structured to ensure regular, rigorous, inclusive curricular reviews for all core content areas, including the planning and implementation of curricula.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of diversification of reading material</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Classroom instruction</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic discourse is a focus.</li> <li>Students receive support through small-group instruction.</li> <li>Differentiation is achieved by scaffolding instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low instructional rigor observed in classrooms</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Student access to coursework</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Educational pathways are structured for students to increase college and career readiness.</li> <li>Policies are reviewed and modified to meet the needs of all students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rigidity of career pathway options that leaves little room for student flexibility</li> </ul>

### Curriculum Selection and Use

Curriculum selection and use is a strength of the district because EPS’s well documented curricular review process is thoroughly structured to ensure regular, rigorous reviews for all core content areas. Finalized in January 2022, EPS’s formalized review process, with its accompanying manual, is assembling groups of stakeholders to review, select, and implement new instructional materials. The district’s new curricular review process is a six-year cycle that includes monitoring compliance with regulatory requirements, developing and implementing revisions to the curriculum, and assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum based on student outcome data. This new review process establishes a collaborative culture of data-driven decision making.

Another strength of the district is EPS's planning and implementation of curricula. The *Everett Public Schools Curriculum Review Manual* outlines the six-year cycle that the district uses to review curricula. This robust process is an opportunity for content leads, building leaders, and district administrators to engage in a continuous analytical review and feedback process regarding the curricula used for all content areas in Grades PK-12. In Year 1 of the curricular review process, content area leads must develop an implementation plan that includes a vision for the curriculum that conveys how the curriculum will make grade-level, rigorous content accessible to all learners; roles and responsibilities of multiple stakeholders; a pre implementation checklist; and guiding questions for content leads to reflect on throughout the year. Content leads also create specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely (SMART) goals for the curriculum that are directly connected to student performance assessment data and survey data. Years 2-5 of the curricular review process are dedicated to reflection, adjustment, and planning. The Reflect, Adjust, and Plan template includes a summary of the current status of curricula, including updates on any curriculum development teamwork and subsequent curriculum guides. Lastly, in the sixth and final year of the review process, content leads enter the audit and review stage in which the curricular review process concludes with a recommendation to either renew the curriculum for additional years or to launch the vetting and selection process for a replacement. The curricular review process culminates with an audit for bias, standard alignment, student representation, student agency, and technology infusion, using BlackPrint's Seven Forms of Bias protocol.

Through a meticulous review process, content leads must organize a curricular review committee for the audit and review stage. Each curricular review committee must include a content lead; at least two teachers who have taught the content and curriculum in review for at least four years; at least two teachers who teach the content and curriculum in review who may be newer to the curriculum; two student representatives for any curriculum for Grades 7-12; one representative from the EL department, one representative from the Special Education department, and the director of remote learning and instruction as a consultant. To find volunteers to participate in the curricular review committees, one district leader explained how "we offer a sizable stipend to be on that team, and that usually draws even more . . . people from different places . . ." After the action step results are synthesized and discussed, the curricular review committee will make a final recommendation to either continue with the curriculum for a certain number of years or adopt a new curriculum; thus, launching the vetting and selection process and a draft timeline for next steps.

The vetting and selection process comprises three phases: Learn and Prepare, Investigate and Select, and Prepare to Launch. In the Learn and Prepare phase, content leads set time frames and dates for meetings, establish a "curriculum council," build curriculum literacy, incorporate stakeholder engagement, and explore other curriculum options on the market. In the Investigate and Select phase, content leads narrow their options, review curriculum materials, run pilot tests, and make a selection. Finally, in the Prepare to Launch phase, content leads develop their implementation plan; thus beginning a new six-year review cycle.

The curricular review cycle is rooted in collaborative, data-driven decision making and affords teachers the opportunity to build a curriculum guide with the content lead. In addition, a curriculum guide includes the standards, content objectives, language objectives, key vocabulary, and graphic organizers to make following the curriculum easy and convenient for teachers with this "one-stop-

shop.” For example, several teachers shared that they collaborate with other teachers and program advisory committees to develop curriculum maps and unit plans for existing curricula.

An area of growth for the district is the diversification of reading material for students. The curricular review process has been updated to include reviews of reading material. In interviews, several district leaders described how the principles of equity outlined in the curricular review manual shape their curricular reviews. For instance, a district leader explained how their department has “put our K-5 mathematics curriculum through that review, our high school ESL [English as a second language] curriculum is through that review, and we’re currently using it for our middle school ESL curriculum.” This district leader also pointed out how the current high school ESL curriculum does not include any characters or topics or themes from Brazil, which is EPS’s biggest emerging EL population. The K-5 curriculum contained linguistic barriers for ELs without necessary scaffolds and supports to help ELs access grade-level mathematics. After reviews of the K-5 mathematics curriculum and the high school ESL curriculum, the district determined that the curricula were not effective for their current student population and ultimately decided to select other curricula. The district will continue to review other curricula through a staggered yearly process. Following their review of the Grades 6-8 ELA curriculum this year, the district will then review their K-5 ELA curriculum. For the high school mathematics curriculum, EPS implemented an integrated mathematics model in which every grade level receives standards from all different types of mathematics, such as algebra and geometry. Once the review of the K-5 mathematics curriculum is fully complete, the K-8 STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) director must decide whether the next step is to review the Grades 6-8 mathematics curriculum or the Grades 5-8 science curriculum.

Teachers and department heads participate in monthly department meetings during which each subject is grouped together and they work together to review current material, discuss what’s working, and describe where they may need to make adjustments. One example of these meetings is the Growing Literacy Equity Across Massachusetts team meeting. The team, part of a DESE grant-funded effort to support local education agencies in implementing equity-related improvements in curriculum and instruction, consists of district leaders, school leaders, and teachers from each school. This group engages in a process of evaluating and selecting high-quality curriculum materials for ELA/literacy during monthly meetings after school hours. In other department meetings, department heads and teachers collaborate with one another during the summer to develop curriculum maps and unit plans for the upcoming school year. One department head explained how the curriculum maps are “. . . living documents that the teachers refer to and they will make updates as they go throughout the school years . . . Is this best for our kids? If it’s not, let’s do something different.”

EPS has documentation for which curricular materials are in use. EPS uses the ELA curriculum Reach for Reading for Grades K-5, Amplify for Grades 6-8, and Savvas for Grades 9-12. The mathematics curricula are Everyday Mathematics 4 for Grades K-5, Big Ideas Math for Grades 6-8, and Savvas for Grades 9-12. The science curricula are Mystery Science for Grades K-5, STEMScopes for Grades 6-8, and Holt Biology for Grades 9-12. Lastly, the history and social science curricula are teacher created for Grades K-5, McGraw-Hill for Grades 6 and 7, iCivics for Grade 8, and Savvas for Grades 9-12. Amplify is the only curriculum used in the district that is rated as “Meets Expectations”

on CURATE.<sup>7</sup> All other curricula were either ineligible or not rated on CURATE because some are teacher developed. EPS also is piloting new social-emotional learning curricula for Grades PK-2 (PATHS), Grades 3-5 (Harmony), and Grades 6-8 (Wayfinder).

Everett High School's ESL department uses National Geographic's Edge for core ESL courses. For Grades 6-8, the EL department currently uses National Geographic's INSIDE curriculum for core ESL instruction for EL Level 1 and 2 students. As a supplement to this curriculum, the district also uses both Fundamentals 2 and INSIDE Level A. All Grades 6-8 Level 3 and 4 ELs receive co-taught ESL instruction in a general education ELA classroom setting using the Amplify curriculum.

According to one district leader, EPS has become much more purposeful about planning time strategically for teachers to implement and internalize new curricula. For example, this district leader shared that teachers are contractually required to have 11 annual hours of professional development, largely driven by teachers' choice; several participants at all levels confirmed this arrangement. To meet this requirement, EPS's ELA director runs an 11-hour professional development on Amplify, the new ELA curriculum for Grades 6-8. This time is dedicated to applying scaffolds and having teachers work together and discuss how the curriculum is impacting students. One middle school teacher described how the academic work inside Amplify is "something that whether you're coming from a poverty-stricken background or whether you're coming from the suburbs . . . I believe you can understand the material and there's no cultural bias." For these reasons, the planning and implementation of curricula is a strength of the district.

Another district leader described how teachers previously considered professional development as ineffective. To address these concerns from teachers and leaders, EPS brought in an outside coordinator to host districtwide professional development that taught teachers about academic discourse and how to facilitate discussion in the classroom.

## Classroom Instruction

EPS has an instructional vision statement at the district level, and staff interviews at all levels reported at least some familiarity with these goals. In particular, a commitment to increasing instructional dialogue in the classroom was cited as a common goal among nearly all interviewed teachers and school administrators.

Eight observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited EPS during the week of December 5, 2022. The observers conducted 144 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

---

<sup>7</sup> CURATE: CUrriculum RATings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>.



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

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

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were in the upper middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.3) and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (4.3 for both).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high-middle to high range for all grade bands (5.8 for Grades K-5, 6.6 for Grades 6-8, and 6.7 for Grades 9-12).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the lower middle range all grade bands (3.3 for Grades K-5, 3.6 for Grades 6-8, and 3.8 for Grades 9-12).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the upper middle range for Grades 4-5 (5.3) and in the middle range for the 6-8 grade band (4.8) and the 9-12 grade band (4.9).

Across all grades, instructional support is an area of growth for the district. Overall, in the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest moderate emotional support and student engagement (Grades 4-5), strong classroom organization, and mixed evidence of instructional support. In the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations suggest strong classroom organization, moderate emotional and instructional support, and mixed evidence of student engagement. In the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations suggest mixed student engagement and emotional and instructional support and high classroom organization.

However, EPS's explicit focus on academic discourse as well as providing student support through small-group instruction are strengths of the district. District leaders and teachers all described an explicit district focus on increasing academic discourse within the classroom. For instance, one



district leader explained how high school department heads have been giving out specific strategies for students to build on each other's ideas verbally and to convey complex ideas using complex sentences. This example is a common scaffold thread taking place throughout all content areas at the high school. To further increase the use of academic discourse, teachers receive professional development; receive feedback from administration; and make sure that "thinking is visible," meaning that teachers look for students to be prompted to respond to questions and having frequent check-ins.

Across multiple focus groups and interviews, coteaching and small-group instruction also emerged as instructional strategies that were very frequently referenced throughout the district. Several elementary teachers reported that they rely heavily on small groups because they differentiate instruction throughout various levels and students have the opportunity to easily express themselves.

According to several district leaders, there has been a large push within the district for student-centered learning and discussions. Middle and high school student focus groups provided additional insight into the learning experiences for students. One high school student similarly shared that teachers are trying to get students more involved in academic discourse by implementing group activities and class presentations. A few students agreed that their teachers try to apply their lessons to current events, which makes their classroom experiences more fun and engaging. Another student appreciated how their English teacher offers them support when they encounter language difficulties in the classroom.

EPS teachers are implementing this focus by differentiating classroom instruction based on student learning needs in courses throughout the curriculum. For instance, the district instructs teachers to use grade-level content during Tier 1 instruction, with just-in-time scaffolds and skillful planning, to meet diverse student needs. EPS emphasizes their instructional mission throughout the district, which is for teachers to have high expectations for all students. According to the 2022-2023 Instructional Vision document, EPS's collective goal for the 2022-2023 school year is for all lessons to be driven by on-grade-level standards, to ensure that (a) all students have access to grade-level content, (b) teachers continually collect and monitor student responses, and (c) student participation and metacognition increases. In focus groups, middle school teachers explained how the instructional vision is woven throughout their professional development courses and onboarding processes. While discussing district priorities, one teacher noted,

I think we're really gearing the curriculum that I teach, . . . towards success with English language learners and our special education students. They're getting a much more fuller curriculum—these days—this year than they have probably in the past.

Teachers and district leaders noted that through the What I Need (WIN) block, a districtwide initiative, staff can provide targeted instruction to all students based on student data, although some interview data suggest that the district's documented model is not yet consistently implemented at all levels in the system, particularly in the high school. One school leader also described how the district has partnered with TNTP to focus on high-quality teaching and instruction and to further ensure that all students have access to grade-level material and standards.

## Student Access to Coursework

EPS is creating a Profile of a Graduate that includes the attainment of transferable skills, disciplinary/interdisciplinary knowledge, understandings, and dispositions necessary to prepare learners for their future. Through a defined curricular experience, students are assured consistent learning outcomes and have the opportunity to creatively demonstrate their skills and knowledge. In addition to a full complement of honors and Advanced Placement (AP) classes at the high school level, EPS has partnerships with Bunker Hill Community College and Salem State University to offer students dual-enrollment courses.

A notable strength of the district is the structured educational pathways for students that were designed to increase college and career readiness. To give students more equitable access to different course offerings at the high school level, EPS offers students the opportunity to select from four thematic academies for Grades 10, 11, and 12. The Academies of Everett High School are pathways within the school that link students with peers, teachers, and community partners in a structured environment: The Academy of Science, Technology, and Engineering; The Academy of Business, Law, and Hospitality; The Academy of Health and Public Service; and the Academy of Construction, Machining, and Architectural Design. Before students can choose an academic pathway to follow, every student must participate in an exploratory program during their freshman year during which they rotate throughout the introductory courses of the academies. One district leader reported that some academic areas stretch across all the academies, such as music and health, so students in any academy can still have access to those content areas.

However, the limited room for student flexibility within the career pathway process is an area of growth for the district. One district leader noted that the district recognizes how the exploratory academy is an area for growth because the academy may limit student accessibility to other coursework that students want to take. Across focus groups, high school students shared that they wished the pathways had more variety and noted that the pathway system somewhat limits their opportunities. The district is updating the process to further reflect student interest and choice in the upcoming school year.

Another strength of the district is their review and modification of policies to meet the needs of their students. ELs and students with special needs and 504 plans receive appropriate programs and services that support their learning from adequate, certified/licensed personnel. The district, specifically at the high school level, purposefully plans within departments (guidance, special education, EL) to ensure balanced special education and EL populations across the Grades 10-12 academies. However, the superintendent noted that the STEM academy was cited for not having any ELs in the program. To make participation in the academies more equitable and with feedback from the EL department, the Special Education department, and teachers, the district began reviewing student enrollment data to revamp their process of pathway selection. All students now have a chance to enter into the academy of their choice.

Outside the pathways, students have a variety of extracurriculars and electives to choose from, such as graphic design, orchestra, and stress management courses. For example, through the health pathway, EPS has an internship partnership with Whidden Hospital as well as a nursing home, in which students work to earn career certifications. Everett High School also offers an elective class in

which students explore areas of interest to them (VITALS: Values, Interests, Temperament, Around the Clock, Life Mission/Goals, Strengths), complete self or personal inventories, and identify and discuss personal aspects relating to their academic and social-emotional learning performance.

At the elementary and middle school levels, students are exposed to college and career readiness through classroom lessons and school events. For example, one guidance counselor shared that their school hosts Free Application for Federal Student Aid nights and scholarship nights during which students and parents are invited to have conversations about the college process. EPS also offers social-emotional learning programs to elementary and middle school students. Elementary teachers described how their social-emotional learning blocks must be included in either their daily or weekly schedules. Middle school students are free to choose from two electives: world language and social-emotional learning support.

## Recommendations

- The district should continue the implementation and expansion of its curriculum review process with a focus on including a diverse collection of high quality reading materials that reflect the experiences and cultures of its student body.
- As part of its curriculum review process, the district should consider adopting curricula that are highly rated by CURATE.
- The district should improve instructional support and rigor across its classrooms, with a specific focus on concept development at grades K-3, analysis and inquiry at grades 4-12, quality of feedback at grades K-8, and instructional dialogue at grades 4-8. Appendix B (the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report) may assist district leaders in this endeavor, outlining practices that are observed when classrooms or lessons are implementing these dimensions at high levels.
- The district should review its policies and practices around student participation in career pathways and academies to ensure that they promote high levels of participation and where appropriate, allow for greater student choice.

## Assessment

---

EPS uses multiple assessments and data tools that vary across schools to ensure that assessments are appropriate for the grade levels served and align with the curricula used, evidenced by submitted documents and interview data.

At the prekindergarten level, the district uses PELI indicators (previously published as Preschool Early Literacy Indicators) three times per year to measure preliteracy and language skills necessary for kindergarten. At the elementary level, EPS uses DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) and i-Ready for ELA and Acadience and i-Ready for mathematics assessments. At the middle school level, the district uses i-Ready for ELA and mathematics. At the high school level, teachers use Exact Path, IXL, Imagine Learning, and Edmentum. Across all grade levels, WIDA is used for EL progress and determining interventions. Interview data across multiple levels confirm that WIN blocks are used to target specific skill development for students. Administrative interviews indicate that assessment data from the aforementioned programs are used to determine what WIN block students need to be in, and MCAS data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of WIN block placements.

Across all grades, staff use several programs and platforms, such as an Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System, Talking Points, Aspen X2, and Class Dojo, to keep track of students' attendance and achievement and communicate with students and parents about progress. Formative assessment data are discussed in data-driven dialogue meetings after each assessment cycle. Meeting attendees include teachers, interventionists, instructional coaches, guidance counselors, and student support staff.

Table 4 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

**Table 4. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Assessment Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#">Data and assessment systems</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A variety of data sources track student progress and identify student needs.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for greater alignment of assessments with the taught curriculum</li></ul>
<a href="#">Data use</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Data are used to inform both academic instruction and the socioemotional curriculum.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Insufficient time allotment for data review, especially at the secondary level</li></ul>
<a href="#">Sharing results</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Clear systems are present for disseminating data to the school committee, administrators, and teachers.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Systems for disseminating data to parents and students not well known to these stakeholders.</li></ul>

### Data and Assessment Systems

A strength of the district is their use of a variety of data sources to track progress and identify student needs. EPS evaluates student progress by reviewing benchmark data and formative assessment data. District documents indicate which assessments are used, their frequency, and how this information will be used to inform interventions in the WIN block. All students receive core

ELA and mathematics instruction and WIN block (or intervention block) instruction. WIN block instruction homogeneously groups students by ability level to provide more targeted support for identified subject areas, based on data-driven criteria. Students who require additional support may be assigned to work with interventionists, EL teachers, and/or special education instructors for more specific curricular programming.

EPS has two timeline options for WIN cycles, as described in district documents. Schools may opt to hold two or three cycles per year, depending on their needs. Both options provide appropriate time frames for benchmark testing, data analysis, data meetings, creating WIN groupings, and progress monitoring conducted by WIN group teachers. Teachers' association interviews described that data collected can be disaggregated by subject area, subtopic, and student identity—all useful tools for data planning meetings. Submitted documents indicate the district also provides tangible ways for instructors to incorporate i-Ready perquisite reports into their daily mathematics routines. Teacher interviews noted that they enjoy working with i-Ready because it allows them to understand what areas are lacking and what subject areas need additional focus. Staff reported that this is particularly useful in the EL and special education classrooms, where the needs might not be the same as in general education classes.

Although assessments are used consistently throughout the district, teachers and district interviews suggest that an area for growth may be ensuring that assessments line up more closely with the taught curriculum. For example, teacher interviews indicated that at the high school level, the assessments being used don't always align with current classroom curricula. In addition, district-level interviews noted that coordinators at the middle school level may switch to a different progress monitoring assessment that better aligns with the newly selected curriculum.

## Data Use

District-level interviews reported that WIN student data are reviewed at both the school level and the district level. At the district level, data reviews are done periodically and monitored by the superintendent, the deputy superintendent, and curriculum and instruction leadership. The district submitted the 2022-2023 Everett High School instructional vision and data team meeting documents, which provide additional evidence that building a data-driven culture is a district goal, and student data are reviewed regularly at the building level. High school teacher interviews confirmed that students who are struggling and MCAS data are discussed during department meetings, and adjustments are made to the instruction to focus more on areas for which students need additional assistance.

District-submitted documents, such as the *September Data Cycle Support Meeting* and the *WIN Block Kick Off 2022-2023*, suggest that the commitment to best practices for data use and data-driven instruction remains a priority for EPS, and these priorities have been communicated to school-level staff. Multiple stakeholder interviews reported that educators use common planning periods to review academic and behavioral data and discuss concerns that they may have about students. During this period, teachers can connect with guidance counselors, interventionists, or specialists if they need additional resources to support students. Teacher interviews suggested that biweekly professional learning groups allow teachers to engage in professional development workshops on subjects that include data analysis and scaffolding.

EPS also is using data to guide its socioemotional curriculum. At the high school level, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey helps determine the current needs of students and guide the mental health and wellness curriculum, as indicated by teacher interviews. Guidance counselors similarly reported that Wayfinder also is used to better determine the socioemotional needs of students. One staff member elaborated that

if they're noticing in that classroom . . . lower scores in empathy . . . Wayfinder has a resource library where they can click through the library and go through a category that focuses on lessons that target empathy. So they are utilizing this to kind of figure out where the needs are.

EPS's gathering of data to assess both the academic and socioemotional needs of its students is consistent with the superintendent's vision of a "whole child approach."

Interviews provide evidence that assessment data are used to support targeted instruction. High school teachers shared that educators are restructuring midterms and finals based on a growth model using their September diagnostic assessments. High school level diagnostics are administered three times per year. By reviewing MCAS data and diagnostic data, teachers reported feeling as if they are focusing more on growth and the individual needs of students. Providing additional intervention supports for ELs at the high school level also was an area for growth noted by high school teacher interview data. Creating additional time for data review was highlighted as an area for growth at the high school level. Secondary teachers reported that they are using teacher-created common assessments at the high school level in some subject areas or classrooms. However, they don't have sufficient time to explore student learning gaps. One teacher said,

Right now we meet as a department every other week and we get a half hour to do it. So it's really, really difficult . . . It's hard to get into anything in-depth just due to lack of meeting time.

## Sharing Results

EPS school and district staff share data using multiple platforms and in multiple formats. Student performance data are shared with instructors and support staff during professional development sessions and in school-level data meetings. District-level leaders share data with the school committee via the superintendent's report and other school committee reports and presentations. School administrators are informed about more district-level data trends during principals' "huddle" meetings.

Parents and caregivers receive information about student test scores, academic progress, and behavioral issues using platforms such as Class Dojo and Aspen X2 according to student, parent, and teacher interviews. The Aspen X2 system is a web-based system that allows families access to students' grades. Teacher focus groups noted that some of these platforms (e.g., Class Dojo) have a translation option that allows teachers to send communications to parents in languages other than English, increasing access for bilingual parents. Parent teacher meetings, IEP meetings, and emails to parents also serve to inform parents of student progress. In general, both district and parent interviews described some ways that parents are regularly informed about their students' progress, though fewer than many parent respondents desired, making this area of growth for EPS.

## Recommendations

- The district should review alignment of its assessments with its curricula and consider including existing assessments as one criterion in its curriculum review process.
- The district should review secondary staff schedules and, where logistically possible, expand time for departments to review data, identify student gaps, and target future instruction.
- The district should support schools in intentionally spreading knowledge about their existing systems for parental communication at multiple points throughout the year to ensure parents are regularly pushed information about student progress.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

---

Under the new superintendent, the human resources and professional development infrastructure in EPS ensures that educators have access to a tailored menu of professional learning opportunities that service district-, school-, and educator-level needs and district priorities. Supervision and evaluation systems are now becoming more collaborative and geared toward constructive criticism.

The district shares a human resources and financial records system with the city that some respondents described as outdated and difficult to navigate. City and district-level interviews indicated that the current payroll system is being replaced and revamped. The new system will serve the school district, the city treasurer's office, and City Hall. District interviews highlighted that replacing the human resources system, also tied to the city, is a remaining area for growth. In addition, the district has identified the diversification of its educators as a priority and is leveraging several strategies to meet this need.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.



**Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<u>Infrastructure</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Need for a human resources system that allows easier access to personnel records for school staff</li> </ul>
<u>Recruitment, hiring, and assignment</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Recruitment and retention strategies are aimed at supplying EPS with a more diverse teacher workforce that reflects the student population.</li> <li>■ Hiring practices are inclusive of both school- and district-level stakeholders.</li> <li>■ Schools have autonomy in the hiring process.</li> <li>■ Adjustment of staffing provides equitable instruction to all schools.</li> </ul>	
<u>Supervision, evaluation, and educator development</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A professional development structure is aligned to district priorities, school-level priorities, and teacher choice.</li> <li>■ Incentives are available for mentors and mentees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Need for more consistently actionable feedback on teacher evaluation reports</li> <li>■ Need for more consistent inclusion of areas for improvement in administrator evaluations</li> </ul>
<u>Recognition, leadership development, and advancement</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Students and staff have regular celebrations for their accomplishments and achievements.</li> <li>■ There are clear structures for career advancement.</li> <li>■ University partnerships and tuition subsidies incentivize continuing education.</li> </ul>	

## Infrastructure

EPS currently employs effective human resources policies, procedures, and practices. The district maintains a human resources procedures document that provides clear guidance on policies for hiring new employees, employee leave, grievance processes, credits and step increases, payroll, and termination of employment. According to multiple interview respondents, the district currently shares an outdated human resources and financial system with the City of Everett. However, city and district-level interviews indicated that the current payroll system is being replaced and revamped. The new system will serve the school district, the city treasurer’s office, and City Hall. District-level staff highlighted that the current human resources system does not meet staff needs for accessing important aspects of staff records such as vacation time.

## Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

Similar to other education institutions across the country, EPS is experiencing a general teacher shortage as well as a substitute teacher shortage. Principal, teacher, school committee, teachers' association, city, and district-level interviews all confirmed that one of the district's foremost priorities is the recruitment and retention of more teachers as well as a more diverse teacher workforce. Interview respondents described the need for a teacher workforce that is "inclusive and representative of our students." State demographic records show that approximately 66 percent of the district's student population identifies as Hispanic or Latino, 12 percent identifies as Black, and 37 percent identifies as ELs, whereas 2022 state data show that more than 89 percent of the district's teachers identify as White. The district also has a significant number of Portuguese-speaking students and families who immigrated from Brazil.

A noted strength of the district is the variety of recruitment and retention strategies aimed at supplying EPS with a more diverse teacher workforce that reflects the student population. To accomplish the aim of adding sufficient and more diverse staffing, the district has applied for and twice received a DESE teacher Diversification Grant. EPS has subsequently launched several initiatives and strategies, including hiring a new human resources director at the district level and hiring family liaisons who are fluent in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Haitian Creole; appointing the district's first chief equity officer; recruiting teachers from Historically Black Colleges and Universities and purposefully recruiting EPS alumni and parents into the teacher and paraprofessional educator community; developing a paraprofessional pipeline to retain paraprofessionals of color and provide gateways to earn bachelor's degrees and become teachers; working with Teach Next Year to help teachers earn a master's degree with financial subsidies from the district; and building fellowship programs with local universities, including Endicott College and the Boston University Consortium. In addition, EPS also revamped the hiring process to include diverse interview panels and unbiased scoring rubrics. Financially, they also began offering recruitment packages that include financial incentives, free professional development, and pathways for career advancement (e.g., support for securing degrees and advanced licensure) and offering stipends to undergraduate students from local universities who do their student teaching in EPS. The comprehensiveness and thoroughness of this strategy, addressing recruitment, retention, and pipeline development, is a strength of the district.

Multiple district-level officials noted that EPS's hiring practices, under the tenure of the previous superintendent, were thought to be rooted in personal connections versus professional references. The district is currently trying to shift away from that perception. Current hiring practices are inclusive of both school- and district-level stakeholders—a strength for EPS. District interviews indicated that schools have autonomy over their recruitment practices, but they may request assistance from the district. EPS principals and school hiring panels/committees interview prospective candidates and evaluate them using unbiased scoring rubrics. Principals then make recommendations to the district regarding which candidates to hire. A district official describes how this differs from what was done previously:

In the past, principals didn't really have much say in their own hiring. So when [the new superintendent] came on, we kind of created a process . . . this panel, especially at the school-based level, can include parents, it can include teachers or . . . parents. It can include students. It definitely includes teachers, you know, and stakeholders that are important to

that process . . . they have a protocol they have to go through where they score résumés. . . . Sometimes what will happen is we'll bring together committees if we're hiring a lot of positions.

Another strength of the district is EPS's willingness to adjust staffing to provide equitable instruction to all schools. Teaching assignments are determined by school leadership according to district-level interviews. Educators are transferred in rare circumstances in which it is "decided that a teacher would be better utilized at a different school or for a different population," in contrast to practices in the recent past where transfers were centrally controlled and seemed capricious to staff. One example, given by a district official, was recently shifting some ESL teachers to other schools so that all 10 schools could have a person with ESL expertise rather than only some schools having these positions. Teacher interviews confirmed that the district's transfer policy has improved since the change in superintendent leadership. In addition, teachers can apply for open positions if they would like to switch schools or pursue leadership opportunities.

## Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

Teacher evaluations may be conducted by school administrators, such as principals, assistant principals, or department heads. According to teacher interviews at the high school level, educators have their lesson plans reviewed by department heads on a weekly basis, classroom walk-throughs are conducted once or twice in a cycle, and full observations and evaluations are done once per year. Teacher observations may be announced or unannounced, and the feedback received may be delivered via an informal conversation or in a formal meeting. These interviews also indicated that the district is moving toward creating more universal standards for teacher observations and write-ups so that they are consistent across school buildings.

Regarding educator evaluations, EPS teachers and administrators are evaluated regularly, evidenced by district documents and interviews. District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently uploaded to TeachPoint. A review of educator evaluation files indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample of 10 percent of 160 professional teacher status teachers (16 teachers), who were scheduled for summative evaluations for 2021-2022. Nearly all (15 of 16) were marked as complete and not missing the required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. All the evaluations (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 (100 percent) included feedback for each standard, and nearly all the evaluations (94 percent) included feedback identifying strengths, whereas only half of the evaluation feedback (50 percent) included areas of improvement. The review of evaluation documents indicated that nearly all educators were developing both student learning (94 percent) and professional practice SMART goals (94 percent).

Administrator evaluations also are stored using TeachPoint. Fourteen administrators were due for a summative evaluation at the end of 2021-2022 school year, and all were available for review. Nearly all (93 percent) summative evaluations were complete with performance ratings and an assessment of progress toward goals. Of the summative evaluations reviewed, all the evaluations included

student learning goals, and nearly all evaluations (93 percent) included professional practice goals. The majority of the evaluations (71 percent) included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. All summative administrator evaluations reviewed included evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback identifying each administrator's strengths, whereas only 64 percent of evaluations included areas for improvement.

School leaders noted that they have been working with TNTP on best practices to coach and evaluate teachers on how to deliver high quality instruction. District-level interviews indicated that principals are given training, coaching, and feedback by the district so that they can better foster good teaching practices within their school buildings. The superintendent conducts the principal evaluations. At all levels, interview data suggest that EPS is making an intentional shift to make the evaluation process structured more like a conversation with constructive criticism. Despite these shifts in the evaluation process, teacher interview data suggest that providing all educators consistently with more actionable feedback is still an area for growth.

A noted strength of the district is EPS's professional development structure. Professional development is organized to be attuned to district priorities, school-level priorities, and teacher choice. As evidenced by district-level documents and school and district interviews, there are mandatory professional development workshops at both the district level and the school level, as well as a set number of self-directed hours for teachers to pursue during the school year. Teachers have full autonomy in deciding what topics to explore with their self-directed professional development, choosing from a menu that district- and school-level staff create.

In the past academic year, teachers were required to attend two professional development workshops on academic discourse and scaffolding because it was a district priority for the year. The district also required implicit bias and diversification in the classroom trainings. School-level professional development topics are determined by individual principals, so they have professional development meetings with staff that focus on those specific goals. One district level employee elaborated as follows:

So, for example, one school has been focusing on growth mindset, another school has been working with BlackPrint [Consulting] on culturally responsive practices. Sort of our philosophy there is we have all of these different things that we want to do. We want to support social-emotional wellness. We want to support, you know, culturally responsive practices. And so our principals determine what is best for their school, what do they think is works best for their school? And they kind of make that vision from there.

In addition, teachers must take 11 hours of self-directed professional development annually. School staff with other types of licenses such as special education or EL licenses may have additional requirements. To fulfill their requirements, educators are given a catalog of professional development courses. The 2022-2023 professional development catalog includes 61 courses. The content of the catalog is generated by teachers' feedback surveys and a professional development committee consisting of teachers and administrators. EPS's options for professional development participation are varied: they may be in person, asynchronous, or delivered on Zoom and offered by both local and external providers. If teachers have an interest in a topic that is not currently being offered, they may apply to have it approved by the district by filling out the professional development instructor

application. Additional leadership opportunities, evidenced by teacher focus groups include service on curriculum groups, affirmative action committees, school councils, and other committees and serving as a mentor.

Teachers and school leadership, including principals, assistant principals, directors, and coordinators all have access to mentorship programs informed by DESE standards, according to multiple interview sources and documents. Mentees are trained on instructional leadership and operational management tasks. Mentors and mentees are required to meet for a minimum of 40 hours per school year and must complete a timeline of work from August to May/June. Leader mentors receive 15 professional development points for their service. District interviews suggest that both mentors and mentees receive a stipend for their participation in the program, a strength for EPS.

## Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

A significant strength of the district is its dedication to recognition and leadership advancement. School committee minutes and documents confirm that the new superintendent regularly celebrates students and staff for their accomplishments and achievements when delivering regular reports to the school committee. District-submitted documents demonstrate that the district thanks employees by offering, for example, an appreciation breakfast for coaches or offering congratulations for Latina Educators of the Year.

As noted earlier in the recruitment, hiring, and assignments section, the district has been investing in several opportunities for the professional development and educational advancement of current educators and prospective recruits. This is one of EPS's strengths. In the past few years, EPS has started to offer a variety of options for career development, including tuition assistance for advanced certificates, certifications, and degrees. This has been evidenced by the university program partnerships pamphlet, other district-level documents, and a variety of interviews. One district-level respondent told of two pipelines that the district is developing:

We are beginning to explore ways . . . of a pipeline to administration for teachers . . . we've partnered with a number of universities in the area to increase the availability of subjects . . . We have a program just put in place with 15 paraprofessionals to become certified as teachers and move into that direction as well.

This information was confirmed by teacher interviews, with one teacher noting that one of her teacher colleagues is now serving as an assistant principal.

Teachers may volunteer to lead professional development workshops, mentor teachers, or seek out other career-related opportunities. EPS offers an Educator Innovation Scholarship for educators seeking to enhance their teaching practice. According to the scholarship informational pamphlet, awardees may "design a proposal around a national conference, an immersive learning experience, a mentorship experience with an expert in his/her field, or a summit for educators from different backgrounds designed to share best practices."

## Recommendations

- The district should partner with the city to ensure a successful implementation of the new HR/payroll system that meets the needs of the School Department.
- The district should aim to increase the level of actionable, constructive feedback provided in evaluations – particularly offering areas for improvement for all administrators and offering actionable feedback more consistently for educators.

## Student Support

EPS is dedicated to meeting the complete range of a student’s educational and developmental needs. The district has a commitment to reconnecting the school community so that all students feel supported and can achieve academic excellence and beyond. Although specific initiatives vary by school, classroom observations indicated the presence of strong behavioral management strategies and an absence of expressed negativity across all schools. Interviews and observation data suggest various levels of implementation of social-emotional learning supports across school and grade levels in the district. The district supports schools in offering a tiered system of supports for all students, which ensures that all students have access to a variety of school personnel and intervention services through general education.

EPS engages family and community members through dedicated family liaisons, information sessions, and frequent progress reports. The district also has formed key partnerships with community organizations, such as Hanover Research, the Wheelock College of Education and Human Development Consortium with Boston University, and Eliot Community Health Services, to further uplift their data-driven school culture and mental health initiatives.

Table 6 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support.

**Table 6. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Student Support Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Safe and supportive school climate and culture</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has a commitment to social-emotional learning and wellness.</li> <li>■ The district has strong positive behavioral approaches to support students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Communication with parents regarding behavioral challenges</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Tiered systems of support</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Student support teams match interventions to individual students to support and provide access to the core curriculum of the school.</li> <li>■ Schools use the WIN block model to offer students tiered supports.</li> <li>■ EL education (ELE) programming is expanded to all grade levels in every school.</li> <li>■ Data-driven decision making allows the development of tiered social interventions and supports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Public access to the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan</li> <li>■ Dedicated spaces for students who require an IEP to receive support</li> <li>■ Implementation of intervention plans in-line with district WIN training</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has culturally responsive and collaborative relationships with students and families.</li> <li>■ The district engages with external community partners.</li> <li>■ Key partnerships are formed with external community organizations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Two-way communication and access for all students’ families</li> </ul>



## Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

EPS's commitment to social-emotional learning and wellness is a prominent strength of the district. EPS's District Strategy Plan, a collaborative effort developed among district leadership and the school committee, explores how the district works to promote building a safe and supportive school climate and culture. The priorities outlined in EPS's District Strategy Plan are aligned with their core values (Integrate, Access, Empower, and Cultivate) and the whole child approach. The whole child approach consists of a few key components: rich instructional experiences, positive developmental relationships, environments filled with safety and belonging, integrated supports, and intentional development of mindsets and skills. Collectively, they are key to EPS's continued efforts to equitably meet the needs of their diverse and dynamic student population.

The District Strategy Plan includes two key objectives that highlight how all school and classroom environments are to be positive, healthy, and inclusive for all students. First, EPS seeks to strengthen an environment and school culture that cultivates a sense of belonging among all students. Second, EPS strives to build a school culture that responds to the social-emotional experiences of every student—one that leads to personal, communal, and societal well-being. Staff identified several ways in which the district is expanding its ability to support all students' safety, well-being, and sense of belonging, including running social-emotional support groups, purchasing new social-emotional curricula, and developing behavioral and mental health intervention plans for students alongside their community made up of an administrator, their teacher, their guidance counselor, and their parent. In addition, in focus groups, students noted increased school security and policy enforcement—particularly at the high school—such as the district hiring additional security staff, increased surveillance, and implementing a new identification policy. The students characterized these changes as improvements over previous years when fights have occurred in the high school.

EPS demonstrates a commitment to access and equity for all students through its District Strategy Plan. Examples of actions that school buildings are taking include providing professional development focused on inclusive practices, creating and implementing targeted interventions, and increasing language access through external partners to providing translation and interpretation services. The district also ensures that schools promote meaningful student engagement, with opportunities for all students to participate in education decisions. Student support staff described how students participate in focus groups and surveys to provide feedback on curricula, student safety, and their day-to-day experiences during the school year. For example, several students shared how their teachers use Google forms to gather opinions on classroom instruction, class reading materials, and what topics they want to see next. EPS also has a student advisory council that meets frequently with the superintendent to plan “morale booster” initiatives.

EPS also uses assessments to identify, understand, and respond to the underlying causes of student behavior. EPS participated in the 2021 Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey and Youth Health Survey to collect data at the middle and high school levels to identify behaviors that continue to require increased prevention efforts at the school, community, and state levels. General topics within the assessment included: drunk driving; violence and suicide attempts; poor dietary behaviors; tobacco, alcohol, and drug use; physical inactivity; and student mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, EPS partnered with the Cambridge Health Alliance to pilot a process to



identify and characterize students' behavioral health needs, improve the management of identified behavioral health condition, and reduce behavioral health disparities for racial and ethnic minority youth. The Cambridge Health Alliance administers the "Kiddie"-Computerized Adaptive Test to ninth-grade students at Everett High School to determine feasibility of referral processes.

To further improve student-teacher relationships, the district uses the revised WIN block model. High school teachers noted that intervention blocks provide space for students and teachers to bond. As one representative teacher said,

I feel like I learn the most about my students during that intervention block. That's when, especially if they've, you know, caught up on all their work or anything like that. That's when all of a sudden one of them will sidle up right next to your desk and tell you their entire life story. So that's when you can kind of find out if something has been a little off with them.

EPS's positive behavioral approaches to supporting students are a strength of the district, as shown by instructional observations, staff and parent focus groups, and district documents. Instructional observation scores in the high range for the Behavior Management dimension (the average score is 6.3 districtwide) suggest that rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and constantly reinforced by teachers. In the 2021-2022 school year, EPS also launched its Student Services/SELWELL department to support the essential work of EPS educators serving the community of students and families in EPS. The SELWELL department released a guide, the SELWELL Roadmap, that provides EPS educators with a roadmap to the "whats" and hows" of social-emotional learning and wellness as they worked to return students to school from the pandemic. Resources in the guide included self-care practices, SELWELL frameworks, SELWELL sentence starters into classroom practices, and SELWELL strategies to improve relationships and impact with students.

School staff shared that schools outline behavioral expectations and disciplinary policies for all students through handbooks and by modeling expected behaviors. For example, teachers establish classroom norms and expectations as an activity with their students, allowing students to offer input and work collaboratively. High school staff also noted that guidance counselors and success coaches are in place to have informal discussions with students about their needs.

However, communication with parents regarding behavioral challenges is an area of growth for the district. Across focus groups, parents expressed concerns about the process of responding to the underlying causes of student behavior. One parent highlighted an incident they considered alarming involving their child and another student. The only notification the parent received was a telephone call from the school's Dojo system. The parent stated, "I think they should have handled it better. They didn't even have myself in for a meeting. I had to keep calling back . . ." Another parent shared, "Before, we probably would have been notified, 'Hey, this happened in your [student's] class' . . . But now everything's private . . . It just stinks as a parent. You don't know what's going on."

EPS students expressed that they enjoy learning, and their teachers try their best to make a good environment for them. Results from the Views of Climate and Learning student survey indicate a relatively strong school climate across all school levels and student subgroups, as evidenced by overall school climate scores in the "favorable" range (51 to 70, with a maximum score of 100). The only exception was in the subgroup of students who fell into the "African-American/Black" racial

category, whose results indicated an overall school climate score on the high end (50) of the “somewhat favorable” range (31 to 50).

## Tiered Systems of Support

A noticeable strength of the district is how each school has a multidisciplinary, problem-solving student support team that matches interventions to individual students to support and provide access to the core curriculum of the school. The district also has a districtwide vision for a tiered intervention and support process, laid out in documents such as a year-opening presentation on the district’s WIN intervention process.

In EPS, the student support team process typically involves a teacher referral, a review of the student’s baseline performance, the development of an intervention plan, and an analysis of the intervention plan to determine its effectiveness. If needed, counseling services provided by Eliot Community Human Services can be part of a student’s intervention plan. According to several student support staff, each school in the district offers weekly support meetings during which clinical supervisors are available to help students who have been identified as having concerns related to behavior or attendance or their disclosed mental health needs. Students can attend these meetings after either being referred by a teacher or by reaching out for assistance themselves. After reviewing the student’s grades and developing an intervention plan, guidance counselors track and help maintain the implementation of the interventions.

Another noteworthy strength of the district is how EPS provides support for the needs of all students by using data-driven decision making to develop tiered interventions and supports. According to EPS’s *School Engagement Guide*, all students receive Tier 1 instruction and supports. The *School Engagement Guide* is a school-level tool designed to support students with getting to the school building and remaining in the classroom. The guide is organized according to a tiered framework of supports, based on multitiered systems of support (MTSS). School engagement supports included in the guide are designed to build on another, and students can move fluidly through Tiers 1, 2, and 3 supports as needed. Tier 1 (Universal Support) is provided for all students, including newly arriving students from other countries/districts, students with previous separation-anxiety, students who struggle with transitions, and students who struggle meeting people. Students also have access to bilingual intervention classes facilitated by the district’s partner, Wayside Youth & Family Support Network. Tier 2 (Target Supports) is provided for students who are absent from school one to five times per month, students who have repeated early dismissals, students with excessive nurse/guidance office visits, and students who struggle with morning routines or who excessively sleep in school. Tier 3 (Intensive Supports) is provided for students who are chronically absent. For each tier, the *School Engagement Guide* provides a checklist of strategies that can be used to determine which interventions worked and how the student responded. This record will inform future action plans should staff need to proceed with a student support team referral.

Another notable strength for the district is the expansion of ELE programming to all grade levels in every school. The *Everett Tiered Focused Monitoring Report* from May 2022 indicated that the district had not established a tiered system to support students in the district. The district was found to be noncompliant with all reviewed criteria as part of the *2022 Tiered Focused Monitoring Report*. According to the report, a review of student records and interviews with staff members indicated that

the district did not have an ELE program in all school buildings and/or grade levels, and the district systematically placed students back in the ELE program if they previously opted out. Lastly, a review of district documentation and student records for the *Tiered Focused Monitoring Report* indicated that the district was not regularly informing parents of their rights regarding ESL services. Reviews of ELE programming and parental notification at that time recommended next steps to support full implementation of programming and additional documents. During this district review visit, however, district leaders shared that the district has implemented several initiatives to support ELs, such as coteaching models, revamping the academic pathway program to increase enrollment of ELs, reallocating staff, and developing scaffolding supports for all learners so that students can access grade-level content. One staff member explained that as part of their 11 hours of professional development, teachers can learn how to differentiate material for ELs and how to use IEPs to their full capabilities. Another staff member noted that they maintain a running log of student incidents and placements so that they can be reviewed later to determine which students are struggling, which students are moving, and what might be the reasons for their behaviors. In addition, teachers also described how ELs can participate in WIN blocks to receive additional academic support.

Lastly, a critical strength of the district is the WIN block model. District leaders began the year with a training provided to school-level staff on the district's procedure for using a common WIN block model across all schools. District leaders and school staff shared that schools use the WIN block model fully throughout the district. Interventionists, along with the EL coordinator, will test students within their first two weeks of school to determine which subject would benefit the student the most during the WIN block. After the assessments, students are placed in small groups in which they receive targeted instruction five days per week. According to the *WIN Block Kick Off 2022-2023*, in 2021-2022, every student across grade levels had targeted instruction five days a week during the WIN block, the WIN net was extended beyond Tier 2 instruction to meet all student needs, and many district schools still attempted to hold three cycles.

Despite these initiatives, the sustained implementation of student support teams and intervention plans in-line with district WIN training is an area of growth for the district. Within focus groups and interviews, several student support staff and teachers reported inconsistencies across schools regarding the follow-up and implementation of interventions. According to the *WIN Block Kick Off 2022-2023* training guide, groups were canceled because of absence or scheduling conflicts, and there is a need for an improved protocol for new students who arrive after the WIN cycle begins. Additional training in the WIN curriculum is needed, and there is a lack of structure and guidance on what each group should focus on.

An additional noted area for growth for the district is the lack of dedicated spaces for students who require an IEP or receive other interventions to receive support, a factor related to the overcrowding and space issues discussed in the following section of this report. In focus groups, several parents expressed concerns about how school overcrowding impacts students receiving additional supports and targeted instruction. For example, one parent recounted an incident in which their student was placed in the hallway of their school and was receiving support there. This parent explained, "I didn't know my daughter was in the hallway until I went to 'get to know your school better night.'" Another parent reported, "Last year . . . I was [volunteering] with special education, second grade. And every

time I would take these kids to the bathroom . . . , there would be other people in the hallways learning . . .”

Another area for growth for the district is the development, publication, and use of a plan that details the process for instruction and intervention across all tiers. This type of report (a District Curriculum Accommodation Plan) was not submitted for review. This lack of publicly available documentation is an area for growth.

## Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

EPS establishes opportunities for students and families to engage with the district and support students' academic progress and general well-being. A strength of the district is that they have formed key partnerships with external community organizations, such as Hanover Research, the Wheelock College of Education and Human Development Consortium with Boston University, and Eliot Community Health Services, to further uplift their data-driven school culture and mental health initiatives. According to some school guidance counselors and district leaders, Eliot clinicians are available to provide services such as weekly school-based counseling, an intensive care coordinator, a family partner through the Family Resource Center, or a therapeutic mentor. One high school teacher explained that having Eliot as a resource helped remove students off the waitlist for outside resources because they now can receive support inside the school building. Another school guidance counselor shared that some Eliot counselors can provide support in Spanish as well.

Another strength of the district is that EPS partners with students and families in a way that is culturally responsive and collaborative. The district provides family liaisons, who help ensure that district and school communications are available in all families' native languages, including English, Portuguese, and Spanish. Family liaisons connect with families to offer guidance on transitioning into EPS's school system and provide both academic and nonacademic support. Family members who participated in the focus groups noted that parents serve roles on both school councils and parent teacher organizations (PTOs). Once a month, school councils hold meetings that include school leaders, teachers, parents, community members, and students. Families also have the option of attending City Hall meetings. The district also offers newcomer orientations for EL students and families to help them become more acclimated to the district, including its information systems.

Overall, an area for growth is the district's support of two-way communication and access for all students' families. Parent focus groups appeared to be split regarding how well-informed parents felt about the ongoings of their child's school and the availability of opportunities to contribute to district decision-making. There was a general sentiment that parents had to be proactive or involved in the district to receive information. The level of connectedness to EPS varied based on several factors: the school site; school leadership; parent involvement in formal school positions and committees; and the ability of parents to navigate online district resources and websites.

In one parent focus group, some parents indicated frustration about not being alerted about student misbehavior or bullying in school and a lack of communication about these issues. In another set of interviews, a parent noted that they were concerned about having limited communication with the school about the special education services that students receive and their progress and needs. Parents described how ClassDojo functions as a multilingual communication method for connecting

with teachers or for updates on their student's classroom activities. Overall, however, most parents reported wanting greater communication. For example, one parent noted as follows:

Last year, I feel like we were informed about more of what was going on in the school than this year, and there was also a principal change at [my school]. So that's very frustrating. Last year I got on PTO. . . I'm trying to get back for PTO at [my school] just to get my foot in the door and see what's going on with the schools and . . . it's just it's gone nowhere with the [new] principal. Even with some of the teachers, last year I was more informed of what was going on in the classroom, and this year just literally nothing . . . So I'm just not happy in that sense . . . I have friends of moms who have kids at all the other schools, and it's night and day.

In addition, parents suggested that the district provide more updates on its webpage, specifically about district-level activities, and include options for translations. These parents noted that they could find school information on the City of Everett's website but not always on the district site. As indicated by parents in interviews, the availability of school committee meetings to be viewed live or via later recordings is a strength for the district.

## Recommendations

- The district should work with families to identify and implement effective systems for caregivers to remain informed about student performance and behavioral incidents in schools.
- The district should document and make publicly available its plan for process for instruction and intervention across all tiers.
- The district should partner with City officials to identify both short-term and long-term solutions to resolve overcrowding issues, especially as they relate to providing dedicated spaces for students who are receiving special education services.
- The district should refine the implementation of its WIN block to ensure consistency across schools regarding the implementation and follow-up of interventions.
- The district should offer additional opportunities for meaningful two-way communication between parents and their children's schools.

## Financial and Asset Management

In recent years, EPS has become extremely focused on transparency with its budget and aligning it to district priorities. District leaders collaborate alongside the school committee to ensure that the allocation and use of funding for other resources improves students' performance, opportunities, and outcomes. School leaders have freedom to prepare a budget proposal for the superintendent, school committee, and city council to review. District leaders collaborate with city leaders to comprehensively develop the overall budget and complete consistent audits of financial reports and the use of funds.

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management.

**Table 7. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Budget documentation and reporting</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear, accurate, user-friendly annual budget documents are publicly available.</li> <li>The budget has explicit connection to school improvement planning.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#"><u>Adequate budget</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is increased funding for school safety, academics, cleanliness, and organizational efficiency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long-term funding at or above net school spending at a level that key stakeholders agree is sufficient</li> <li>An annual process for negotiating and clarifying city chargebacks that allows for budget planning and greater school department flexibility</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular, accurate reports are provided to the superintendent and school committee.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity between city budget lines and systems and school budget lines and systems</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Capital planning and facility maintenance</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A long-term capital plan describes future capital development and facility improvements.</li> <li>A formal preventive maintenance program prolongs the life of the district's capital assets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for more stakeholder input and greater collaboration on the district's school overcrowding issue</li> </ul>

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

EPS's budget documents are a strength of the district because they provide an explicit connection to school improvement planning and are clear, accurate, and user-friendly. EPS maintains detailed and accurate budget documents that include information about all sources of funds and the allocation of resources. The district budget for fiscal year 2021 is publicly available on the district website, and published copies of the 2022-2023 school year budget were provided to the site visit team. EPS's



budget documents and presentation to the school committee and city council include critical information about the allocation of resources and the sources of funds. The budget documents provide information on funding sources, detailed expenditures, and current school committee budget priorities. The budget documents also provide historical spending data from previous years for comparison to the current year's resource allocations, alongside enrollment information. Budget presentations and documents contain expenses for fixed costs, compensation for all staff, athletics, special education, and specific budget details by school. These budget documents also provide significant historical spending data for comparisons, and they are sufficient for stakeholders to understand the current year's resource allocations.

City and district leaders described collaboration between school administrators, city officials, and district central office staff in developing the overall budget. The annual budget documents detail the chargebacks paid to the city by the school department for services, including line-item costs and as a percentage of overall costs. In interviews, district leaders noted that there is consistent communication between departments and the City of Everett to determine how funds are allocated within the school budget. To provide more visibility into how the overall budget is spent and what it takes to support each individual school, district leaders changed how they present budget information. District leadership now presents budget information on a school-by-school basis to the school committee and the city council. In addition to the budget binder received by school committee members, PowerPoint files detailing line-item budgets for each individual school accompany the binder and are used as a basis of district leadership presentations.

## Adequate Budget

A strength of the district is the increase in funding for school safety, academics, cleanliness, and organizational efficiency. The community provides sufficient general appropriation funds each year to meet required net school spending and cover other costs, such as transportation. EPS uses all available funding to support student performance, opportunities, and outcomes. The district also annually reviews staffing and scheduling to plan for the effective use of people and time. This year's budget includes funding for an additional 11 interventionists, six new EL coordinators, seven additional guidance counselors, and dedicated professional development funds for each school. The budget also prioritizes school-based, student-facing staff.

The district uses all available funding effectively to support student performance, opportunities, and outcomes. School committee members explained that the district budget is adequate to their needs as a department; however, a few members also shared that the district would be in a better financial position if the city would give additional funding over and above net school spending. City and district leaders also reported that there has been a historic trend, one that predates current district leadership, in which all the funds have not been spent each year, indicating that the budget is adequate for the district. Recently, EPS has had to return grant funds largely because of department transitions. For example, after the departure of their previous chief equity officer, EPS lost a large teacher Diversification Grant because the district was unable to obtain diverse candidates and a partnership with a local college.

City hall chargebacks affect EPS's net school spending as well. Both the EPS 2023 budget report and the annual memorandum of agreement between the city and EPS describe the list of



chargebacks, or funds paid back to the city for school services. The total amount estimated for 2023 city hall chargebacks is \$27,470,368, or 21% of the annual budget, according to the 2023 EPS budget report. These chargebacks include nurse salaries, a portion of city administrative positions, city retirement, health insurance, other employee benefits such as workers' compensation and unemployment, and stadium upkeep. Approximately 21% of EPS's budget is dedicated to chargebacks, and several district staff expressed in interviews concerns with how the amount of chargebacks are calculated and the inability of the school department to consider some alternatives to paying for certain city services. Therefore, an area of growth is the need for a clearer process for annually calculating and clarifying chargebacks that allows for clearer budget planning and greater school department flexibility.

## Financial Tracking, Forecasting, Controls, and Audits

The district's business office provides regular, accurate reports to the superintendent and school committee on spending from all funding sources, and forecasts spending through the end of the year, with adequate school-level information provided to every principal, making this a strength of the district.

At the end of every month, EPS's financial team tracks and reviews spending. To forecast spending, the district uses historical data to inform payroll forecasts. The district competitively procures independent financial auditing services and implements audit recommendations. The company, Powers & Sullivan, audits both the city and the district. The district, however, is responsible for its own reporting for the audit, which is conducted independently from the overall town audit.

The district's business office ensures that systems are in place for timely payment of invoices and accurate payrolls; however, the district is currently migrating to the Munis system for payroll but currently uses Harpers. According to one district leader, it is extremely hard to keep track of simple items such as an employee master list. As a result, the district must manually track staff leave accruals. District leaders also shared that their budget decisions are largely impacted by their outdated human resources and financial system. The system is not explicitly interconnected, causing staff to have to manually input charges within the system.

As noted earlier, the district publishes annual budget reports for public review, and these are discussed regularly in public school committee meetings. Seven of 10 school committee minutes from the last half of 2022 (July-December) contained discussions of district budget and financial matters.

Providing greater clarity between city budget lines and systems and school budget lines and systems is an area for growth for EPS. City and district interviews confirmed the existence of these overlapping systems. The overlapping budgetary and HR systems between the city and the school district have created obstacles to maintaining clear records and to the school district receiving necessary funds, according to district-level interviews. Respondents noted that there often is disagreement on what constitutes "shared services" between the city and school department, and, therefore, what the shared costs should be, as detailed in the annual memorandum of agreement between EPS and the city of "chargebacks." Interview participants further reported disagreement between school and city officials over the allocation of Medicaid reimbursements. In addition,

another district official noted that, with shared systems, it is difficult to account for funds that municipal officials will transfer onto and off of the school department's budget lines without proper notice. This official described being concerned about this activity—facilitated by the shared budget systems—and reporting it to state authorities.

An additional area of growth for the district is securing long-term funding substantially above net school spending. District-level interviews described a need for additional funds, but district and city government interviews indicated disagreements on the level of need and sources of these funds. District participants noted that other districts in the state receive additional funds from their locality above net school spending, but EPS does not, despite multiple requests. School committee interviews indicate disagreement over whether the current school budget is sufficient to meet the needs of the district. The most recent year's budget was 4 percent above net school spending according to state data. They have been able to implement some additional programming because of Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds. The district's ESSER website described four areas they are targeting between 2022 and 2024, including social-emotional supports, instructional rigor, supplemental services (e.g., vacation academies, tailored supports to families). In interviews, several staff expressed concerns that these funds are temporary, but some programming needs as well as salaries for newly added staff will continue beyond the life of these grants. These staff stated a concern that EPS will not be able to continue necessary programming and retain new positions when that funding period expires.

## Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

EPS currently has a long-term capital plan that describes future capital development and facility improvements, making this a strength of the district. The district's five-year capital improvement plan describes an extensive list of necessary projects that are currently being planned or are already underway. Many of these projects are detailed in the 2023 budget document provided to the review team. For example, the budget summary offers a detailed, tiered list of capital improvement and expenses by tier. These documents are clear and available to the public. The capital improvement plan includes essential projects such as roof and floor repairs, new telephone and paging systems, boiler and heater replacements, fire alarm upgrades/replacements, elevator replacements, and parking lot paving.

An area of growth for the district includes the improvement of stakeholder collaboration to alleviate the district's school overcrowding issue. Although EPS has an extensive capital plan, disagreement exists on implementing this plan and addressing some capital issues. Some issues related to capital planning, including addressing overcrowding and school space, are challenges the district appears to have difficulty resolving. Publicly reported enrollment figures indicated that enrollment in EPS currently exceeds prepandemic levels. The superintendent and district leaders described a significant need for additional classroom space to alleviate overcrowding. A city government representative seemed to agree, noting, "The estimate is about . . . 1,200 to 1,500 students over capacity, including the high school."

School committee and district-level interviews indicated that the biggest challenge to resolving this long-standing issue has been achieving agreement among participants on a solution to this issue. Some stakeholders have proposed repurposing a recently acquired private school building, whereas

others want to apply to the state for building a new building and others have proposed modular classrooms.

EPS district leaders have proposed to build a new high school as well as reconfigure several storage spaces and unused buildings into classroom space. However, a challenge to the development of this new high school has emerged. Although the building plan was approved by the school committee and the city council, the mayor has yet to approve it.

Both district and teacher interviews confirmed that the district has been dealing with a spacing issue for several years. The proposal to repurpose a newly acquired private school building, Pope John, to create additional classroom space is stalled while the final decision surrounding the use of recently acquired property lies with the mayor's office and the parties disagree on its use as a school or as housing.

Another notable strength of the district is its formal preventive maintenance program developed to prolong the life of the district's capital assets. The district has prioritized the cleanliness and safety of all buildings. In the 2023 Fiscal Year Budget Presentation, EPS expressed a commitment to fund custodial staff and purchasing cleaning supplies. The district has allocated funds to contract overnight cleaning services for Everett High School. In addition, district leaders described improvements made to school security by the recently hired director of security. These improvements include upgrades to both external and internal camera systems, ALICE training (active shooter training), security guards, and the development of a long-term security plan.

## Recommendations

- The district should partner closely with the city during its implementation of MUNIS, to ensure that this new financial management system and payroll system aligns with the needs of the school department and automates work that is currently done manually.
- Given the size of annual its annual chargebacks, the district should revise its existing Memorandum of Understanding, to be agreed upon by city officials and voted upon by the school committee, to clarify the methods by which chargebacks are transparently identified and calculated.
- The district should collaborate with the city to identify ways that more clearly separate school budget lines from the municipal budget lines, such as using separate connection groups for school and city.
- The district should partner with the city and community stakeholders to continue progress on implementing its capital plan, constructing a new high school, and ultimately resolving its overcrowding issues.

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

---

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in EPS. The team conducted 144 classroom observations during the week of December 5, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups between December 5 and December 9. 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 president
- Principals
- Teachers
- Support specialists
- Parents
- Students
- City government 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 enrollment, staffing, and finances
- Curricular review process, membership, and timelines
- EPS curriculum and assessment inventories
- 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 minutes and policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, tiered systems of support guidelines, and the district's end-of-year financial reports
- All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations

# Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

---

## *Everett Public Schools*

### **Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings**

## **Districtwide Instructional Observation Report**

**December 2022**



201 Jones Road  
Waltham, Massachusetts  
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499  
[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)





# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction .....	1
Positive Climate.....	3
Teacher Sensitivity.....	4
Regard for Student Perspectives .....	5
Negative Climate .....	6
Behavior Management .....	7
Productivity.....	8
Instructional Learning Formats .....	9
Concept Development .....	10
Content Understanding.....	11
Analysis and Inquiry .....	12
Quality of Feedback .....	13
Language Modeling .....	14
Instructional Dialogue.....	15
Student Engagement .....	16
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K-5 .....	17
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6-8 .....	18
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9-12 .....	19
References .....	20



## 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.

Eight observers visited Everett Public Schools during the week of December 5, 2022. Observers conducted 144 observations in a sample of classrooms across seven 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Positive Climate</li> <li>■ Negative Climate</li> <li>■ Teacher Sensitivity</li> <li>■ Regard for Student Perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Behavior Management</li> <li>■ Productivity</li> <li>■ Instructional Learning Formats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Concept Development</li> <li>■ Quality of Feedback</li> <li>■ Language Modeling</li> </ul>

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Positive Climate</li> <li>■ Teacher Sensitivity</li> <li>■ Regard for Student Perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Behavior Management</li> <li>■ Productivity</li> <li>■ Negative Climate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Instructional Learning Formats</li> <li>■ Content Understanding</li> <li>■ Analysis and Inquiry</li> <li>■ Quality of Feedback</li> <li>■ Instructional Dialogue</li> </ul>
<b>Student Engagement</b>		

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support or attention, was

unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students' problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

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

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

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

## Positive Climate

---

### *Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

#### **Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.2**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	5	6	28	20	13	73	5.4
Grades 6-8	0	0	7	8	9	7	4	35	4.8
Grades 9-12	0	1	4	4	14	9	4	36	5.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 16] + [4 \times 18] + [5 \times 51] + [6 \times 36] + [7 \times 21]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

**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\*: 5.3**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	2	11	21	24	15	73	5.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	5	4	8	10	8	35	5.3
Grades 9-12	0	1	3	6	14	10	2	36	5.0

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 10] + [4 \times 21] + [5 \times 43] + [6 \times 44] + [7 \times 25]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 5.3$

**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\*: 3.3**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	1	14	22	14	17	5	0	73	3.6
Grades 6-8	6	8	11	6	3	1	0	35	2.9
Grades 9-12	1	13	14	4	4	0	0	36	2.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 8] + [2 \times 35] + [3 \times 47] + [4 \times 24] + [5 \times 24] + [6 \times 6]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 3.3$

**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.<sup>1</sup>

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

**Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.9**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	0	1	2	68	73	6.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	35	7.0
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	36	7.0

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [5 \times 1] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 137]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

**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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

## 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\*: 6.3**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	3	6	10	20	34	73	6.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	2	1	3	5	24	35	6.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	1	2	7	26	36	6.6

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 5] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 32] + [7 \times 84]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 6.3$

**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\*: 6.4**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	0	0	1	2	11	15	44	144	6.4
Grades K-5	0	0	1	2	11	15	44	73	6.4
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	1	4	10	20	35	6.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	3	4	5	24	36	6.4

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 19] + [6 \times 30] + [7 \times 88]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 6.4$

**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\*: 4.8**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	8	17	24	18	5	73	4.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	3	12	15	2	3	35	4.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	5	6	15	8	2	36	4.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 16] + [4 \times 35] + [5 \times 54] + [6 \times 28] + [7 \times 10]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 4.8$

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

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

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

## Concept Development

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Concept Development District Average\*: 3.1**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	7	14	16	6	10	2	0	55	3.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 7] + [2 \times 14] + [3 \times 16] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 10] + [6 \times 2]) \div 55 \text{ observations} = 3.1$

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

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

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

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

## Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

**Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.2**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	1	2	3	2	7	2	1	18	4.2
Grades 6-8	0	2	10	10	7	3	3	35	4.2
Grades 9-12	0	4	9	6	10	5	2	36	4.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 8] + [3 \times 22] + [4 \times 18] + [5 \times 24] + [6 \times 10] + [7 \times 6]) \div 89 \text{ observations} = 4.2$

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

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

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

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

## Analysis and Inquiry

---

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

### Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 3.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	3	7	2	1	1	2	2	18	3.2
Grades 6-8	5	9	8	9	4	0	0	35	2.9
Grades 9-12	3	13	9	7	4	0	0	36	2.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 11] + [2 \times 29] + [3 \times 19] + [4 \times 17] + [5 \times 9] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 2]) \div 89 \text{ observations} = 3.0$

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

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

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

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



## Quality of Feedback

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 3.5**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	6	16	22	14	9	4	2	73	3.3
Grades 6-8	5	6	11	3	7	3	0	35	3.3
Grades 9-12	1	9	4	8	10	2	2	36	3.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 12] + [2 \times 31] + [3 \times 37] + [4 \times 25] + [5 \times 26] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 4]) \div 144 \text{ observations} = 3.5$

**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\*: 3.5**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	3	7	14	21	9	1	0	55	3.5

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 3] + [2 \times 7] + [3 \times 14] + [4 \times 21] + [5 \times 9] + [6 \times 1]) \div 55 \text{ observations} = 3.5$

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

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

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

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

## Instructional Dialogue

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12*

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

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

### Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	5	2	6	1	3	1	0	18	2.9
Grades 6-8	8	6	9	6	3	3	0	35	3.0
Grades 9-12	8	7	3	8	6	2	2	36	3.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 21] + [2 \times 15] + [3 \times 18] + [4 \times 15] + [5 \times 12] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 2]) \div 89 \text{ observations} = 3.1$

\*\*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\*: 4.9**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	1	2	7	6	2	18	5.3
Grades 6-8	0	0	6	9	10	6	4	35	4.8
Grades 9-12	0	1	4	9	9	10	3	36	4.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 11] + [4 \times 20] + [5 \times 26] + [6 \times 22] + [7 \times 9]) \div 89 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

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

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

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

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>5.3</b>
Positive Climate	0	1	5	6	28	20	13	73	5.4
Negative Climate**	0	0	1	0	1	2	68	73	6.8
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	2	11	21	24	15	73	5.5
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	14	22	14	17	5	0	73	3.6
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>5.8</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	3	6	10	20	34	73	6.0
Productivity	0	0	1	2	11	15	44	73	6.4
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	1	8	17	24	18	5	73	4.9
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>3.3</b>
Concept Development (K-3 only)	7	14	16	6	10	2	0	55	3.1
Content Understanding (UE only)	1	2	3	2	7	2	1	18	4.2
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	3	7	2	1	1	2	2	18	3.2
Quality of Feedback	6	16	22	14	9	4	2	73	3.3
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	3	7	14	21	9	1	0	55	3.5
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	5	2	6	1	3	1	0	18	2.9
<b>Student Engagement (UE only)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5.3</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 28] + [6 \times 20] + [7 \times 13]) \div 73 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

\*\*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:  $([3 \times 1] + [5 \times 1] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 68]) \div 73 \text{ observations} = 6.8$ . In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	7	8	9	7	4	35	4.8
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	5	4	8	10	8	35	5.3
Regard for Student Perspectives	6	8	11	6	3	1	0	35	2.9
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>6.6</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	2	1	3	5	24	35	6.4
Productivity	0	0	0	1	4	10	20	35	6.4
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	35	7.0
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	3	12	15	2	3	35	4.7
Content Understanding	0	2	10	10	7	3	3	35	4.2
Analysis and Inquiry	5	9	8	9	4	0	0	35	2.9
Quality of Feedback	5	6	11	3	7	3	0	35	3.3
Instructional Dialogue	8	6	9	6	3	3	0	35	3.0
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>4.8</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 7] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 9] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 4]) \div 35 \text{ observations} = 4.8$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 34]) \div 35 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Positive Climate	0	1	4	4	14	9	4	36	5.1
Teacher Sensitivity	0	1	3	6	14	10	2	36	5.0
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	13	14	4	4	0	0	36	2.9
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>6.7</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	0	1	2	7	26	36	6.6
Productivity	0	0	0	3	4	5	24	36	6.4
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	36	7.0
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	5	6	15	8	2	36	4.9
Content Understanding	0	4	9	6	10	5	2	36	4.3
Analysis and Inquiry	3	13	9	7	4	0	0	36	2.9
Quality of Feedback	1	9	4	8	10	2	2	36	3.9
Instructional Dialogue	8	7	3	8	6	2	2	36	3.3
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4.9</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 4] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 4]) \div 36 \text{ observations} = 5.1$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 35]) \div 36 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

## References

---

- Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf>
- MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from [http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS\\_10\\_29\\_10.pdf](http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf)
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K–3*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.



## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

**Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB)</a> from Education Resource Strategies	This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs.
<a href="#">Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook</a>	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.
<a href="#">Coherence Guidebook</a>	This guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School 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.

**Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Curriculum Matters MA</a> Webpage	A suite of resources to support the use of high-quality curriculum, including <i>IMplement MA</i> , our recommended four-phase process to prepare for, select, launch, and implement new high-quality instructional materials with key tasks and action steps. Also includes <i>CURATE</i> , which convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate evidence on the quality and alignment of specific curricular materials and then publish their findings for educators across the Commonwealth to consult.
<a href="#">MA Curriculum Frameworks Resources</a>	Some of the most frequently used resources include “ <a href="#">What to Look For</a> ” classroom observation guides; <a href="#">Family Guides</a> to help families understand what students are expected to know and do by the end of each grade; and the Standards Navigator tool and app that can be used to explore the standards, see how they are connected to other standards, related student work samples, reference guides, and definitions.
<a href="#">Mass Literacy</a> Guide	An interactive site with research, information, and resources on evidence-based practices for early literacy that are culturally responsive and sustaining. There is current information on complex text, fluent word reading, language comprehension, students experiencing reading difficulties, equity in literacy, how to support an MTSS for ELA/literacy, and much more.

**Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment**

Resource	Description
DESE's <a href="#">District Data Team Toolkit</a>	A set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team.

**Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources</a>	A suite of resources and practical tools that reflect feedback from educators on how to implement educator evaluation in support of more equitable, culturally responsive schools and classrooms for all. These resources include Focus Indicators, a subset of indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the 2022-2023 school year.
<a href="#">Guide to Building Supportive Talent Systems</a>	Resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on racial equity.
<a href="#">Professional Learning Partner Guide</a>	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 professional development providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials.

**Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Safe and Supportive Schools Framework and Self-Reflection Tool</a>	Based on the <a href="#">Five Essential Elements</a> , these resources (see <a href="#">At-a-Glance overview</a> ) can help guide school- and district-based teams create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures. Through a phased process (with preliminary and deeper dive self-reflection options) teams can create plans based on local context and data and by examining <a href="#">six areas</a> of school operation.
<a href="#">MTSS Blueprint</a>	This MTSS resource offers a framework for how districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.
<a href="#">Prenatal Through Young Adulthood Family Engagement Framework for Massachusetts</a>	This resource offers a roadmap for practitioners and families in health, human services, and education. A companion document is the <a href="#">Family, School, and Community Partnership Fundamentals Self-Assessment Version 2.0</a> .
State and local student survey data, such as <a href="#">Views of Climate and Learning</a> and <a href="#">Youth Risk Behavior Survey</a>	State and local student survey data can provide information about student experiences, strengths, and needs. They also can help prompt additional local inquiry through focus groups; advisories; and ongoing communication with students, families, staff, and partners to inform continuous improvement efforts.

**Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management**

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Description</b>
<a href="#"><u>Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets</u></a> (scroll down to Research section)	A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.
<a href="#"><u>Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)</u></a>	A suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions.
<a href="#"><u>Planning for Success (PfS)</u></a>	An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support.
<a href="#"><u>DESE spending comparisons website</u></a>	A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public.

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

**Table D1. Everett Public Schools: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2022-2023**

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	7,285	100.0%	913,735	100.0%
African American	911	12.5%	85,662	9.4%
Asian	369	5.1%	67,010	7.3%
Hispanic	4,817	66.1%	221,044	24.2%
Native American	17	0.2%	2,155	0.2%
White	1,055	14.5%	496,800	54.4%
Native Hawaiian	3	0.0%	787	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	113	1.6%	40,277	4.4%

Note. As of October 1, 2022

**Table D2. Everett Public Schools: 2022-2023 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of state
All students with high needs	6,221	100.0%	84.3%	508,820	100.0%	55.1%
Students with disabilities	1,153	18.5%	15.6%	179,095	35.2%	19.4%
Low-income households	5,330	85.7%	73.2%	386,060	75.9%	42.3%
ELs and former ELs	2,709	43.5%	71.1%	110,554	21.7%	25.0%

Note. As of October 1, 2022. 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 7,377; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 923,349.

**Table D3. Everett Public Schools: Chronic Absence<sup>a</sup> Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

<b>Group</b>	<b>N (2022)</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>State (2022)</b>
All students	7,929	19.0	25.6	42.7	27.7
African American/Black	1,054	14.2	21.5	33.8	32.0
Asian	398	8.7	9.4	24.9	15.4
Hispanic/Latino	5,115	21.0	28.6	45.4	42.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	120	25.0	32.0	50.0	28.4
Native American	21	8.7	20.0	33.3	37.8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	4	--	--	--	32.1
White	1,217	19.1	23.2	44.3	22.1
High needs	6,966	21.3	28.5	44.0	37.1
Low income <sup>a</sup>	6,253	--	--	44.8	40.6
ELs	2,717	22.8	32.8	45.6	39.9
Students w/disabilities	1,350	23.8	31.7	49.0	36.9

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

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

	Fiscal year 2020		Fiscal year 2021		Fiscal year 2022	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
<b>Expenditures</b>						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	\$89,851,821	\$86,860,707	\$87,999,966	\$88,299,963	\$98,862,378	\$100,422,862
By municipality	\$32,988,150	\$33,750,860	\$29,503,587	\$35,667,975	\$28,934,213	\$38,584,068
Total from local appropriations	\$122,839,971	\$120,611,567	\$117,503,553	\$123,967,938	\$127,796,591	\$139,006,930
From revolving funds and grants	—	\$10,809,411	—	\$14,219,923	—	\$17,319,794
Total expenditures	—	\$131,420,978	—	\$138,187,861	—	\$156,326,724
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>						
Chapter 70 state aid <sup>a</sup>	—	\$75,001,709	—	\$75,001,709	—	\$84,335,921
Required local contribution	—	\$30,615,794	—	\$35,431,511	—	\$36,483,827
Required net school spending <sup>b</sup>	—	\$105,617,503	—	\$110,433,220	—	\$120,819,748
Actual net school spending	—	\$109,164,545	—	\$115,109,270	—	\$125,806,555
Over/under required (\$)	—	\$3,547,042	—	\$4,676,050	—	\$4,986,807
Over/under required (%)	—	3.4%	—	4.2%	—	4.1%

Note. Data as of June 1, 2022, and sourced from fiscal year 2022 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.

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

**Table D5. Everett Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2019-2021**

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	\$368	\$415	\$453
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$1,330	\$1,325	\$1,031
Teachers	\$6,060	\$6,787	\$7,079
Other teaching services	\$869	\$966	\$864
Professional development	\$211	\$230	\$207
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$366	\$372	\$1,365
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$207	\$283	\$300
Pupil services	\$1,221	\$1,050	\$647
Operations and maintenance	\$1,048	\$988	\$787
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$2,155	\$2,266	\$3,353
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$13,834	\$14,681	\$16,085

Note. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from [per-pupil-exp.xlsx \(live.com\)](#).

## Appendix E. Student Performance Data

The COVID-19 pandemic had a profound impact on the 2020-2021 and 2021-22 school years. Data reported in this appendix may have been affected by the pandemic. Please keep this in mind when reviewing the data and take particular care when comparing data across multiple school years.

**Table E1. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	2,950	38	24	21	41	16	32	30	17
African American/Black	390	30	23	21	26	19	36	32	27
Asian	144	57	42	43	63	6	12	17	8
Hispanic/Latino	1,877	37	20	18	22	17	35	33	31
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	49	35	22	14	48	19	38	41	14
Native American	6	54	—	—	29	15	—	—	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	43	—	—	—	17
White	477	41	33	32	48	16	23	21	11
High needs	2,591	31	19	18	24	20	36	34	28
Low income <sup>a</sup>	2,316	—	—	19	24	—	—	33	28
ELs and former ELs	1,270	26	13	11	20	23	43	42	34
Students w/disabilities	625	7	7	4	11	43	59	64	46

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.



**Table E2. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	512	42	41	36	58	14	18	15	8
African American/Black	85	31	47	38	41	21	12	8	13
Asian	34	84	52	62	79	0	4	12	4
Hispanic/Latino	289	36	35	29	38	15	24	20	17
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	70	—	—	62	0	—	—	6
Native American	3	—	—	—	53	—	—	—	8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	45	—	—	—	16
White	93	52	51	45	65	11	9	8	4
High needs	419	32	34	31	38	21	23	18	15
Low income <sup>a</sup>	372	—	—	32	40	—	—	17	14
ELs and former ELs	141	7	12	16	21	43	40	39	30
Students w/disabilities	76	7	15	12	20	26	28	28	26

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E3. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	2,953	37	14	22	39	16	38	28	17
African American/Black	391	27	9	16	19	26	45	36	31
Asian	144	69	34	51	69	4	16	11	6
Hispanic/Latino	1,877	36	11	19	18	16	41	29	32
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	50	32	9	10	44	17	38	38	16
Native American	6	31	—	—	27	23	—	—	23
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	39	—	—	—	19
White	475	41	21	31	47	15	32	20	11
High needs	2,590	32	11	20	22	20	43	31	28
Low income <sup>a</sup>	2,316	—	—	19	20	—	—	30	29
ELs and former ELs	1,272	30	8	17	21	19	46	35	32
Students w/disabilities	621	9	2	4	12	45	65	62	45

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E4. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	501	35	23	24	50	19	23	22	10
African American/Black	84	24	18	21	26	28	21	25	20
Asian	34	72	52	59	78	0	12	9	4
Hispanic/Latino	279	30	17	18	26	19	27	24	21
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	60	—	—	53	0	—	—	10
Native American	3	—	—	—	37	—	—	—	16
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	48	—	—	—	19
White	93	45	36	31	59	17	17	18	6
High needs	407	27	16	19	28	26	28	25	19
Low income <sup>a</sup>	361	—	—	19	29	—	—	24	19
ELs and former ELs	137	12	11	14	17	41	40	34	32
Students w/disabilities	73	5	3	3	15	45	39	56	33

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E5. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	989	28	16	22	42	21	39	32	18
African American/Black	109	21	11	17	21	22	47	36	31
Asian	55	55	36	42	65	4	14	18	8
Hispanic/Latino	638	24	15	18	20	21	41	34	33
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	18	14	18	17	48	29	45	39	15
Native American	3	—	—	—	28	—	—	—	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	41	—	—	—	20
White	160	39	20	38	52	21	24	28	10
High needs	857	21	12	19	24	26	45	35	29
Low income <sup>a</sup>	767	—	—	19	23	—	—	36	30
ELs and former ELs	372	15	6	13	18	30	55	39	37
Students w/disabilities	215	6	3	7	15	50	66	64	44

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E6. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	449	—	—	18	47	—	—	29	14
African American/Black	75	—	—	16	25	—	—	33	25
Asian	29	—	—	55	70	—	—	17	6
Hispanic/Latino	246	—	—	13	23	—	—	34	28
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	—	—	—	51	—	—	—	12
Native American	3	—	—	—	38	—	—	—	14
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	45	—	—	—	23
White	88	—	—	22	56	—	—	20	8
High needs	360	—	—	15	26	—	—	34	24
Low income <sup>a</sup>	324	—	—	16	26	—	—	32	25
ELs and former ELs	109	—	—	6	13	—	—	55	43
Students w/disabilities	67	—	—	4	16	—	—	63	37

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E7. Everett Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 & 2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,990	48.4	47.7	49.8
African American/Black	255	47.5	49.3	48.8
Asian	107	56.6	55.9	58.5
Hispanic/Latino	1,273	48.6	46.2	46.5
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	34	43.3	46.2	51.5
Native American	5	—	—	46.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	51.7
White	315	47.3	49.5	50.0
High needs	1,735	48.2	47.1	46.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	1,553	—	47.0	46.5
ELs and former ELs	822	50.8	46.2	47.7
Students w/disabilities	398	45.5	41.5	41.8

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E8. Everett Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 & 2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	408	46.9	44.3	50.0
African American/Black	76	47.8	45.9	49.8
Asian	26	52.6	46.4	56.0
Hispanic/Latino	209	43.4	44.0	47.6
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	—	—	50.6
Native American	3	—	—	54.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	49.5
White	86	49.8	45.6	50.1
High needs	318	42.9	43.8	47.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	296	—	43.3	47.2
ELs and former ELs	65	34.8	53.5	50.5
Students w/disabilities	64	36.1	42.5	45.1

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E9. Everett Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 & 2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,977	49.4	51.8	49.9
African American/Black	253	46.3	51.7	47.0
Asian	108	57.1	60.0	59.8
Hispanic/Latino	1,271	49.6	50.6	46.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	32	46.0	48.9	51.0
Native American	5	—	—	49.5
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	49.9
White	307	49.5	54.5	50.4
High needs	1,718	49.0	51.0	47.1
Low income <sup>a</sup>	1,537	—	51.0	46.4
ELs and former ELs	823	50.9	52.8	48.6
Students w/disabilities	396	43.7	40.7	43.3

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E10. Everett Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 & 2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	401	46.3	35.6	50.0
African American/Black	75	47.7	37.4	45.6
Asian	26	52.2	53.2	57.3
Hispanic/Latino	202	43.7	32.6	44.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	—	—	50.0
Native American	3	—	—	46.6
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	41.2
White	87	47.6	37.3	51.6
High needs	310	42.7	34.9	46.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	288	—	34.4	45.6
ELs and former ELs	64	38.9	41.2	48.9
Students w/disabilities	63	39.1	32.8	47.3

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E11. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
3	462	45	25	23	44	10	22	27	15
4	517	36	27	20	38	14	25	28	16
5	478	32	25	23	41	18	25	26	13
6	492	39	23	20	41	21	43	37	22
7	488	39	22	22	41	16	38	34	19
8	513	36	19	21	42	20	41	31	18
3-8	2,950	38	24	21	41	16	32	30	17
10	512	42	41	36	58	14	18	15	8

**Table E12. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	Percentages meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
3	464	39	8	22	41	18	56	37	20
4	520	40	12	25	42	15	40	29	17
5	481	35	13	20	36	15	32	22	16
6	493	48	12	24	42	14	37	24	15
7	485	34	20	22	37	18	29	30	19
8	510	26	19	19	36	20	34	26	17
3-8	2,953	37	14	22	39	16	38	28	17
10	501	35	23	24	50	19	23	22	10

**Table E13. Everett Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
5	480	29	16	24	43	21	19	34	18
8	509	27	16	20	42	19	16	31	18
5 and 8	989	28	16	22	42	21	17	32	18
10	449	—	—	18	47	—	—	29	14

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 STE are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about the Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test.

**Table E14. Everett Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	420	45.3	48.5	50.0
5	400	41.7	48.3	49.9
6	395	50.1	42.1	49.8
7	381	56.8	49.7	49.7
8	394	47.8	49.7	49.7
3-8	1,990	48.4	47.7	49.8
10	408	46.9	44.3	50.0

**Table E15. Everett Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	421	52.7	57.4	50.0
5	403	44.2	52.7	50.0
6	396	60.3	47.8	49.8
7	377	46.0	51.3	49.9
8	380	42.5	49.3	49.8
3-8	1,977	49.4	51.8	49.9
10	401	46.3	35.6	50.0

**Table E16. Everett Public Schools: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	548	75.5	83.3	81.2	90.1
African American/Black	114	75.9	84.2	86.0	86.2
Asian	26	85.2	100	96.2	96.2
Hispanic/Latino	300	69.0	77.2	75.7	81.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	6	71.4	90.9	100	88.7
Native American	3	--	--	--	82.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	81.3
White	99	86.8	91.3	86.9	93.2
High needs	481	71.2	80.1	78.8	83.9
Low income <sup>a</sup>	451	73.5	81.1	80.0	83.2
ELs	164	53.3	64.2	58.5	73.1
Students w/disabilities	85	58.7	78.9	81.2	78.0

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E17. Everett Public Schools: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021**

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	466	76.4	78.7	84.5	91.8
African American/Black	95	79.8	80.4	85.3	88.1
Asian	24	96.0	85.2	100	97.0
Hispanic/Latino	232	67.9	72.7	78.9	84.0
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	11	60.0	71.4	90.9	91.2
Native American	--	--	--	--	84.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	87.7
White	103	89.0	88.4	92.2	94.4
High needs	366	71.3	74.7	81.7	85.8
Low income <sup>a</sup>	359	73.6	77.3	82.5	85.1
ELs	120	56.3	59.9	66.7	78.0
Students w/disabilities	76	67.4	58.7	78.9	80.6

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E18. Everett Public Schools: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	7,922	3.3	0.0	0.5	1.6
African American/Black	1,053	6.0	—	0.4	2.2
Asian	402	1.7	—	—	0.4
Hispanic/Latino	5,137	2.6	0.0	0.6	2.1
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	115	6.5	—	0.9	1.8
Native American	21	—	—	—	2.4
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	4	—	—	—	1.9
White	1,190	3.0	—	0.3	1.4
High needs	6,951	3.4	0.0	0.6	2.2
Low income <sup>a</sup>	6,243	—	—	0.6	2.3
ELs	2,905	2.4	0.0	0.5	1.4
Students w/disabilities	1,280	4.7	—	0.9	2.8

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.



**Table E19. Everett Public Schools: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	7,922	3.5	0.2	3.2	3.1
African American/Black	1,053	5.1	—	4.3	6.2
Asian	402	1.0	—	—	0.7
Hispanic/Latino	5,137	3.1	0.2	3.0	4.9
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	115	8.9	—	4.3	3.5
Native American	21	—	—	—	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	4	—	—	—	3.6
White	1,190	3.5	—	3.6	2.1
High needs	6,951	4.0	0.3	3.4	4.6
Low income <sup>a</sup>	6,243	—	—	3.4	5.2
ELs	2,905	3.0	0.2	2.3	3.5
Students w/disabilities	1,280	5.8	—	6.3	5.8

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E20. Everett Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	2,111	4.0	4.5	3.7	2.1
African American/Black	354	2.3	3.2	2.0	2.8
Asian	108	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Hispanic/Latino	1,215	6.0	6.3	4.9	4.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	36	0.0	5.1	2.8	2.4
Native American	12	11.1	0.0	8.3	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	1.2
White	385	1.7	1.8	2.6	1.3
High needs	1,689	5.1	5.8	4.6	3.6
Low income <sup>a</sup>	1,492	4.3	5.4	4.4	3.8
ELs	427	12.7	14.3	10.3	7.8
Students w/disabilities	333	0.8	3.0	3.0	3.4

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

**Table E21. Everett Public Schools: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,040	65.8	61.2	61.0	64.9
African American/Black	199	63.5	56.2	67.3	55.5
Asian	57	89.8	88.2	82.5	84.9
Hispanic/Latino	575	59.2	57.5	53.6	49.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	16	82.4	56.3	56.3	66.1
Native American	7	--	--	85.7	50.0
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	65.4
White	185	74.7	68.9	69.7	69.5
High needs	842	59.5	54.8	57.1	49.1
Low income <sup>a</sup>	755	59.9	56.3	57.5	50.1
ELs	210	41.9	35.5	33.8	30.0
Students w/disabilities	159	44.9	40.3	50.3	34.3

<sup>a</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.