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## Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a comprehensive review of Mansfield Public Schools (hereafter, Mansfield) in October 2023. 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.[[1]](#footnote-2)

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Mansfield during the week of October 16, 2023. The observers conducted 89 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[2]](#footnote-3) guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12). In the K-5 grade band, instructional observations generally suggest strong emotional support, high classroom organization and student engagement (Grades 4-5), and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. In the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization, generally strong emotional support and student engagement, and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. In the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide strong evidence of classroom organization and mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, instructional support, and student engagement.

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

The superintendent at Mansfield, since 2017, is Ms. Teresa Murphy. She receives support from a leadership team consisting of the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning; the assistant superintendent of finance and operations; and directors of special education, human resources, health services, and prekindergarten. These officials, particularly the superintendent, work closely with the elected school committee members who represent Mansfield residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has five members, each serving a three-year term.

The school committee has three main responsibilities: (a) developing district policy to guide administrative action; (b) approving the district’s budget; and (c) hiring and evaluating the superintendent. The school committee also maintains open and trusting relationships with district leaders, town leaders, and the broader Mansfield community. At the time of the district review, new members recently joined the school committee, with three of the five members having 16 months or less of experience serving in this capacity.

The district has a current, three-year district improvement plan (2023-2025) and annual school improvement plans that the school committee approves. School leaders actively contribute to the process, creating and aligning their school improvement plans with the district’s plan while still addressing their individual school needs.

In terms of strengths, strong communication exists between the superintendent and school committee, a positive relationship exists between the school committee and teachers’ association, and strong working relationships exist between district leaders and Mansfield municipal leaders. In addition, the district has a well-defined process for updating its improvement plan, the improvement plan guides the district’s work moving forward, and school leaders intentionally align their school improvement plans with the district’s plan while having autonomy to address their specific context and needs. The district has a clearly defined budget development process and effectively manages and monitors its funding and resources.

Areas for growth include making communication methods more accessible and inclusive for the broader community, meaningfully engaging stakeholders in and increasing their awareness of the district improvement process, and disaggregating student data to drive budgeting decisions.

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

Mansfield strives to ensure equitable, inclusive, and effective instruction for all students. The district uses a combination of published and district-created curricula, although at the time of the district review, most of these curricula have no rating or do not meet expectations on either CURATE[[3]](#footnote-4) or EdReports. As described in the district’s improvement plan, the district places a strong emphasis on curriculum across all levels. At the elementary level, the district is currently adopting new mathematics and literacy curricula. To accomplish this, the district has a process for adopting new curricula, with adoption teams consisting of district leaders, building administrators, and teachers. At the middle and high school levels, teachers are starting to update teacher-developed curricula using the Understanding By Design (UbD) format. The Secondary Leadership Team/Department Chairs received professional development in spring 2023 on UbD utilizing the train-the-trainer model. They began to train teacher in fall 2023 and are in the early stages of updating their curricula.

Mansfield offers a wide range of academic and nonacademic offerings that cater to the needs and interests of its students. At the middle school, the district offers three different levels of classes in mathematics to better target students’ needs. At the high school, district and school leaders have been working to expand students’ access to Advanced Placement (AP) courses by lessening the prerequisite requirements, which have been a barrier for many students.

Mansfield has several strengths related to curriculum and instruction, including a well-defined process for critically reviewing curricular materials, rewriting the secondary curricula using the UbD framework, high scores in the classroom organization domain across all grade bands, expanding students’ access to AP courses, and partnering with Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical High School to give opportunities to students who would like to participate in a career vocational technical education program.

Areas for growth include selecting and implementing high-quality curricula, providing staff with opportunities to pilot curricula during the curriculum adoption process, improving instructional supports as seen through the low-middle scores in the instructional support domain across all grade bands, addressing students’ social-emotional learning competencies across the district, providing access within the general education curriculum to rigorous, challenging work at the elementary level shifting schedules and staffing at the middle school to accommodate enrichment opportunities without impeding on core instructional time, and ensuring equitable access for all students to the various learning opportunities available within the district.

### [Assessment](#_Assessment)

District leaders have been working to expand their capacity to collect and use data to drive continuous improvement efforts and instructional decisions. During the 2021-2022 school year, Mansfield adopted the Illuminate data platform to provide an easy-to-access tool for educators in Grades K-12. Mansfield uses several different assessments and data sources across the district, depending on the grade range. At the elementary and middle school levels, educators administer Acadience Math, FastBridge, DIBELS 8th (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), and Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) multiple times per year, in addition to other curriculum-based assessments. At the high school level, students complete some common assessments in specific courses and end-of-unit tests. District leaders, school leaders, and educators also review Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and ACCESS for English learners (ELs) scores annually. The district is working to transparently share data with students and their families. Students and families can review student progress via Aspen, parent-teacher conferences, and report cards.

In terms of strengths, the Illuminate data platform allows for staff in Grades K-12 to track student progress and identify student needs in both ELA and mathematics. The ELA and math curricula adoption teams actively use the Illuminate data to help guide curricular decisions. Lastly, the district uses multiple methods for sharing student and program information with families throughout the school year. In terms of areas for growth, teachers report needing more time and support on data use, and parents would like more ongoing, two-way communication with the schools that extends beyond information sharing.

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

Mansfield’s human resources department is a shared office between the town and the district that works to standardize hiring and onboarding procedures. The human resources department works in collaboration with district and school leaders to determine needed positions, post positions across a variety of online platforms, oversee the onboarding process, and complete the orientation process. The district has a comprehensive mentorship program for teachers during their first two years in the district that involves stipends for volunteer mentor teachers. Teachers have numerous opportunities to become involved in leadership within the district, including being a mentor teacher; serving on a variety of committees; and joining the inclusion, culture, and unity (ICU) team at their school.

Mansfield has several strengths related to human resources and professional development, including sharing the human resources department between the district and the town for improved efficiency and greater consistency, the active involvement of the superintendent in all hiring decisions across the district, the well-defined and comprehensive mentorship program to support new teachers, and the many opportunities for teachers to participate in meaningful leadership activities.

Areas for growth include transitioning to Munis for the district’s recruitment and performance data to improve efficiency, continuing to expand efforts to diversify the teacher and leader workforce, creating district-level guidance for hiring committees, providing evaluators with adequate time to complete evaluations and classroom observations and provide actionable feedback, differentiating professional development opportunities to better meet the learning needs of educators across the district, and creating districtwide formal structures to recognize strong teacher performance.

### [Student Support](#_Student_Support)

The district demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging for all students, staff, and families. Aligned with the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Strategic Plan, the district implements various strategies and structures, including creating school-based ICU teams, strengthening the district’s MTSS, providing professional development related to trauma-informed practices and social-emotional learning, and identifying supports for the increasing number of ELs and their families. Mansfield also recognizes the importance of engaging parents, families, and community partners, with multiple opportunities for parent engagement and leadership, such as participating in improvement planning and/or joining leadership committees, including the Mansfield Elementary School Association, parent advisory councils, and the Special Education Parent Advisory Council.

Strengths include creating school-based ICU teams that promote supportive and culturally responsive classroom environments, providing meaningful opportunities for student engagement and leadership, implementing trauma-informed approaches for student behavior, providing tiered supports across all schools, having problem-solving teams (e.g., student support team [SST], MTSS team) at each school to assess data and make decisions about interventions for students, encouraging a variety of ways for families to engage with the district, and leveraging a variety of partnerships providing wraparound, holistic student supports.

Areas for growth include improving the culture and climate of the middle and high schools so that all students feel safe, supported, and welcomed; monitoring the implementation of behavioral management and discipline policies for equitable enforcement at the secondary level; making sure that teachers and instructional staff have sufficient social-emotional learning supports; improving two-way communication with parents, students, and staff about the academic, behavioral, and mental health supports available; and advertising leadership and engagement opportunities that are meaningful, authentic, and accessible to the general community.

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

District and town leaders collaborate to create one budget for both the town and the district, representing the joint interests of both. Similarly, budget tracking is a collaboration between the town and the district. The district has a well-defined process for developing the budget, which includes participation across 10 different major cost centers, district leaders, town leaders, and the school committee. The district also has a five-year capital plan that includes data from an educational space study, which predicts the district’s needs in future years. Overall, the district and the town are very involved in capital needs, and the district regularly makes presentations to the town about capital needs.

The district has several strengths related to financial and asset management, including having strong collaboration between the district and town concerning budget documentation; having a collaborative, organized, and transparent process between the town and the district for budget negotiations; providing financial reporting to the school committee quarterly and the superintendent monthly to ensure transparency; maintaining a five-year capital plan with ability to readjust as needed; and allocating funds for an educational space study of all school buildings to determine future capital improvement needs.

The few areas for growth related to financial and asset management include providing more narrative within the budget to make it more accessible to all community members, making explicit connections between the budget and district improvement priorities, developing a written municipal agreement about shared costs between the district and the town, and addressing the recommendations provided by the 2022 student activity audit.

## Mansfield 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 are also 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 Mansfield occurred during the week of October 16, 2023. The site visit included 19 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 107 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with eight elementary school teachers, seven middle school teachers, and eight high school teachers; two focus groups with eight middle school and seven high school students; and two-family focus groups with 18 parents.

The site team also conducted 89 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

Appointed in 2017, the superintendent of Mansfield is Dr. Teresa Murphy. She receives support from a leadership team consisting of the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning; the assistant superintendent of finance and operations; and directors of special education, human resources, health services, and prekindergarten. The district is governed by a school committee composed of five members who are elected for three-year terms.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 299 teachers in the district, with 3,431 students enrolled in the district’s five schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School  | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| Roland Green Pre-School | Preschool | PK | 91 |
| Robinson Elementary | Elementary | K-2 | 754 |
| Jordan/Jackson Elementary | Elementary | 3-5 | 704 |
| Harold L. Qualters Middle School | Middle | 6-8 | 790 |
| Mansfield High School | High | 9-12 | 1,092 |
| Total |  |  | 3,431 |

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

Between 2021 and 2024, overall student enrollment decreased by 133 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and ELs and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

In fiscal year 2022, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Mansfield was $19,375, which is $1,767 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($17,608), and $2,088 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures in districts of similar wealth ($17,287).[[4]](#footnote-5) In-district per pupil expenditures for Mansfield were $179 less than the average state spending per pupil ($19,554). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

### School and Student Performance

#### Student Performance

The following section includes selected highlights regarding student performance in Mansfield. This section is meant to provide a brief synopsis of data, not a comprehensive analysis of district performance data. For additional details and data on district performance, please see Appendix E and [School and District Profiles (mass.edu)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/general/general.aspx?topNavID=1&leftNavId=100&orgcode=01670000&orgtypecode=5).

#### Achievement

* In 2023 in grades 3-8, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA on the Next Generation MCAS was equal to the state rate for Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and higher than the state rate for every other student group by 1 percentage point to 13 percentage points. In grade 10 ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was 3 percentage points to 20 percentage points higher than the state rate for each student group with reportable data, except for Students with Disabilities.
* In mathematics, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next Generation MCAS was higher than the state rate for all student groups with reportable data by 2 percentage points to 22 percentage points in grades 3-8. In grade 10, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was above the state rate for each student group by 9 percentage points to 36 percentage points, except for Students with Disabilities.
* In science in grades 5 and 8 the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next Generation MCAS declined between 2022 and 2023 by 4 percentage points to 21 percentage points for each student group with reportable data.
* The percentage of Hispanic/Latino students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next Generation MCAS was higher than their statewide peers in grades 3-8 in ELA by 8 percentage points, in mathematics by 22 percentage points, and in grades 5 and 8 in science by 6 percentage points. In the 10th grade, the percentage of Hispanic/Latino students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher than their statewide peers in ELA by 20 percentage points, in mathematics by 36 percentage points, and in science by 26 percentage points.

#### Growth

* ELA student growth percentiles (SGPs)**[[5]](#footnote-6)** exceeded typical growth in grade 10 for all students and White students. For all other student groups with reportable data, ELA SGPs were typical in grades 3-8 and grade 10.
* Math SGPs were typical for all student groups with reportable data in grades 3-8 and grade 10.

#### Other Indicators

* Mansfield’s four-year graduation rates in 2022 were above the state rate for each student group with reportable data by 1.9 percentage points to 18.8 percentage points, except for Students with Disabilities, which was equal to the state rate.
* Mansfield’s dropout rates have been consistently low for each student group with reportable data since 2020, and in 2022 eight of the nine student groups with reportable data had a dropout rate between 0.0 percent and 0.6 percent.
* The percentage of Asian students completing advanced coursework decreased by 32 percentage points between 2021 and 2023 and was 19.7 percentage points lower than their statewide peers.
* The percentage of Mansfield students who were chronically absent in 2023 was below the state rate by 3.7 percentage points to 13.7 percentage points for each student group with reportable data.
* English Learners (ELs) at Jordan/Jackson Elementary were more than twice as likely as non-ELs to have a teacher teaching out of field. Similarly, students of color at Jordan/Jackson Elementary were 1.92 times more likely to have a teacher teaching out of field than students not of color.
* Based on the 2023 accountability results, Mansfield High School was classified as meeting or exceeding targets, and Harold L. Qualters Middle School was classified as making substantial progress toward targets.

### Classroom Observations

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Mansfield during the week of October 16, 2023. The observers conducted 89 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

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

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

* Emotional Support. Ratings were in the high-middle range for the K-5 and 6-8 grade bands (5.6 and 5.1, respectively) and in the middle range for the 9-12 grade band (4.2).
* Classroom Organization. Ratings were in the high-middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.9) and in the high range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (6.6 and 6.7, respectively).
* Instructional Support. Ratings were in the low-middle range for all grade bands (3.0, 3.7, and 3.5, respectively).
* Student Engagement. For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the high-middle range for Grades 4-5 (5.2) and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (4.7 and 4.2, respectively).

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

## Leadership and Governance

Mansfield’s superintendent, appointed in 2017, is Ms. Murphy. She receives support from a leadership team consisting of the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, director of special education, director of human resources, director of health services, and director of prekindergarten. These officials, particularly the superintendent, work closely with the elected school committee members who represent Mansfield residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has five members, each serving a three-year term.

The school committee plays a pivotal role in the district, collaborating closely with district and town leaders to ensure compliance with Massachusetts laws and regulations and fulfill fiduciary duties. As outlined in the School Committee Operational Protocols and emphasized in interviews with committee members and district leaders, the primary responsibilities of the school committee include hiring and evaluating the superintendent, approving the budget, and establishing high-level strategic goals and policies for the district. The committee also maintains a culture of collaboration and trust with school, district, and town officials, resulting in productive contract negotiations with the teachers’ association, constant communication with the town, and the regular adoption of budgets that maintain level services.

The district employs a clear, thoughtful, and inclusive approach to district and school improvement planning. School and district leaders collaborated to develop a multi-year district improvement plan (2023-2025) and annual school improvement plans that the school committee approves. School leaders actively contribute to the process, creating and aligning their school improvement plans with the district’s plan while still addressing individual school needs. The district also provides opportunities to engage school and community stakeholders (e.g., parents, students, teachers) in improvement planning, although stakeholders have mixed perceptions of how meaningful these opportunities are.

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

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

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [School committee governance](#_School_Committee_Governance) | * Strong communication and collaboration exist between the superintendent and school committee.
* A positive relationship exists between the school committee and teachers’ association.
 |  |
| [District and school leadership](#_District_and_School) | * District leaders have strong working relationships with Mansfield municipal leaders.
 | * Making communication methods more accessible and inclusive for the broader community
 |
| [District and school improvement planning](#_District_and_School_1) | * The district has a clearly defined process to update its improvement plan, and the improvement plan guides the district’s work moving forward.
* School leaders intentionally align their school improvement plans with the district’s plan while having autonomy to customize their school’s improvement plan to fit their specific needs.
 | * Meaningfully engaging stakeholders (e.g., parents, school staff, students) in and increasing their awareness of the district improvement process
 |
| [Budget development](#_Budget_Development) | * The district has a clearly defined budget development process that includes close collaboration with district leaders, school committee members, and town officials.
* The district effectively manages and monitors its funding and resources.
 | * Disaggregating student data to drive budgeting decisions
 |

### School Committee Governance

The school committee collaborates with district and town leaders to uphold Massachusetts laws and regulations and fulfill fiduciary responsibilities to the district. According to the School Committee Operational Protocols, and interviews with committee members and other district leaders, the primary roles of the school committee are hiring and evaluating the superintendent, establishing a budget, and setting policy or “high-level strategic goals” for the district. School committee members vocalized their current areas of focus as aligned with the district’s 2023-2025 improvement plan, including addressing needed improvements to facilities as identified by the Facilities Assessment and Educational Visioning Study (see the Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance section) and carrying out the DEI Strategic Plan. When evaluating the superintendent annually, school committee members described how the superintendent sets and is assessed on goals aligned with the district improvement plan annually, with one member explaining “everything does a good job of tying together.”

As evidenced by a review of school committee meeting materials and interviews with committee members and other district and school stakeholders, the school committee maintains a culture of collaboration and trust with school, district, and town officials. For example, both school committee members and the teachers’ association described the school committee’s role during the recent contract negotiation as productive and supportive. One school committee member echoed the importance of listening to teachers during the negotiation process as follows:

So, my role is, from what I’ve gathered over the years, is really to just be there to listen and try to understand where the teachers are coming from and where the administration is coming from and provide a perspective like, you know, this is what I’m hearing to help, you know, move things to consensus. . . . And it’s never been adversarial; it’s always been respectful coming at it from obviously different places and priorities.

Interviews with school committee members and a review of meeting minutes also demonstrate the collaborative relationship between the superintendent and school committee. For example, materials from the summer workshop and interviews with school committee members explain that “day-to-day operations” of the district are the superintendent’s responsibility, and a clear delineation of roles is essential to building trust. School committee members also reported that the superintendent regularly sends updates to the committee and has taken actions to help educate new committee members on school and district policies. The positive and collaborative relationships between the school committee, the teachers’ association, and the superintendent is a clear strength for the district.

The school committee’s budget subcommittee, which is responsible for overseeing funding for the district, also demonstrates collaboration when working with district leaders and town officials. For example, a liaison from the town’s finance committee and the assistant superintendent of finance and operations both regularly attend budget subcommittee meetings, and the finance committee, school committee, and Mansfield Select Board will meet usually two or three times per budget cycle. As one district leader explained, “It creates more of a collaboration if we all come to the table together.” This ongoing collaboration has helped the district maintain level staffing in the budget despite budget cycles “getting more and more challenging” because of declining school enrollment and an increase in the percentage of students who are low income.

A recent endeavor for the school committee has been the onboarding of new school committee members, with three of the five members having 16 months or less of experience serving in this capacity. Efforts to educate new members include information presentations and training workshops held during the summer by the Massachusetts Association of School Committees.

### District and School Leadership

The superintendent has established and is supported by a leadership team consisting of the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning; the assistant superintendent of finance and operations; and directors of special education, human resources, health services, and prekindergarten. According to interviews with district leaders and school leaders, this leadership team meets weekly, whereas the superintendent communicates daily with a smaller administrative team of district leaders consisting of herself, the two assistant superintendents, the director of special education, and the director of human resources. According to interviews with district leaders and a review of district leadership team agendas, leadership team meetings provide opportunities for district and school leaders to revisit strategic goals, receive updates on improvement planning, and review student data (e.g., student disciplinary, restraint incidences, state MCAS results).

District leaders provide appropriate leadership development and support to school leaders and instructional staff. School leaders reported having sufficient autonomy about developing their schools’ budgets and participating in improvement planning. During the summer leadership team retreat, school leaders set goals on which they are evaluated that tie directly into their school improvement plan and the district’s DEI Strategic Plan. The superintendent further supports principals through weekly meetings and actively fosters leadership growth among a team of assistant directors and assistant principals by meeting with them every three weeks and providing specific training and professional development opportunities for them. At the building level, each school has an instructional leadership team composed of staff such as administrators, department heads, the assistant director of special education, and others who meet on a weekly basis. At the middle and high schools, a combined leadership team (called the secondary leadership team) meets monthly. This team consists of middle and high school administrators, department heads, and the special education assistant director to provide feedback on district initiatives, propose professional development topics, and generally discuss observed instructional practices. At the teacher level, teachers have opportunities to serve on a variety of teams (i.e., SSTs, ICU teams) or committees, according to both teachers and school leaders. For more on leadership opportunities, see the Human Resources and Professional Development section.

Both school committee members and district leaders reported that district leaders actively engage with the school committee and the broader school community to support district improvement efforts. For example, a district leader described the superintendent as having a “great collaborative relationship” with the town manager, meeting monthly with members of the Mansfield Educators Association, and generally being “well respected” in the community. District and town leaders agreed that they have strong working relationships, as evidenced by the town and district sharing a human resources director. The collaborative relationship between district leaders and Mansfield municipal leaders is a clear strength for the district.

Relatedly, the district has taken steps to establish clear communication channels and respond promptly to feedback from other school and community stakeholders. According to both parent and district interviews, the superintendent initiated quarterly listening sessions and engages with individual parents via email, demonstrating a high level of responsiveness. District and school leaders communicate to parents primarily through emails, newsletters, social media, and community events. However, some parents indicated challenges with the current communication structures, highlighting issues with accessibility for non-English speakers and people who struggle with technology. Making communication methods more accessible and inclusive for the broader community is an area of growth for the district.

### District and School Improvement Planning

School and district leaders generally agree that the district uses a clear, thoughtful, and inclusive process to develop its three-year district improvement plan and its annual school improvement plans, which is a strength of the district. According to Mansfield’s “District Improvement Plan 2023-2025,” the district has three priorities:

* Academic advancement for all students (largely through the adoption of DESE-approved curriculum)
* Capital improvements, as identified by the Facilities Assessment and Educational Visioning Study
* Following the district’s DEI Strategic Plan that resulted from the equity audit conducted by Mass Insight

According to interviews from school leaders, the process for creating the district improvement plan starts with the district’s leadership team reviewing data and assessing community needs. From there, district and school leaders divide and complete sections of the improvement plan. School plans come directly from the district’s improvement plan; school leaders described the process for taking district improvement goals and developing individual school improvement plans with input from faculty. For example, one school leader reported working with a school counselor to draft their section, whereas another school leader reported having their faculty complete an MTSS self-assessment for their planning. From there, school councils approve individual school improvement plans, and the superintendent then combines all the plans into an annual school improvement plan for the district.

Overall, school leaders’ ability to contribute to the district’s improvement plan, align the district improvement plan to their own school’s improvement plan, and customize their own improvement plan to fit their needs is a strength of the district. One school leader described the process of customizing the district plan for the individual school setting, explaining that “at each building it looks a little different, but faculty play a role in contributing what goes into that.” School committee leaders further corroborated how the superintendent embeds school improvement plans into the broader district plan, explaining “everything does a good job of tying together.” The final School Improvement Plan, embedded within the larger district improvement plan, summarizes the individual initiatives that schools plan to carry out related to adopting curriculum, pursuing professional development, and fostering social and behavioral growth. A document review demonstrated that all school improvement documents align with the larger district improvement plan and the district’s DEI Strategic Plan.

According to district and school leaders, the district presents multiple opportunities to involve stakeholders in the improvement planning. One district leader explained, “No matter what we do, there are a lot of people involved,” citing how the Facilities Assessment and Educational Visioning Study involved district leaders, school leaders, school committee members, and town officials. Likewise, both district leaders and parents affirmed that the strategic planning process that resulted in the district’s DEI Strategic Plan was “community-driven” and incorporated input from a diversity of school and community voices. Finally, a teacher-led vision planning committee, consisting of various parents and students from the middle and high schools, is currently drafting the district’s vision for DEI, which will then be presented to both the school committee and general school community for feedback.

Although opportunities for engagement exist, several groups of parents questioned the extent to which the district meaningfully incorporates their feedback into planning. For example, multiple parents serving on their school’s council reported that they received updates on improvement planning and the final plans, but they didn’t feel as if they were “really driving anything” or “making a huge contribution.” A review of school council and school committee meeting minutes and presentations confirm that the district provides improvement plan updates on a midyear basis, but requests for feedback appear limited. Teachers also indicated little awareness of the district’s ongoing improvement priorities. Meaningfully engaging stakeholders (e.g., parents, school staff, students) in and increasing their awareness of the district improvement process is an area of growth for the district.

### Budget Development

District leaders, school leaders, and school committee members articulated a collaborative budget development process that involves multiple school, district, and town stakeholders and focuses on maintaining level services. Both district and school leaders described a continuous, deliberate, and clearly defined process for budget development that begins in early fall when a member of the district’s business operations department sends out budget templates to school leaders and department heads at the middle and high schools. The superintendent and assistant superintendent of finance and operations then meet with every school leader to review their school-based budget, focusing first on addressing personnel needs and then “wish list” items. District leaders then compile the school budgets and other major cost centers (e.g., central office, facilities, special education) into one budget amount that they submit to the school committee for initial approval in December. In January, district leaders present the complete budget to the school committee and invite school leaders and department heads to present their portions of the budget. From there, the town and school committee then work together toward a budget amount to be presented at a town meeting in May.

Throughout the budget development process, school committee members and the superintendent regularly meet with town officials to ensure alignment between district and town priorities. As corroborated by school committee members and meeting minutes, the town’s finance committee, the school committee, and the select board will meet two to three times per budget cycle as a “Tri-Board.” Town officials, school committee members, and district leaders described the process of working with the town as extremely collaborative, with multiple stakeholders echoing a “one town, one budget” approach that ultimately integrates municipal and school department budgets into a single document, reflecting the shared priorities of both the town and the district. This close collaboration between district leaders, school committee members, and town officials concerning budget development is a strength for the district.

District administrators regularly track spending and other financial transactions and provide quarterly updates to the school committee, according to interviews and school committee meeting minutes. One district leader described the monitoring process as “easy” given the small size of the district and collaboration between the district’s business operations department and the town. This process is further supported by both the district and the town having access to the spending accounts on Munis, ensuring further transparency. Interviews with town officials also indicate that the district and, specifically, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations seek ways to expand capacity and resources, such as by negotiating a lower natural gas contract and working with the town to lower the cost of facilities. According to both district personnel and school committee members, school leaders regularly monitor their staffing to determine whether new positions are necessary. For example, at the time of the district review, the district recently added new EL specialists in response to the influx of migrant students. The district’s approach to financial monitoring and collaboration highlights their commitment to efficient resource management—a strength for the district.

Regarding the relationship between resource allocation and data use, some evidence, including budget presentations and interviews with district officials, suggests that district leaders actively use student enrollment projections to support budgeting and staffing decisions. For example, a district official described an annual review of student enrollment data to determine staffing, and school leaders described incorporating their school improvement priorities into their initial budget creation. However, school committee members, district personnel, and town officials stressed that needs and feedback identified by district and school leaders, rather than data or improvement goals, drive budgeting decisions. Likewise, limited evidence exists to suggest that leaders explicitly incorporate disaggregated student data into the budget or resource allocation process, with the intent of closing achievement, access, and opportunity gaps. Disaggregating student data to drive budgeting decisions is an area of growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should increase the community’s access to district communications, with a particular focus on non-English speaking members and those who struggle with technology.*
* *The district should refine its improvement planning process to incorporate greater opportunities for meaningful feedback from staff and community members.*
* *The district should revise its budgeting process to directly connect resource allocations to student need, data, and improvement goals.*

## Curriculum and Instruction

In accordance with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Mansfield strives to ensure equitable, inclusive, and effective instruction for all students. Curriculum and instruction are the responsibility of the assistant superintendent for teaching and learning and the director of curriculum and assessment, with support from the director and assistant directors of special education. Recognizing the importance of high-quality curricular materials, the district is actively working toward adopting new elementary mathematics and literacy curricula to create greater consistency and alignment across the two schools. At the middle and high schools, teachers are working to rewrite their curricula using UbD. School leaders and teachers have participated in professional development on UbD, and at the time of the district review, they were in the early stages of rewriting their curricula.

Mansfield offers a wide range of academic and nonacademic offerings that cater to the diverse needs and interests of its students and nurtures the whole child. At the middle school, the district provides three different levels of classes in mathematics to better target students’ needs. At the high school, district and school leaders have been working to expand students’ access to AP courses by lessening the prerequisite requirements, which have been a barrier for many students. However, instructional observations indicated that instructional expectations and rigorous instruction were not yet implemented consistently across all schools and classrooms.

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 |
| [Curriculum selection and use](#_Curriculum_Selection_and) | * The district has a well-defined process for critically reviewing and adopting curricular materials that includes a variety of stakeholder input and feedback.
* The district is working to rewrite all secondary curricula using the UbD framework.
 | * Selecting high-quality curricula
* Including opportunities to pilot curricula in the curricular adoption process
 |
| [Classroom instruction](#_Classroom_Instruction) | * Observation scores were in the high range across all grade bands for the classroom organization domain.
 | * Improving instructional supports, as seen through low-middle scores in the instructional support domain observed across all grade bands
* Addressing students’ social-emotional learning competencies across the district
 |
| [Student access to coursework](#_Student_Access_to) | * Mansfield High School has been expanding AP course offerings to improve student access to advanced learning opportunities.
* Mansfield has partnered with Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical High School for high school students who would like to participate in a career vocational technical education program.
 | * Providing access within the general education curriculum to rigorous, challenging work at the elementary level
* Shifting schedules and staffing at the middle school to accommodate enrichment opportunities without impeding on core instructional time
* Ensuring equitable access for all students to the various learning opportunities available within the district
 |

### Curriculum Selection and Use

According to a review of Mansfield’s curricula table, the district uses a combination of teacher-developed and published curricula. A review of Mansfield’s curricular materials revealed most schools and classrooms in the district currently use curricula that are not rated or do not meet expectations according to trusted curricular evaluation resources including CURATE and EdReports. Into Literature 2020 (eighth-grade ELA) was the only curriculum to receive an EdReports rating of meets expectation; no other curricula used by the district received a meets expectation rating. Three curricula considered core by the district—Journeys 2016 for early elementary ELA at Robinson Elementary, Big Ideas Math for the Algebra 2 honors course, and Holt McDougall Larson for the Geometry honors course—do not meet expectations according to EdReports. The current lack of highly rated curriculum according to CURATE and/or EdReports is a self-identified area of growth for the district.

The district is aware of these deficiencies and is actively working to address them. According to the 2023-2025 district improvement plan and district and school leader interviews, the district is currently adopting new, CURATE or EdReports-rated curricula in both mathematics and literacy at the elementary level and updating teacher-created curricula using the UbD format at the middle and high school levels. The district and school improvement plans present detailed timelines for reviewing and adopting new elementary curricula and for creating new curricula at the secondary level using UbD principles. The district has a well-defined process for evaluating and selecting new curricula that involves a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, and specialists on the advisory team. This team reviews multiple DESE-approved curricula, using an evaluative checklist to ensure that the curricula will meet their needs. This checklist, created by the district, examines topics such as academic rigor, potential content bias, and instructional design. The team also considers the local context and feedback from staff prior to making a final selection. Though the current curricula are not highly rated, the district is working to remediate the issue through the district’s review process, which is well-defined and inclusive. For that reason, the review process is considered a strength of the district.

However, the curricular adoption process does not currently include opportunities for staff to pilot the curricula under consideration, and some teachers expressed concern about this potential oversight. An elementary teacher explained as follows:

In the past, two of us would [pilot] one program and two of us would [pilot] another program and we had time to meet. We were able to meet with the staff and discuss our feedback. As the years have gone on, [the decision] has been less in our hands, even though we’re told it’s our choice, and more about the district’s choice.

Including opportunities for staff to pilot curricula as part of the curriculum review process is an area of growth.

At the time of the district review, the district had two separate advisory teams working on reviewing and selecting new elementary mathematics and literacy curricula. For mathematics, the process began in the 2022-2023 school year. According to the 2023-2025 district improvement plan, the team intends to select the curriculum during the 2023-2024 school year and implement it in both elementary schools starting in the 2024-2025 school year. A review of agendas and meeting notes shows that team members solicited feedback via surveys of staff at both elementary schools, reviewed programs on EdReports and CURATE, and discussed the strengths and weaknesses of different options as a group. As of July 2023, the group chose three finalists: Savvas (meets expectations according to CURATE), Origo (meets expectations according to EdReports), and Reveal (meets expectations according to EdReports), with a goal of making a final recommendation in mid-October; however, at the time of the district review, the final curriculum had not yet been selected because the two schools had differing opinions on which program they wanted to select. At the time of the district review, a similar process had just started for the elementary literacy curriculum, with selection planned for the 2024-2025 school year and implementation in the 2025-2026 school year.

Implementation of these new elementary curricula will take time, especially as teachers navigate learning two new programs in short succession. According to the Mansfield Curriculum Review document, once the new curricula have been finalized and purchased, the district will be convening an implementation team. This team will be responsible for setting goals and developing a success plan for implementation, including determining professional development needs and the need for instructional coaching and/or consulting. During interviews, district leaders acknowledged the need for teachers to have professional development to support implementation, although an implementation team had not yet convened because a curriculum had not yet been selected.

At the secondary level, teachers are working to create curricula using the UbD format. At the high school, all teachers attended professional development on UbD in fall 2023. Throughout this school year (2023-2024), teachers will continue their professional development while simultaneously working together to rework the curricula using UbD principles; at the time of the district review, this process was in its early stages. Teachers and district leaders both stated that their goal is to create unified curricula across all classrooms. Within this framework, teachers retain some autonomy to adapt curricula and include extra materials that they believe will benefit their students. All secondary curricula are on the district’s Google Drive and are readily accessible to staff.

### Classroom Instruction

Classroom observations revealed a strength in classroom organization throughout the district. As described previously (see Classroom Observations), across all grade levels, ratings within the classroom organization domain were generally in the high range. Observations provide evidence that rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and consistently reinforced by the teacher, and teachers provide a steady flow of activities to help the classroom run smoothly.

However, classroom observations also reveal that instructional support throughout the district is an area for growth. For all grade ranges, the overall Instructional Support domain scores were in the low-middle range. For Grades K-5, average scores for three of the six dimensions within this domain (Concept Development, Quality of Feedback, and Language Modeling) were in the low range. For Grades 6-8, one of the five dimensions within this domain (Analysis and Inquiry) was in the low range. For Grades 9-12, three of the five dimensions within this domain (Analysis and Inquiry, Quality of Feedback, and Instructional Dialogue) were in the low range. Observations provide evidence that teacher feedback tends to be more perfunctory, instead of providing opportunities for students to explain their thinking and reasoning for responses. In addition, students have few opportunities to engage in higher order thinking skills through novel or open-ended tasks.

When asked about the classroom environment and quality of instruction, most students noted variation across teachers. Middle school students reported that many of their classes were not interactive, with few opportunities to work in small groups; instead, the primary modes of instruction included lectures, watching videos, and completing worksheets independently. Further, some students indicated that some teachers didn’t know their names by the time of the district review in mid-October. At the high school, students spoke more positively of their teachers and the available learning opportunities. They reported that some courses are self-directed, with teachers mainly making themselves available to students who needed more help. Student opinion on this freedom varied, with some preferring the chance to work independently while others saw it as busy work. Students in both the middle and high school focus groups also reported that required texts tended not to be engaging and were “U.S.-centric” and “outdated.”

There is relatively little evidence of a common schoolwide vision for classroom instruction in each building. Elementary teachers and leaders report using a workshop model, in which teachers use a blend of whole-group and small-group instruction. At the middle and high schools, teachers in focus groups stated that no specific instructional model is required, and most teachers described having autonomy to choose their own mode of instruction.

Although Mansfield articulates the importance of developing students’ social and emotional competencies, these structures are not currently in place at all schools and in nascent piloting stages at others, which is an area for growth. At both elementary schools, the morning meeting is part of the school schedule to allow time for social-emotional learning. Last year, the district also purchased books for use during this time. At Jordan/Jackson Elementary School, the school adopted Everyday Speech as their social-emotional learning curriculum, although teachers questioned how consistently it is being used. At the middle school, both the school improvement plan and teachers mentioned that restorative circles are currently being piloted. In addition, as detailed in their improvement plan, Harold L. Qualters Middle School (QMS) intends to pilot and select a social-emotional learning curriculum during the 2023-2024 school year. The district does not currently have a universal social-emotional curriculum across all schools that uses “common language.” Various stakeholders identified this issue as a need in the district (see Tiered Systems of Support for more information).

Mansfield is highly invested in creating an instructional environment in which all students and staff feel recognized, safe, valued, and supported and have a strong sense of belonging. During the 2021-2022 school year, Mansfield undertook a DEI audit, led by Mass Education Insight & Research. As a result, the district released the DEI Strategic Plan 2022-2025 in May 2023. This report identified five focus areas for the district to achieve this vision: (a) cultivate a shared districtwide vision for DEI; (b) develop data-informed decision-making practices to ensure success for all students; (c) increase cultural competency understanding and practices; (d) increase student belonging, access, and support to foster a culture in which every student feels safe and included; and (e) develop inclusive communication methods and engagement with families/caregivers and community members. At the time of the district review, district leaders described some practices being in place, such as each school developing an ICU team to bring professional development on culturally responsive teaching to school staff. However, other teachers reported needing additional clarity on how the district is defining culturally responsive teaching practices, with some staff reporting that implementation of culturally responsive practices varies by teacher.

### Student Access to Coursework

At the elementary level, rigorous learning experiences primarily take place in the classroom through hands-on materials, differentiation, and small-group instruction. Students also participate in specials such as music, gym, art, and health. The district employs a music and art specialist, and district leaders said they are looking into extending science, technology, engineering, and mathematics labs to elementary classrooms in the future. Parents indicated that elementary students can sometimes also participate in clubs during recess and after school, but these opportunities are not offered consistently to younger students. Parents also expressed concern at the lack of opportunities for students who could use more advanced work. As one parent said, “If they’ve mastered the standards at their current grade, there’s nothing additional they can do.” Providing access within the general education curriculum to rigorous, challenging work is an area of growth for the district.

At the middle school, mathematics courses are offered at three levels: grade-level placement, enriched, and accelerated, with all other core courses offered at one level. According to the QMS Program of Studies, grade-level placement represents comprehensive, standards-based courses; enriched mathematics is similar to grade-level placement but delves deeper into mathematical concepts and moves at a more accelerated and rigorous pace; and accelerated mathematics is for students who have achieved mastery of the basic mathematical skills and concepts for their grade level and provides students with a deeper and more rigorous approach. Parents felt as if the different pathways were not well articulated in terms of which middle school courses lead into which high school courses and could be more clearly defined. According to the district’s improvement plan and district and school leaders, the middle school is also in the early stages of considering a fourth math level, called “Step Up” for students who want further advanced offerings. At the time of the district review, this level was still in the early planning stages, and a committee to further investigate the need for this offering had not yet been assembled.

Also at the middle school, students have a wide range of elective courses that foster their personal interests and talents. According to the QMS Program of Studies, courses outside the core include Spanish, French, physical education, health, visual and performing arts, student success, current events, science and engineering, identity and history, and computer applications. In focus groups, parents said they were impressed about the number of offerings, including the variety of student clubs.

However, at the middle school, music electives are not part of students’ schedules. According to teachers, nearly one third of the students are enrolled in a music elective; however, students are pulled from their core courses twice per week to participate. Because the middle school has a rotating schedule, the same core class is not impacted each time, but this practice still disrupts learning. Teachers explained that students are expected to stay after school to make up the work that they miss, but this does not happen consistently. Further, this expectation could be particularly burdensome for students who can’t stay after school because of extra familial responsibilities, such as caring for younger siblings. Given the number of students who participate in the music electives, shifting schedules and staffing to accommodate enrichment opportunities without impeding on core instructional time is an area for growth in the district.

At the high school, students have opportunities to participate in multiple advanced coursework opportunities, including 17 AP offerings, honors, and dual enrollment, described in the school’s program of studies. District and high school leaders have been expanding AP course offerings to improve student access to advanced learning opportunities, which is a strength of the district. To improve students’ access to AP opportunities, district and school leaders described how the school has been working to relax prerequisite requirements. School leaders examined student grades by those who had met the prerequisite requirements and those who did not. Through this analysis, they found that those who did not have the prerequisite requirements were still successful in AP courses.

According to DESE’s 2023 district profile, 65 percent of 11th and 12th graders completed at least one advanced course. Yet, according to DESE’s district profile, few of these students are high needs students (16 percent compared with 29 percent of all 11th and 12th graders), suggesting further room for improvement with expanding student access to advanced opportunities. The DEI Strategic Plan 2022-2025 also mentioned access to advanced opportunities, which identified inequities in course access as an issue for the district. Ensuring equitable access for all students to the various learning opportunities available is an ongoing area of growth for the district.

According to district leaders and the high school’s program of studies, the high school also partners with several local community colleges for seniors to participate in dual enrollment, allowing students to earn college credit toward a postsecondary diploma. Mansfield partners with Massasoit Community College, Bristol Community College, Stonehill College, and Bridgewater State University for students to enroll in preapproved, credit-bearing courses. All expenses for tuition, fees, and textbooks are the responsibility of the student and their family, which may limit some students’ access to these opportunities.

As detailed in the program of studies, high school students also have a wide range of elective courses that foster their personal interests and talents. Elective courses include additional offerings in core subjects (e.g., media studies, creative writing, astronomy, sociology), visual and performing arts (e.g., drama, dance and stage movement), business and technology (e.g., personal writing, entrepreneurship), health and wellness (e.g., strength & conditioning, yoga and fitness), and world languages (e.g., Hispanic culture, Portuguese culture). Students also have an opportunity to participate in experiential learning, such as internships, tutoring, and applied learning projects. Teacher and family focus groups both reported that more students desire to participate in internships than there are slots available.

For students interested in a career vocational technical education program, Mansfield has partnered with Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical High School. This partnership is a strength of the district, with students determining whether to enroll in the technical high school or Mansfield High School during their eighth-grade year.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should continue its review of existing curricula and shift to using high-quality instructional materials with students.*
* *Where feasible, the district should incorporate opportunities for teachers to pilot proposed curricula as part of the curriculum review process, as outlined in* [*DESE’s Implement MA Process Guide*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/rlo/instruction/implement-ma-process/story.html)*.*
* *The district should work with its school leaders and instructional leadership teams to address its low scores around instructional support (see Appendix B for greater detail).*
* *The district should continue its initial development of structures for students’ social-emotional competencies, with an eye towards alignment across grades and buildings.*
* *The district should offer differentiation within the classroom and provide enrichment opportunities for advanced learners at the elementary level.*
* *The district should expand its previous analysis around barriers to advanced coursework for its high needs students.*

## Assessment

In recent years, district leaders have been working to expand their capacity to collect and use data to drive continuous improvement efforts and instructional decisions. During the 2021-2022 school year, Mansfield adopted the Illuminate data platform to provide an easy-to-access tool for educators in Grades K-12. At the elementary and middle school levels, educators administer Acadience Math, FastBridge, DIBELS 8th, and Fountas & Pinnell BAS multiple times per year, in addition to other curriculum-based assessments. At the high school level, students complete some common assessments in specific courses and end-of-unit tests. District leaders, school leaders, and educators also review MCAS and ACCESS for ELs scores annually. The district is working to transparently share data with students and their families. Students and families can review student progress via Aspen, parent-teacher conferences, and report cards. For school staff, the district is still in the early stages of supporting teachers’ data use, which is an area of growth for the district.

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 |
| [Data and assessment systems](#_Data_and_Assessment) | * The district recently adopted the Illuminate data platform for Grades K-12 to track student progress and identify student needs in both ELA and mathematics.
 |  |
| [Data use](#_Data_Use) | * ELA and math curriculum teams are using Illuminate data to help guide curriculum decisions.
 | * Providing teachers with more time and support on data use to drive instructional decisions
 |
| [Sharing results](#_Sharing_Results) | * The district uses multiple methods for sharing student and program information with families throughout the school year.
 | * Increasing ongoing, two-way communication between schools and families that extends beyond sharing information with families (e.g., parent-teacher conferences)
 |

### Data and Assessment Systems

In recent years, district leaders have been working to improve the district’s capacity to use a variety of data and assessments. In May 2022, the district created the director of instruction and assessment position, which elevated the importance of data use. More recently, the district selected the FastBridge assessment to administer in Grades K-8 (ELA) and Grades 3-8 (mathematics); the 2023-2024 school year is the second year that the district is using this screening tool. According to the assessment calendars, elementary and middle school students take FastBridge three times per year: in September, January, and May. The district also administers Acadience (Grades K-2 in mathematics) as a primary screening assessment. School leaders report that they are discussing moving the early elementary mathematics screening to FastBridge as well to create greater vertical alignment and consistency.

According to the district’s assessment inventory, the elementary schools also use various other assessments, including FastBridge as a dyslexia screener, assessments tied to particular curricula (such as Journey’s unit assessments and Fountas & Pinnell BAS in Grades 3-5), common writing assessments, and end-of-term common assessments in Grades 3-5. In the middle school, students complete common writing assessments, grammar tests, and regular chapter and unit assessments. The high school does not currently have a common screening tool for all subjects or grades. Instead, students complete common grammar and writing assessments (in ELA), common mini-constructed responses (in Algebra 1, Algebra 2, and Geometry), and end-of-year examinations. Additional data sources examined annually include MCAS and ACCESS for ELs results. The district does not currently have a social-emotional screening tool at any grade level.

According to district leaders, the Illuminate system has greatly improved the district’s ability to use data in a timely manner to inform instructional decisions and is a strength of the district. Illuminate is the common platform for all online assessment tools, and it connects with the district’s student information system. This platform updates nightly with data from all assessment sources, including MCAS. School staff can log in using their staff Google account to see the latest information. A district leader explained the power of this new system as follows: “[Illuminate] allows us to get down to a granular level in our data quickly. . . . We’re able to take our data, see what we need to see, and make decisions based on that.” The platform also allows district leaders to send reports to teachers specific to their individual needs. For example, after receiving MCAS results for the 2022-2023 school year, the district pushed out reports to each teacher showing how their current students performed so they could make better decisions about the needs of the students in front of them.

### Data Use

District leaders spoke about their vision of educators using data to drive continuous improvement efforts and guide instructional practices. The importance of data use is highlighted in the district’s DEI Strategic Plan, as emphasized in the second priority to “develop data-informed decision-making practices to ensure success for all students.” Data use is also emphasized in the district’s District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP).

Utilization of Illuminate data has enabled the curriculum adoption teams to be more data-driven, a strength for the district. According to district leaders, the Illuminate system allows district leaders, school leaders, and teachers to examine student data in a variety of ways, to track individual students and look at overall patterns of learning. For example, district leaders described using data within the Illuminate platform to guide the curriculum adoption process at the elementary level. A district leader explained this as follows:

We have taken a data-driven approach to the [curriculum review] so we are very informed, especially at the K-2 level, about where our current program is not meeting our needs. That area is in phonics, especially at the K-1 level, and that is well demonstrated in our data. It’s not that we weren’t using an [early literacy] screener previously, but now our data is very, very accessible, in a way that we previously couldn’t get to as a whole group. We are able to see things differently [now]; . . . [through] the curriculum adoption work, we will be able to tell teachers that these are our gaps and here is how this new curriculum is going to help.

District leaders also intend for school staff to use data for continuous improvement efforts. For example, QMS conducted a review of students who did not meet expectations in mathematics and/or ELA on the 2023 MCAS assessment, summarized in an Achievement Gaps Summary report. The team considered potential barriers to success, including (a) sense of belonging and transience because nearly one quarter of students not meeting expectations in mathematics had been in the district for one or two years; (b) communication and planning between special and general education teachers because about one third of students represented in the data received small-group instruction in one or more subjects; (c) access to community and school resources because many families would benefit from accessing community and school resources but do not know what is available, have time constraints, or cannot access these resources because of their location or a lack of transportation; and (d) parent and student beliefs about education, such as cultural beliefs about the role of education or stigmas regarding special education. The report went on to suggest both short- and long-term solutions (e.g., piloting an advisor block, setting up a buddy system for peer mentoring, additional tutoring opportunities). It also presented a long-term plan to improve family engagement.

District leaders expect teachers to use data to make quick, real-time decisions to adjust instruction and identify which students need what supports. “We don’t want to wait to address gaps two years from now,” a district leader explained. This statement is reinforced through the district’s DCAP, which states how “data from the screeners, as well as MCAS data, school-based common assessments, and formative assessments is used to drive instructional practices and to identify students requiring intervention.” However, elementary and middle school teachers described how they are still learning the FastBridge system and getting used to incorporating data into their planning. Teachers in focus groups report that many educators primarily use data to identify students for tiered supports (see Tiered Systems of Supports).

To improve teachers’ data use, teachers would like more time and support, an area of growth for the district. For example, multiple elementary teachers suggested a desire for more training on how best to use these data. At the high school, teachers reported a less formal expectation of regular data use, describing it as “supplemental” and varying by teacher and subject area. Teachers also described varying opportunities to meet to review and discuss data together, with some meeting during lunch or after school.

### Sharing Results

All elementary, middle and high school instructional staff have access to the Illuminate system, which is updated nightly. As previously described, district leaders also send reports to teachers on a regular basis to better enable them to use data within their classrooms.

Elementary parents in focus groups described communication about how their child is doing as primarily driven by the classroom teacher and information sent home (e.g., reviewing worksheets completed in class). As one parent described, “the fact that [student] work comes home in a timely manner and you can see the steady stream of all the work that they’re doing in class, that’s very helpful.” Middle and high school parents and families have access to their student’s Aspen platform, the online student information portal, by using their child’s login. The Aspen platform is easily accessible on the district’s website. Across all schools, parents also receive feedback through report cards and during parent-teacher conferences.

For students in Grades K-3, school leaders and staff described how some families receive a FAST Family Report, produced using the FastBridge system. According to a review of a sample FAST Family Report, the report provides information on a student’s performance, showing whether the student is at high risk, some risk, or on track for each assessment, as well as the student’s percentile compared with other students within the district and across the country. The report also includes a section for the student’s score changes across time. To help parents interpret the report, the school shares a supplemental guide to reading and understanding the report. For students identified as high risk, school leaders and specialists described how the elementary and middle schools send additional information home and describe the intervention plan for the student. This notification describes the identification process, what intervention the child will be receiving, who they’ll be working with, and contact information for more questions. These multiple methods for sharing student and program information with families throughout the school year are a strength of the district.

One area for growth identified across parent focus groups was the need for meaningful, two-way communication between schools and families. This area was exemplified by parent reports about the need to extend parent-teacher conferences at the middle and high schools. According to parents, each parent-teacher conference is about five minutes long, which is further limited by the time needed for transitions between classrooms. Parents felt as though these conferences were “very metric driven,” which given that parents have easy access to Aspen to see these data - is not very useful. One parent elaborated, “I want to hear how [my child is] doing socially, how they are thriving, what’s making them tick, things like that. You can’t do that in five minutes.” Further, at the high school level, some parents reported that if their child is doing well in class, teachers ask them not to come to the parent-teacher conferences so that more time is available for other students who are not doing as well in class. These reports highlight the need for ongoing, two-way communication between schools and families that extends beyond sharing information with families by providing them with greater availability for opportunities to meet and discuss questions and concerns.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should provide greater structure and support around teacher data use, which might include standardizing data use expectations, additional trainings, the implementation of data teams, and greater time for staff to review data.*
* *Where feasible, in partnership with middle and high school teachers and leaders, the district should collaborate to identify additional opportunities for teachers to meet with families and actively engage them in their children’s learning.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

Mansfield’s human resources department is a shared office between the town and the district. This configuration helps to standardize hiring and onboarding procedures. The human resources department responds to job requisition forms and works in collaboration with district and school leaders to determine if the proposed position is fiscally responsible and necessary. If there is a determined need, the human resources department will post the position to a variety of different online platforms including SchoolSpring, The Teachers’ Lounge, and the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity in Education.

The district has a comprehensive mentorship program for teachers during their first two years in the district that involves stipends for volunteer mentor teachers. Teachers have numerous opportunities to become involved in leadership within the district, including being a mentor teacher, volunteering to serve on the curriculum adoption teams, serving on a variety of committees, and joining the ICU team at their school.

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 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Infrastructure](#_Infrastructure) | * The human resources department is shared by the school district and town, allowing for improved efficiency and greater consistency in policies and procedures.
 | * Transitioning to Munis for recruitment, performance management, and other HR data to improve efficiency
 |
| [Recruitment, hiring, and assignment](#_Recruitment,_Hiring,_and) | * The superintendent is actively involved in all hiring decisions across the district, including interviewing final candidates and making job offers.
 | * Continuing to expand efforts to improve and diversify the teacher and leader workforce
* Creating district-level guidance for hiring committees, including an emphasis on parent and student representation
 |
| [Supervision, evaluation, and educator development](#_Supervision,_Evaluation,_and) | * The district’s mentorship program is well defined and comprehensive to support new teachers during their first and second years in the district.
 | * Providing evaluators with adequate time to complete evaluations and classroom observations and provide actionable feedback
* Differentiating professional development opportunities to better meet the learning needs of educators across the district
 |
| [Recognition, leadership development, and advancement](#_Recognition,_Leadership_Development) | * The district provides many opportunities for participation in meaningful teacher leadership activities (e.g., serving as mentor teachers, participating on various committees).
 | * Creating districtwide formal structures to recognize strong teacher performance
 |

### Infrastructure

Three staff members manage Mansfield’s human resource department: a director of human resources, who is a member of the central office administration and reports directly to both the superintendent and the town manager; a human resources specialist; and a human resources assistant. These three staff collaborate to support current and potential employees within the district in several ways, including collaborating with district administration to approve job requisition requests submitted by hiring managers through Frevvo, creating job postings for approved job requisitions both internally and externally through SchoolSpring and the Massachusetts Partnerships for Diversity in Education, onboarding new hires, and completing the orientation process for new hires. In addition, the human resources staff sends all new employee information to the payroll department and they enter the information into the current payroll system (Millennium).

In addition to supporting current and potential employees within the district, the human resources department also provides similar services for the town, including creating job postings, onboarding new hires, completing the orientation process, and “anything else involved with supporting employees once they are on board.” For years, the human resources department in Mansfield has worked to standardize language and procedures across both the district and the town for job vacancy postings, onboarding, and orientation. Mansfield’s human resources department has created documentation on standard operating procedures for filling vacant positions and new employee orientation. They also created an onboarding checklist to standardize human resources procedures. The fact that the human resources department is a shared responsibility between the district and the town allows for improved efficiency and greater consistency in policies and procedures, which is a strength of the district.

In terms of collaboration between the human resources department and school staff, the human resources department is generally a step removed from school-based monitoring, evaluation, and decision making. For example, the human resources department is not involved in determining schools’ hiring needs or in managing staff assignments within and across schools; school leaders are responsible for managing these processes (see Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment). Likewise, the human resources department does not have a role in supporting employee evaluations: those are completed by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning (see Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development).

One reported area for growth within Mansfield’s human resources department is developing a comprehensive Human Resources Information System (HRIS) for recruitment, performance management, learning and development, and compliance. Currently, the district uses multiple spreadsheets for managing this data for the district. Because Mansfield is a small district, this process is doable; however, human resources personnel described the process as tedious and cumbersome. In the upcoming year, the district and town will soon switch to implementing Munis to house their data.

In addition to the spreadsheets used to house HR information, the district also uses Vector Solutions (formerly known as Teachpoint) to house evaluation information. The Vector Solutions system maintains and notifies evaluators of tasks due regarding evaluation timelines, though the human resources department is not involved in the district’s evaluation process (see Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development).

### Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

Staffing needs are determined and monitored by school-based hiring managers at each building (e.g., principals), and the human resources department collaborates with hiring managers to maintain needed staffing levels within the district. The hiring process starts when hiring managers submit a job requisition form using Frevvo. To guide hiring managers through this process, the human resources department prepared a 14-page *Frevvo User Guide* to inform the process of submitting a job requisition form. The completed job requisition form then goes to the assistant superintendent of finance and operations and the financial operations supervisor to ensure that the new position is funded. Once complete, the human resources department creates a job posting both internally and externally, according to the specifications required by the Mansfield Educators Association contract for that position. Internally, a new job posting is emailed to current staff within the district according to a standardized sample internal job posting. Externally, a job position is posted on SchoolSpring, Teacher’s Lounge, and the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity in Education, each according to standardized sample job postings for the respective external platform.

The district has been focused on improving the diversity of their educator workforce, which was an area of focus during the equity audit conducted by Mass Insight last year. Currently, district leaders reported that they would like to diversify, but they have not yet identified any specific targets of diversification. The human resources department attempts to recruit candidates from Teacher’s Lounge and the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity in Education, two platforms catered toward a diverse candidate pool. These two online platforms are the primary ways in which the district tries to diversify the workforce. Reportedly, the district had some initial successes this year using those two platforms to hire for open paraprofessional and substitute positions. District leaders also noted not having a mechanism for tracking how the demographics of their employee workforce compares with their student population, although staffing data by race and ethnicity is publicly available on DESE’s website. According to DESE’s Employed Educators Report for 2023, 97 percent of administrators and 96 percent of teachers are White, compared with 76 percent of all students identifying as White. Overall, diversifying the teacher and leader workforce continues to be an area for growth in Mansfield.

Across the district, after positions are created and candidates identified, hiring committees (for both administrator and teacher positions) assemble to determine which candidate would be an ideal employee within a school. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning are also involved in the hiring committees. District leaders reported having no district-level guidance on the composition of these hiring committees, and the composition is determined by the hiring manager. This generally gives principals “a lot of autonomy with the hiring.” In an effort to standardize hiring practices, the human resources department has given trainings to hiring committees about what they can and cannot do and ask during an interview. Human resources reportedly conducts these trainings a few times per year on either a committee-specific basis or on a large-scale basis during administrator meetings. Creating district-level guidance for hiring committees would allow for greater consistency across schools and is an area of growth for the district.

In all cases, the superintendent interviews final candidates before an offer is made. As district leaders reported, “[The superintendent] interviews every single candidate for a teaching position in the district.” The superintendent’s assistant checks a candidate’s licensure leading up to hire, and also manages the process to make sure that all teachers hired have active licenses in the content and levels they are being hired for. Employees are hired for specific positions and subject areas within schools, and teacher assignments are determined at the time of hire. Generally, teachers stay within the subject area and grade level for which they were hired, and the human resources department does not monitor teacher assignment within the district. Once the candidate has completed the interview process and licensure requirements are confirmed, the superintendent makes the final hiring decision, considering input of the hiring manager and committee. The active involvement of the superintendent within the hiring process allows for new teachers to begin forming a relationship with the superintendent and is an area of strength for the district.

### Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

The superintendent and the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning lead the educator supervision and evaluation process for the district. To prepare evaluators across the district, both individuals co-lead trainings on how to become an evaluator and how to conduct classroom observations. Overall, the evaluation process differs for teachers who have been with the district for under four years and those who have been with the district for more than four years. Teachers who have been in the district less than four years have observations in their classrooms four times a year, and each year these teachers must set SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goals for themselves, prepare a self-assessment, and get approval from their administrator on their goals and objectives throughout their evaluation process. After four years in the district, district leaders and teachers reported that the evaluation process has become more self-directed. After the first four years, teachers write their SMART goals for review on a two-year cycle, and in the second year of each evaluation cycle, the evaluator observes teachers in their classrooms.

Overall, teachers reported challenges with receiving actionable feedback from their evaluators through the evaluation system. Teachers noted that administrators had “a lot on their plates,” with limited opportunities for evaluators to check in with teachers and provide informal feedback to them because they are so busy. Teachers in focus groups repeatedly mentioned that it was a common practice within the district to elect to have peer teacher evaluations as a part of their formalized evaluation process. Reportedly, teachers “are not afraid to ask for help” or for another teacher to come alongside and support them in their development. Evaluators reportedly are often so busy that teachers do not feel formally recognized for their growth in the classroom.

In addition, within the formal evaluation process, multiple teachers in focus groups commented that evaluators rarely give out the “exemplary” rating under the evaluation system, and educators are consistently rated “proficient,” despite self-reported growth in their teaching. Conversely, some teachers in focus groups voiced that when teachers were recognized as needing improvement and placed on targeted plans, they were not given the opportunity and the support necessary to improve their teaching before they exited the district. Teachers in focus groups reported that they “lost many great colleagues” because the district did not invest time in them to help them grow. Overall, providing evaluators with adequate time to complete thorough evaluations, classroom observations, and actionable feedback is an area for growth in the district.

District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently completed using Vector Solutions. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample of 10 percent of 156 Professional Teacher Status teachers (16 teachers) due for summative evaluations for the 2022-2023 school year. All teacher evaluations selected for review (100 percent) had summative evaluation available for review. However, only 10 of the teacher evaluations (63 percent) were complete and included required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. A majority of the teacher evaluations reviewed (14 of 16) included both student learning and professional practice SMART goals; however, the goals are inconsistently included in the summative evaluation report. Only five of the student learning and professional goals were on the summative evaluation report, whereas the other nine appeared only on the goal-setting form. More than half of the evaluations reviewed (10 of 16) included multiple sources of evidence, such as artifacts of planning or instruction, observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. Nearly all summative evaluations (15 of 16) included feedback for each standard and feedback naming strengths or practices the teacher should continue, whereas only two evaluations included feedback indicating areas of improvement.

Administration evaluations are also consistently completed using Vector Solutions. Of the 18 administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2022-2023 school year, all (100 percent) were available for review and complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Of the summative evaluations reviewed, a majority (15 of 18) included student learning and professional practice SMART goals and 14 of 18 included school improvement goals. None of the evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards.[[6]](#footnote-7) All summative evaluations (18) included feedback for each standard, providing administrators with specific, actionable feedback identifying each administrator’s strengths. However, less than half of the evaluator’s feedback (6 of 18) identified areas of improvement for administrative district staff.

Aside from the formal evaluation process, school leaders conduct some informal observations to monitor teaching and learning. However, teachers in focus groups reported wanting more ongoing feedback to improve their teaching practices, and school and teacher leaders reported barriers to being in classrooms regularly (e.g., lack of time). As a teacher summarized, “there is a lot to manage for administrators. . .; there’s not enough time to check-in with teachers on how it is going. They’re just too busy and there aren’t enough of them.” In addition, administrators noted challenges regarding how much time they are in a classroom and when it would constitute a formal evaluation. A teacher leader summarized:

The longer [administrators] stay [in a classroom], the more it could be perceived as a formal observation, and we only get one every two years [depending on how long a teacher has been in the district]. So, administrators have to be careful about that.

At the middle and high schools, department heads also conduct informal observations and provide feedback, although according to teachers, this is primarily driven by teacher request. Teachers also reported that the department heads primarily work with newer teachers who have been in the district for less than two years.

Taken together, the review of teacher and administrator evaluations and staff feedback during focus groups demonstrate that while the district frequently highlights educators’ strengths in the evaluation process, there are critical gaps in the evaluation process and the feedback provided to educators. Providing evaluators with adequate time to complete evaluations and classroom observations, and providing actionable feedback, is an area of growth for the district.

In terms of professional development, according to the professional development handbook, Mansfield provides two full days and four half-days of in-district professional development per year. One full professional development day occurs at the beginning of each school year for a back-to-school orientation of all staff. The four early release days are coordinated by each school administrative team in consultation with the assistant superintendent for teaching and learning and the director of instruction and assessment. According to the district’s professional development handbook, district and school improvement plans’ goals and objectives guide all in-district professional development activities. These professional development opportunities cover several topics that vary from year to year, with 2023’s professional development options including CALM training for special education on de-escalation strategies, Fostering Therapeutic Classrooms for paraprofessionals, a Safe Schools presentation by DESE geared toward fostering inclusivity with the district’s LGBTQ community, and behavior management training. District leaders reported that after each professional development workshop or collaboration time, participants evaluate the professional development opportunity in a survey. District leaders reported that district staff analyze the results from these surveys, and these evaluations help guide the district’s future professional development.

However, teachers reported that the professional development opportunities at times “felt random” and did not appear to target teachers’ actual needs within the classrooms, indicating an area of growth for the district. As a teacher summarized, “professional development has not been great over the past few years; . . . the content often felt like preaching to the choir.” According to teachers, this sentiment is particularly relevant to professional development on reading instruction. In addition, teachers reported that presenters often have examples at the secondary level with fewer examples at the elementary level. “This makes it hard to extrapolate takeaways,” a teacher summarized. Overall, a continued area for growth in Mansfield is differentiating professional development opportunities to better meet the learning needs of educators across the district.

To support new teachers during their first and second years in Mansfield, the district has a well-defined and comprehensive mentorship program, which is a strength of the district. According to the 2023-2024 Mentor Expectations document, mentors volunteer for this position within the district and receive a stipend for their work, which was $2,104 for the 2023-2024 school year. As described by district and school leaders in focus groups, each principal pairs the mentor and mentee teachers together. Before becoming a mentor, mentors participate in a two-hour training to prepare for their role. Within the role, mentors must conduct at least 30 hours of one-on-one support for their mentees and complete their mentor log. Mentors also must observe their mentees for at least one hour total, and mentees must observe their mentors for at least one hour total. In addition, the mentor teacher must attend at least two New Teacher Induction Program Meetings with their mentee per year.

### Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Teachers have multiple opportunities to lead in the district, several of which receive stipends, a strength for the district. As mentioned previously, teachers can lead by volunteering to be a mentor teacher within the district. As detailed in several documents, teachers also can volunteer to serve on district-level panels that evaluate and rate high-quality curricular materials for Mansfield to consider for their classrooms as well as volunteer to join the ICU team at their school to help foster a sense of belonging at the school and develop activities and events to increase sense of belonging and representation.

In terms of recognition, district documents described a 2023 retiree reception to honor staff for their work in Mansfield. In addition, the district recognizes continuing exemplary staff throughout the district by their partnership with MassCUE, an organization focused on digital teaching and learning that recognizes exemplary teachers who employ digital teaching and learning practices in their classroom. MassCUE recognizes these teachers through their monthly featured educator award. According to district newsletters, several of Mansfield’s exemplary educators have been spotlighted as monthly featured educators, with a school leader and teacher from Jordan/Jackson Elementary School announced as a “MassCUE Featured Educator” in 2023. In addition to the newsletter, the district sends a monthly email update to teachers, which includes recognition for teachers throughout the district who have received formal awards, such as a MassCUE Featured Educator, or for receiving stand-alone awards or recognitions, such as the Career Compass Award by Knowledge Matters, which was awarded to a Mansfield teacher in 2023, along with a $5,000 software grant for the MHS Business Department.

At the school level, a couple of schools reported having their own methods of recognizing excellence, such as teacher-nominated shout-outs. For example, according to documentation, Robinson Elementary School has a weekly Google form for “Thankful Thursday,” which gives teachers the opportunity to “shout out” their colleagues for their help and support. In addition, according to documentation, QMS has a daily faculty newsletter, which includes a staff recognition component. Mansfield High School has a monthly Staff Excellence Form, which they include in their weekly newsletter so that students and families from the high school can nominate school staff. They also include this nomination form in the Monday Memo so that staff can nominate each other as well. As described by an informative pamphlet, “this award is meant to recognize two members of the Mansfield High School staff who provide extraordinary service to the school community.”

Despite these various mechanisms to recognize exemplary teachers within the district, teachers across all schools agreed that an area for growth for the district is creating formal structures to recognize strong teacher performance. Creating districtwide formal recognition, including opportunities for parent and student involvement, is an area of growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should work closely with its municipal colleagues to ensure a smooth transition to Munis as its new HRIS.*
* *Where feasible, the district should expand its efforts to improve and diversify the teacher and leader workforce to better mirror its student body.*
* *The district should consider creating district-wide guidelines for interview committee selection and interview protocols, and incorporate student or family perspective where feasible.*
* *The district should brainstorm possible solutions to provide evaluators with more time to give instructional staff feedback and support.*
* *The district should set expectations around incorporating greater levels of constructive feedback on evaluations for both teachers and administrators.*
* *The district should utilize instructional observation data to inform professional development topics.*
* *The district should establish more consistent, formal structures of recognition for strong teacher performance that involve parents and students.*

## Student Support

As discussed in previous sections, Mansfield engaged in a comprehensive Equity Audit that informed the development of a strategic plan for incorporating equitable student supports across the district. The resulting DEI Strategic Plan identified five areas of focus for the district:

* Cultivate a shared district-wide culture of and vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in Mansfield Public Schools.
* Data-informed decision-making to ensure successes for all students.
* Increase cultural competency understanding and practices to move Mansfield Public Schools across the continuum of cultural proficiency.
* Increase student belonging, access, and support to foster a culture where every student feels safe and included.
* Inclusive communication and engagement with families, caregivers, and community in support of success for all students.

The district has since implemented strategies and structures aligned with this strategic plan, including creating the aforementioned school-based ICU teams, strengthening the district’s MTSS, providing professional development related to trauma-informed practices and social-emotional learning, and identifying supports for the increasing number of ELs and their families. These initiatives provide evidence of the district’s commitment to supporting students and families.

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 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Safe and supportive school climate and culture](#_Safe_and_Supportive) | * School-based ICU teams promote school and classroom environments that are supportive, culturally responsive, and respectful of all students.
* The district provides meaningful opportunities for student engagement and leadership.
* The district implemented trauma-informed approaches for student behavior.
 | * Improving the culture and climate of the middle and high schools so that all students feel safe, supported, and welcomed
* Monitoring the implementation of behavioral management and discipline policies for equitable enforcement at the secondary level
 |
| [Tiered systems of support](#_Tiered_Systems_of) | * The district provides tiered supports across all schools, including a building curriculum accommodation plan that outlines strategies for differentiation and accommodation to support inclusive learning environments.
* Each school has a problem-solving team (e.g., SST, Mega, MTSS team) to assess data and make decisions about interventions for students.
 | * Making sure that teachers and instructional staff have sufficient social-emotional learning supports
* Improving two-way communication with parents, students, and staff about the academic, behavioral, and mental health supports available
 |
| [Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships](#_Family,_Student,_and) | * The district encourages a variety of ways for families to engage with the district, including through parent organizations (e.g., Mansfield Elementary School Association, parent advisory council) and other district committees.
* The district leverages a variety of partnerships providing wraparound and holistic student supports.
 | * Advertising leadership and engagement opportunities that are meaningful, authentic, and accessible to the general community
 |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

The district demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging for all students, staff, and families. Aligned with the DEI Strategic Plan’s focus on improving cultural competence and sense of belonging, the district has implemented several initiatives related to school climate, including creating school-based ICU teams; providing professional development in areas related to trauma-informed care, cultural competency, DEI, and substance abuse; administering cultural perception surveys to students, parents, and faculty; and promoting clubs, programs, and initiatives that elevate student voice and celebrate cultural heritage. Although students and parents generally demonstrated awareness of these initiatives, they acknowledged that more work is necessary, especially in recognizing and celebrating diverse backgrounds and identities.

According to district leaders and teacher focus groups, the school-based ICUs play a critical role in facilitating initiatives related to sense of belonging and cultural competency. Across schools, ICU teams have engaged in various activities, including analyzing DESE’s View of Climate and Learning (VOCAL) and cultural perception survey data and receiving specialized professional development on cultural proficiency. The district’s goal is to share their learnings with the broader school faculty through a “train-the-trainer” model. Support specialists generally spoke positively about their school’s ICU teams, with one support specialist explaining as follows:

We do have an inclusivity team, and I will say that I’ve noticed a difference just in the [climate], in terms of just even the visuals in the building and that has helped out tremendously . . . to bring us together in that regard and to just put action to plan in a different way than we were anticipating.

The ICUs’ role in promoting positive school and classroom and enhancing staff capacity to examine and dismantle biases represents a strength of the district.

According to teachers, students, and parents across schools, the district provides meaningful student engagement and leadership experiences, which is a strength of the district. For example, students and support staff at the high school reported that creating clubs is a relatively easy process. Examples such as the Black Student Alliance at the high school or the diversity club and the I-Care program at the elementary schools illustrate how clubs and programs can create spaces for students from different backgrounds to connect with and support each other. Both students and parents also praised the “A World of Difference” Institute opportunity for providing meaningful leadership experiences and cultural competency at the high school. Finally, interviews with students and district documents confirm the creation of the Student Voice Summit, which provides opportunities for a select group of high school students to meet and discuss various problems or concerns within the school.

VOCAL results indicate an overall school climate score in the “favorable” range (51 to 70, with a maximum score of 100). There were some important exceptions, including at the middle and high schools where overall scores and scores for each student subgroup were in the “somewhat favorable range” (31 to 50). Analysis of CLASS data also show slight variations in the extent to which students, staff, and faculty feel supported across school levels. For example, Positive Climate scores were higher at the elementary levels (averaging 6.0, with a maximum of 7.0) versus the middle (5.6) and high schools (4.5), indicating room for improvement in establishing strong school climates at the middle and high schools.

Interviews with district leaders and support staff and a review of school improvement plans demonstrate the district’s commitment to implementing trauma-informed and positive behavioral practices. For example, support specialists at the middle and high schools identified how they are addressing chronic student absences through tiered interventions. As reported by district leaders, parents, and support staff, the elementary schools have begun implementing elements of positive behavioral interventions and supports, although the system has not been formally adopted in the district. Likewise, the middle school formally adopted restorative practices, including restorative circles to address behavioral conflicts. Finally, the district implemented various support services, such as counseling and professional development about trauma-informed care, to support students’ general mental health. The district’s commitment to using trauma-informed approaches for student behavior is a strength for the district.

Relatedly, CLASS data included high marks for Behavioral Management, with averages in the high range (6.3-6.6) across grade levels, suggesting that rules and guidelines for behavior are generally clear and consistently reinforced by teachers. However, both parents and students in the middle and high schools reported that behavioral consequences may not be consistently enforced, with some students being disproportionally disciplined. As one parent explained,

I’ve heard a lot of very real and very specific incidents, and it’s from all different people from the different schools, and they all very much report that they do not feel like everybody is treated the same. There definitely is a general feeling that there are certain people that get on a radar and that follows them from school to school to school and they can’t shake it, regardless of whether their circumstances or behaviors changed.

District leaders acknowledged that although they are building systems to analyze and identify disproportionality in discipline data, more work still is necessary in that area. Monitoring the implementation of behavioral management and discipline policies for equitable enforcement, particularly at the secondary level, is an area of growth for the district.

### Tiered Systems of Support

The district’s provision of tiered supports across all schools is a strength of the district. Mansfield’s DCAP explicitly delineates the supports in place across all schools to address students’ academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs. Each school developed their own building curriculum accommodation plan, which outlines Tier 1 accommodations and strategies for differentiation to support inclusive learning environments. According to interviews with district leaders and support specialists, both elementary schools provide remedial, small-group instruction for mathematics and literacy, including both targeted skill interventions (Tier 2) and intensive, individualized interventions (Tier 3). In addition, the elementary schools have begun implementing a Tier 1 social-emotional learning program, which focuses on promoting positive social-emotional skills for all students. In addition to supporting Tier 1 classroom and behavioral accommodations at the middle school, QMS provides a Tier 2 academic intervention and an afterschool extra help program, along with Tier 3 reading specialists, mathematics interventions, and an Academic Learning Center. At the high school, district leaders and support specialists reported offering a variety of tiered support, including an academic support center (Tier 2), co-taught classes with special education and general education teachers (Tier 3), and the Bridge Transition program for students returning from extended absence (also Tier 3). Across all schools, the Behavioral and Emotional Social Skills Training program (Tier 3 support) provides social-emotional support to a targeted group of students. The district also has demonstrated its commitment to supporting the use of tiered models, such as offering professional development about MTSS and trauma-informed practices. Finally, the district has added more support staff, including EL specialists, psychologists, and Board-Certified Behavioral Analysts.

As evidenced by interviews with teachers and support specialists and a document review, each school has a systematic process for assigning tiered interventions and supports, reviewing data, and monitoring effectiveness. For example, each school has its own version of an SST or MTSS team, which consists of a variety of administrators, guidance counselors, teachers, and support specialists. These teams meet on a regular (either weekly or biweekly) basis to review referrals, decide appropriate interventions, and monitor progress. The referral process at each school begins when a teacher or a counselor identifies a student in need of support and submits their school’s referral form. From there, the team sends a data collection form to all the student’s teachers and counselors, which captures information such as the observed concerns, any data to support the concern, and interventions used. Teachers also are expected to reach out and notify parents of the need for an intervention (see Sharing Results section). MTSS teams or SSTs then review data, create an intervention plan, and review the plan in a cycle varying from four to eight weeks, depending on the school. The district’s structured process for assigning interventions, including the use of problem-solving teams composed of a variety of perspectives, is another strength for the district.

Interviewed school staff generally indicated an awareness of the supports available, but some provided mixed feedback on the usefulness and availability of the supports. One elementary teacher explained that “our SST is great, but the process we have in place isn’t great,” citing concerns that interventions overly focused on academics to the detriment of mental health. Likewise, teachers and support specialists at the elementary and middle schools noted a need for more social-emotional learning resources, trainings, and interventions to support the rise in student behaviors not aligned with school expectations. As another teacher explained,

We’ve been desperately trying to figure out how to manage those increasing aggressive behaviors. . . . I feel like that’s what we need to work on. I feel like we have a great place for the academically struggling children; it’s the behaviorally struggling children that I feel like we need perhaps more support, more guidance, more training.

Teachers and support specialists across all schools also reported concerns with the social-emotional learning curricula available at the elementary schools, or the lack of a formal social-emotional learning curriculum at the middle and high schools (see Classroom Instruction section). Making sure that teachers and instructional staff have sufficient social-emotional learning supports is an area of growth for the district.

Although parents largely provided positive feedback on the MTSS supports available, several parents raised concerns about communication issues within the MTSS process, such as a lack of information about behavioral plans, insufficient communication for students identified as at risk or struggling, and a disconnect in understanding the referral processes for a 504 or an IEP. Likewise, students at the high school reported that students are generally unaware of what mental health supports are available, and an MTSS self-assessment conducted by the high school found that interventions sometimes are “not well publicized among staff.” Improving two-way communication with parents, students, and staff about the academic, behavioral, and mental health supports available is an area of growth for the district.

### Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

As evidenced by interviews with district leaders, support specialists, and parents, Mansfield recognizes the importance of and has established opportunities toward engaging parents, families, and community partners. Both district leaders and parents reported multiple opportunities for parent engagement and leadership, such as participating in improvement planning and/or joining leadership committees, such as the Mansfield Elementary School Association, parent advisory councils, and the Special Education Parent Advisory Council. Students, parents, and school committee members also reported that students can participate in a student advisory committee that occasionally makes presentations at school committee meetings. Overall, the presence of multiple engagement and leadership opportunities represents a strength for the district.

Despite the recognition of the various engagement opportunities available, both parents and school staff raised concerns about the authenticity of these opportunities and the extent to which these opportunities are well advertised. For example, parents appeared divided on the extent to which they felt well informed of these opportunities, with one parent explaining as follows:

Parents are not generally well informed; . . . absolutely there are times where they tell us [about leadership opportunities], and we have plenty of time to think about it and consider and enter our hat in the ring. There are other times when things happen so quickly, or aren’t shared districtwide, or are only shared in like the Mansfield Mom Facebook group, and not everybody knew about it.

Likewise, parents in another focus group expressed concerns about the extent to which their feedback has been meaningfully incorporated into improvement planning. (See District and School Improvement Planning indicator for more details.) Finally, both school staff and parents questioned the extent to which participants in leadership roles represent the community served. For example, one staff member reported that even though the district administers a lot of surveys, the respondents are not usually representative of the general population. Likewise, parents in one focus group agreed that the “same faces” participate in these opportunities. Advertising leadership and engagement opportunities are meaningful, authentic, and representative of the general community is an area of growth for the district.

The district’s DEI Strategic Plan outlines the district’s focus on inclusive communication, to “embrace multiple modes of communication to reach and engage all families, caregivers, and the overall community.” District leaders, parents, and instructional staff reported that engagement with non-English-speaking families has been an ongoing challenge, but the district has taken deliberate steps to bridge these accessibility gaps. For example, the district translated informational materials and flyers into multiple languages (e.g., Creole, Portuguese, Spanish), identified interpreters and translation services for one-on-one communication, and held an EL family night at the public library to provide an opportunity for non-English-speaking families to meet the district’s ESL teachers and learn more about the resources and supports offered by the district and the public library.

To meet the growing demand for mental health and other holistic supports, the district leverages a variety of external partnerships. For example, district leaders and support staff referenced partnerships with a variety of health and mental health providers, such as McClean Hospital, and partnerships with wraparound service providers, such as Westside Benevolent Circle. The district’s director of health services primarily initiates and manages these partnerships. Likewise, the district’s close relationship with the town (as documented throughout this report) facilitates collaboration with the town’s fire department, police, library, and other services. Both district leaders and support specialists, for instance, noted the positive impact of a school resource officer’s service dog on school climate. Although support specialists noted challenges with partnerships stemming from staff turnover and a high demand for mental health supports, the district overall demonstrates a commitment to providing wraparound student supports, which is a strength for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should conduct a deeper investigation into the culture and climate at middle and high schools to determine what action, if any, is needed.*
* *The district should regularly conduct an analysis of discipline and behaviors, disaggregated by student group.*
* *The district should establish greater structures and provide teachers with greater materials to support students’ social emotional learning, including spreading awareness of supports available to students.*
* *The district should consider ways to make engagement opportunities more authentic to families while also recruiting a wider array of families to participate in school-based opportunities.*

## Financial and Asset Management

District and town leaders collaborate to create one budget for both the town and the district, representing the joint interests of both the town and the district. Likewise, budget tracking is a collaboration between the town and the district. Every year, about 10 different major cost centers within the district submit their needs to the district leadership team, and the district leadership team presents these requests to the school committee. From there, the Tri-Board convenes a joint leadership group composed of members of the Mansfield Board of Selectman, the district’s budget subcommittee, and the finance committee. The district has a five-year capital plan that includes data from an educational space study, which predicts the district’s needs in upcoming years. Overall, the district and the town are very involved in capital needs, and the district regularly makes presentations to the town about their capital needs.

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 |
| [Budget documentation and reporting](#_Budget_Documentation_and) | * The district and town have strong collaboration for budget documentation, as seen by their shared “one town, one budget” approach.
 | * Including more narrative in the budget to make it more accessible to community members without financial backgrounds
* Making more explicit connections between the district’s budget and district improvement priorities
 |
| [Adequate budget](#_Adequate_Budget) | * Budget negotiations are a collaborative, organized, and transparent process between the town and the district.
 |  |
| [Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits](#_Financial_Tracking,_Forecasting,) | * District leaders provide quarterly financial reporting to the school committee and monthly reporting to the superintendent to ensure transparency.
 | * Developing a written municipal agreement about shared costs between the district and town
* Addressing the recommendations provided by the 2022 student activity audit
 |
| [Capital planning and facility maintenance](#_Capital_Planning_and) | * The district maintains a five-year capital plan, with ability to adjust and reprioritize as needed.
* The district allocated funds for an educational space study of all school buildings to determine needed capital improvements for the next 20 years.
 |  |

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

Mansfield has a unique approach to district budget documentation with their “one town, one budget” initiative. The town and the district develop one comprehensive budget document representing the interests of both the town and the district. With the nature of the connection between the town’s budget and the district’s budget, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations and the town manager jointly manage budget reporting. The town’s budget subcommittee, composed of members of the select board, the school committee, and the finance committee, along with the superintendent and the town manager, oversee the budgeting process. Overall, the town is reportedly highly supportive of the district, and a major priority of town officials is to work in close collaboration with the district’s central office staff for the benefit of the town. The district’s central office staff and the town staff work side by side in the same building and collaborate regularly. Collaboration between the town and the district, as demonstrated by their shared “one town, one budget” approach, is an area of strength for Mansfield.

The budget report is publicly available on the websites of the district and the town. It is a long, comprehensive document broken into sections, which includes line items for the town’s spending across all expenditures, including the district. The report does not include much narrative to make it accessible to community members without financial backgrounds, which is an area of growth.

The budget document also does not explicitly tie spending to either district or town priorities to help community members understand why fiscal decisions were made. Rather, this information can be obtained through the budget subcommittee’s meeting notes on a separate page of the town’s website. This webpage includes more narrative-based information about the school’s budget and details the proposed major expenditures by cost center within the district. However, this presentation does not tie into the district’s improvement plan. Although the district has an accessible and up-to-date district improvement plan on their website, neither the joint town and school budget nor the superintendent’s budget presentation are explicitly connected to the improvement plan. Overall, making more explicit connections between the district’s budget and district improvement priorities is an area for growth within Mansfield.

### Adequate Budget

According to Mansfield’s overall general fund budget for fiscal year 2024, the overall town budget was $111,655,967, and the district budget was $57,482,994. As described in the proposed fiscal year 2024 budget presentation, the district’s original proposed budget for was $57,601,994, indicating that the town’s approved budget was close to the one originally proposed. For fiscal year 2024, school personnel totaled $46,302,365, or 41.47 percent of the town’s overall budget, a 2.21 percent increase from fiscal year 2023. Additional school expenses totaled $11,180,629, or 10.01 percent of the town’s overall budget, a 5.97 percent increase from fiscal year 2023. According to Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR) data, Mansfield’s in-district per-pupil expenditure in 2022 was $19,375, representing a 4.9 percent increase from the previous year. Overall, the town of Mansfield funds their school district well above the net school spending requirements.

The town has a transparent and highly organized process of moving from the district’s proposed budget to the budget that is adopted each year. First, the town holds an annual town meeting to alert the public to the town’s current state of finances. Then the town holds a series of budget subcommittee meetings to discuss the upcoming budget process. All budget subcommittee meetings are open to the public, and recordings of these meetings are accessible on the town website. In November, the different town departments, including the district, enter their requested budgets in Munis for the town to review. In January, a preliminary budget is posted on the town’s website that highlights any discrepancies between the proposed budget and the current budget. Between January and April, many budget meetings are held between the town’s financial committee, the budget subcommittee, and the Tri-Board. In these meetings, representatives collaborate to make budget adjustments according to the needs of the district and the town. According to Mansfield’s “one town, one budget” commitment, members from the Mansfield Board of Selectman, the school committee, and the town’s finance committee must all vote to support the amended budget for the upcoming fiscal year. The budget is then presented to the town leaders and the final amount is determined. This collaborative process in which representatives from the town and district negotiate the yearly budget with transparency is a strength for the district.

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

District leaders provide quarterly financial reporting to the school committee and monthly reporting to the superintendent to ensure transparency, which is a strength of the district. All budgeting and spending information is entered into Munis, for easy tracking by both district and town leaders. For the district’s more immediate spending needs, the district has a buffer built into its budget. For example, hall monitors became necessary at QMS, and those services were purchased immediately and retroactively reported to both the superintendent and the school committee. In both district and town leader interviews, an implicit level of trust between the current district leadership team and the town leadership team helps guide a collaborative relationship between the two leadership offices.

In terms of grants, the district’s finance department drafted the *Mansfield Public Schools: Internal Control Manual for Federal Grants*, which is publicly available to all district employees and details the grant process, an overview of the district’s financial management and accounting system, and requirements about budgeting and spending down grant funds and record keeping. According to the Internal Control Manual, recording and assigning account numbers to a grant is a joint effort between the town and the district. The town maintains the grant records, but the district’s grant manager is responsible for identifying grant opportunities and tracking, budgeting, and spending down the grant funds. The grant manager is also responsible for entering grant information into Munis and then spending the grant money on budgets approved by district leaders. Reportedly last year, the district had an EL afterschool care grant that they could not completely spend down during the school year. Reportedly, this instance of not exhausting grant funds occurred because the grant arrived late in the academic year, which reduced the time available to spend the budgeted amount for the grant. District leaders noted this onetime occurrence is not indicative of a chronic problem within the district.

The town of Mansfield is responsible for both the town and district’s annual reporting requirements as well as the shared budget audit, which is conducted annually by an independent auditor. The independent audit for fiscal year 2022 revealed one finding: the district and town do not have a formally signed and agreed-on cost allocation plan between town officials and the school committee. In response to this audit finding, the town designated a subcommittee to address the issue. Because the issue has not been fully resolved as of the time of the district review, this is an area for growth.

In addition to the joint annual audit conducted for the town and district, the district has a student activity audit conducted every three years. This audit reports on the district’s procedures regarding the district’s student activity funds. The most recent student activity audit occurred on June 30, 2022, and provided recommendations for improvement. Examples of recommendations included having student activity advisors consistently use the district’s standardized forms for all deposits and disbursements, using prenumbered receipt forms, ensuring funds are remitted to the principals within 24 hours and funds deposited into the bank on at least a weekly basis, closing accounts for inactive student activity organizations after three years, and addressing student activity accounts with deficit balances. Addressing the recommendations provided by the audit is an area of growth for the district.

### Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

The district maintains a five-year capital plan approved by the school committee and developed by the district leadership team. This capital plan includes the total cost of each capital project, the anticipated fiscal year when the district will ask for additional funds from the town, and the date (if applicable) when the school committee voted to approve the capital project. The district’s capital needs plan for fiscal years 2024 and beyond included items such as a boiler replacement at QMS; lighting upgrades throughout the district; modernization of elevators throughout the district; a mini-bus for the special education department; an alumni complex; updates to playgrounds throughout the district; refreshing gym lockers at the high school; bathroom renovations throughout the district; roof and heating, air-conditioning, and ventilation rooftop replacements throughout the district; and many other items. Each capital need has a date when the item will appear on the town meeting agenda and voted on by members of the town.

As described by the district leadership team, this capital needs plan is a “rolling plan because priorities shift” within the district as more imminent needs arise. For example, the elevator at the high school had to be pushed earlier in the capital plan because it broke down ahead of the maintenance schedule. In addition, paving was necessary within the district sooner than expected, so its priority within the capital needs plan was increased. Overall, district leaders reported a positive working relationship with the town and the community. They reported that the town prioritized the district’s needs, and “they are very good to us” in giving the district the capital needs requested. The district’s maintenance of a five-year capital plan, with ability to adjust and reprioritize as needed, is a strength of the district.

To proactively plan their capital needs ahead of time, the district allocated funds for an educational space study of all school buildings to determine more efficient ways for schools to optimize space and determine the needed capital improvements across the district for the next 20 years. This study was presented to the district and is publicly available on the town’s website. The district’s commitment to planning and allocating resources for the capital needs study is a strength. As a next step, the district is meeting with town leaders to prioritize recommendations from the study.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should incorporate additional narrative in its budget documentation to improve access for to the general community.*
* *In its budget documentation, the district should draw greater connection between its fiscal decisions and district and school improvement plans.*
* *The district, along with its municipal partners, should finalize a written agreement that delineates how costs are shared between the district and town.*
* *In areas where it has not yet acted, the district should implement the recommendations from its 2022 student activity accounts audit.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Mansfield. The team conducted 89 classroom observations during the week of October 16, 2023, and held interviews and focus groups between October 16 and 18, 2023. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

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

* Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
* Data on the district’s staffing and finances
* Curricular review process and timeline
* Published educational reports on the district by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
* District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district’s end-of-year financial reports
* All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations

## Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report
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Introduction

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

Three observers visited Mansfield Public Schools during the week of October 16, 2023. Observers conducted 89 observations in a sample of classrooms across four schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 89 | 5.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 15 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 5.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 4.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 2] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 34] + [6 x 20] + [7 x 20]) ÷ 89 observations = 5.4

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 89 | 5.7 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 7 | 14 | 40 | 5.8 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 19 | 6.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 30 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 2] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 32] + [6 x 21] + [7 x 26]) ÷ 89 observations = 5.7

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 | 89 | 3.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 3.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 7] + [2 x 23] + [3 x 21] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 19] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 89 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.[[7]](#footnote-8)

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

Negative Climate District Average\*: 7.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 89 | 7.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 39 | 40 | 7.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 19 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 30 | 6.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:
([6 x 4] + [7 x 85]) ÷ 89 observations = 7.0

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

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

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average\*: 6.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 89 | 6.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 19 | 40 | 6.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 19 | 6.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 30 | 6.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 1] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 21] + [7 x 56]) ÷ 89 observations = 6.4

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

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

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

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Productivity District Average\*: 6.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 89 | 6.6 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 31 | 40 | 6.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 19 | 6.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 30 | 6.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:
([4 x 3] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 18] + [7 x 62]) ÷ 89 observations = 6.6

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 | 89 | 4.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 4.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 5.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 4.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 1] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 55] + [6 x 12] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 89 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\*: 2.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 26 | 2.5 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 4 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 4] + [2 x 10] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 2]) ÷ 26 observations = 2.5

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

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

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

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

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 4.1 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 3.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 30 | 4.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 2] + [2 x 2] + [3 x 18] + [4 x 20] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 63 observations = 4.1

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 2.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 3.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 2.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 18] + [2 x 17] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 63 observations = 2.6

\*\*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\*: 3.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 89 | 3.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 2.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 3.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 2.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 14] + [2 x 24] + [3 x 21] + [4 x 17] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 89 observations = 3.0

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\*: 2.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 26 | 2.7 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 4 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 4] + [2 x 8] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 3]) ÷ 26 observations = 2.7

\*\*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\*: 3.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 3.3 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 3.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 3.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 10] + [2 x 14] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 63 observations = 3.3

\*\*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\*: 4.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 4.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 4.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 4.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 5] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 35] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 63 observations = 4.6

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

|  | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 4 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 35 | 22 | 69 | 160 | 5.6 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 15 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 39 | 40 | 7.0 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 7 | 14 | 40 | 5.8 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 4 | 4 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 3.5 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 34 | 24 | 50 | 120 | 5.9 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 19 | 40 | 6.3 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 31 | 40 | 6.7 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 4.7 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 14 | 39 | 44 | 18 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 134 | 3.0 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 4 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2.5 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.0 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 3.1 |
| Quality of Feedback | 5 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 2.9 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 4 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2.7 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 3.5 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **6** | **6** | **0** | **14** | **5.2** |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 3] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 13] + [7 x 15]) ÷ 40 observations = 6.0

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 39]) ÷ 40 observations = 7.0. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

|  | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 15 | 57 | 5.1 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 5.6 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 19 | 6.3 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3.5 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 46 | 57 | 6.7 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 19 | 6.6 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 19 | 6.5 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 19 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 15 | 15 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 12 | 4 | 95 | 3.7 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 5.4 |
| Content Understanding | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 3.8 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1.9 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 3.4 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 3.8 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 4.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 1] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 19 observations = 5.6

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 19 observations = 6.9

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

|  | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 3 | 17 | 7 | 13 | 33 | 15 | 2 | 90 | 4.2 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 4.5 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 30 | 5.2 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 3 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 2.9 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 68 | 90 | 6.6 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 30 | 6.6 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 30 | 6.4 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 30 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 23 | 22 | 24 | 37 | 30 | 13 | 1 | 150 | 3.5 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 4.6 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 30 | 4.3 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 9 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 2.7 |
| Quality of Feedback | 6 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 2.8 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 8 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 2.9 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 4.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 15] + [6 x 4]) ÷ 30 observations = 4.5

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

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

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

Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

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

Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment

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

Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

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

Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support

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

Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource  | Description |
| [DESE Spending Comparisons Website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) | A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public. |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grants resources.  |
| [Massachusetts Farm to School Grant Opportunities](https://www.massfarmtoschool.org/announcement/grant-opportunities/) | A summary of state, regional and national grant opportunities related to farm to school, school gardens, hydroponics, school food and more. |
| [Office for Food and Nutrition Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/) | Resources for school districts, childcare centers, family day care homes, adult day health programs, Summer Eats community organizations, USDA Foods storage and distribution vendors, food banks, and anti-hunger organizations across the Commonwealth. |
| [Planning for Success (PfS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |
| [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) | RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions. |
| [Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets (scroll down to Research section)](https://gtlcenter.org/products-resources/spending-money-wisely-getting-most-school-district-budgets) | A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.  |
| [Summer Eats | Free Meals for Kids and Teens in MA](https://www.projectbread.org/summer-eats-program?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&gclid=CjwKCAjwzo2mBhAUEiwAf7wjkljB4ngm0uZLSTYsl5hK5QGTkC3mKF_4ae_5AUxyrVs6UiPIIrys1RoCQV0QAvD_BwE) | Summer Eats is a free-of-charge program that provides free meals to all kids and teens, ages 18 and under, at locations all across Massachusetts during the summer months. |
| [Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB) from Education Resource Strategies](https://www.erstrategies.org/cms/files/2752-student-based-budgeting-guide.pdf%29%2C%20from%20Education%20Resource%20Strategies) | This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | District | Percentage of total | State | Percentage of total |
| All | 3,371 | 100.0 | 914,959 | 100.0 |
| African American | 176 | 5.2 | 88,104 | 9.6 |
| Asian | 281 | 8.3 | 67,847 | 7.4 |
| Hispanic | 232 | 6.9 | 229,930 | 25.1 |
| Native American | 5 | 0.1 | 2,178 | 0.2 |
| White | 2,518 | 74.7 | 484,692 | 53.0 |
| Native Hawaiian | 1 | 0.0 | 790 | 0.1 |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic  | 158 | 4.7 | 41,418 | 4.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023.

Table D2. Mansfield Public Schools: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2023-2024

|  | District | State |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of district | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of state |
| All students with high needs | 1,120 | 100.0 | 32.9 | 515,939 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| Students with disabilities | 587 | 52.4 | 17.2 | 187,160 | 36.3 | 20.2 |
| Low-income | 660 | 58.9 | 19.6 | 385,697 | 74.8 | 42.2 |
| English Learner | 84 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 119,749 | 23.2 | 13.1 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 3,407; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 924,947.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 3,549 | 6.6 | 15.5 | 10.6 | 22.2 |
| African American/Black | 181 | 12.0 | 21.3 | 17.1 | 25.3 |
| Asian | 304 | 4.4 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 13.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 249 | 16.4 | 32.9 | 21.3 | 34.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 151 | 6.6 | 17.1 | 13.2 | 23.3 |
| Native American | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 33.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 28.3 |
| White | 2,658 | 5.7 | 13.9 | 9.0 | 17.0 |
| High needs | 1,254 | 15.4 | 26.7 | 20.4 | 30.3 |
| Low income | 825 | — | 30.4 | 25.0 | 33.5 |
| ELs | 81 | 5.5 | 26.9 | 19.8 | 33.5 |
| Students w/disabilities | 605 | 14.5 | 26.0 | 21.5 | 30.4 |

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

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

|   | Fiscal year 2020 | Fiscal year 2021 | Fiscal year 2022 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual |
| Expenditures |
| From local appropriations for schools |  |
| By school committee | $51,634,995 | $50,264,357 | $52,670,030 | $52,570,147 | $54,814,118 | $54,485,638 |
| By municipality | $14,307,436 | $14,698,018 | $14,723,951 | $15,164,411 | $14,912,646 | $15,096,441 |
| Total from local appropriations | $65,942,431 | $64,962,375 | $67,393,981 | $67,734,559 | $69,726,764 | $69,582,079 |
| From revolving funds and grants | — | $5,735,954 | — | $6,018,799 | — | $6,761,081 |
| Total expenditures | — | $70,698,329 | — | $73,753,358 | — | $76,343,160 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program |
| Chapter 70 state aida | — | $18,962,339 | — | $18,962,339 | — | $19,070,309 |
| Required local contribution | — | $28,659,688 | — | $29,709,526 | — | $29,922,569 |
| Required net school spendingb | — | $47,622,027 | — | $48,671,865 | — | $48,992,878 |
| Actual net school spending | — | $58,481,072 | — | $60,650,347 | — | $62,647,055 |
| Over/under required ($) | — | $10,859,045 | — | $11,978,482 | — | $13,654,177 |
| Over/under required (%) | — | 22.8% | — | 24.6% | — | 27.9% |

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

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

Table D5. Mansfield Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Administration | $400 | $464 | $525 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $978 | $1,036 | $1,105 |
| Teachers | $7,264 | $7,703 | $8,045 |
| Other teaching services | $1,338 | $1,496 | $1,517 |
| Professional development | $177 | $312 | $446 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $287 | $384 | $384 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $567 | $698 | $755 |
| Pupil services | $1,421 | $1,606 | $1,762 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,178 | $1,403 | $1,408 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,125 | $3,341 | $3,429 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $16,734 | $18,444 | $19,375 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from <https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/per-pupil-exp.xlsx>.

## Appendix E. Student Performance Data
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Table E1. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

| Group | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 1,507 | 50 | 55 | 42 | 41 | 35 | 39 | 9 | 10 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 78 | 36 | 31 | 26 | 45 | 50 | 45 | 19 | 19 | 29 |
| Asian | 142 | 66 | 65 | 64 | 27 | 28 | 27 | 6 | 7 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 91 | 29 | 30 | 22 | 56 | 51 | 43 | 15 | 20 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 78 | 45 | 49 | 49 | 47 | 44 | 35 | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | 29 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 28 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 45 | — | — | 37 | — | — | 18 |
| White | 1,115 | 52 | 58 | 50 | 40 | 33 | 37 | 8 | 9 | 13 |
| High needs | 561 | 26 | 28 | 24 | 52 | 48 | 45 | 22 | 24 | 31 |
| Low income | 355 | 29 | 34 | 24 | 53 | 46 | 44 | 19 | 20 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 95 | 30 | 27 | 20 | 50 | 53 | 42 | 20 | 20 | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 269 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 49 | 46 | 40 | 39 | 41 | 48 |

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

| Group | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 245 | 76 | 76 | 58 | 23 | 19 | 30 | 1 | 4 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 15 | 61 | 60 | 42 | 39 | 33 | 41 | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| Asian | 17 | 83 | 82 | 79 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 18 | 64 | 56 | 36 | 36 | 33 | 39 | 0 | 11 | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | 63 | — | — | 29 | — | — | 9 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 11 |
| White | 191 | 78 | 79 | 67 | 21 | 17 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| High needs | 68 | 43 | 44 | 37 | 53 | 40 | 42 | 4 | 16 | 21 |
| Low income | 49 | 54 | 49 | 39 | 42 | 39 | 40 | 4 | 12 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | 5 | — | — | 16 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 45 |
| Students w/disabilities | 37 | 18 | 14 | 22 | 74 | 57 | 47 | 8 | 30 | 31 |

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

| Group | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 1,507 | 55 | 58 | 41 | 38 | 35 | 41 | 7 | 7 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 79 | 34 | 30 | 21 | 52 | 54 | 47 | 14 | 15 | 32 |
| Asian | 142 | 76 | 73 | 71 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 90 | 37 | 41 | 19 | 52 | 44 | 47 | 12 | 14 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 78 | 47 | 58 | 46 | 49 | 36 | 38 | 4 | 6 | 16 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | 28 | — | — | 46 | — | — | 26 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 1,115 | 56 | 59 | 49 | 38 | 34 | 40 | 6 | 6 | 11 |
| High needs | 562 | 32 | 31 | 23 | 50 | 50 | 47 | 17 | 18 | 30 |
| Low income | 355 | 36 | 34 | 21 | 51 | 51 | 48 | 14 | 15 | 31 |
| ELs and former ELs | 94 | 36 | 36 | 21 | 51 | 48 | 44 | 13 | 16 | 34 |
| Students w/disabilities | 271 | 17 | 16 | 13 | 49 | 51 | 41 | 34 | 34 | 46 |

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

| Group | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 244 | 71 | 75 | 50 | 26 | 22 | 42 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| African American/Black | 15 | 47 | 47 | 27 | 47 | 47 | 58 | 6 | 7 | 15 |
| Asian | 18 | 83 | 89 | 80 | 17 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 18 | 50 | 61 | 25 | 50 | 28 | 57 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 8 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 32 | — | — | 59 | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | 57 | — | — | 7 |
| White | 189 | 73 | 77 | 60 | 23 | 20 | 36 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| High needs | 68 | 31 | 43 | 27 | 56 | 46 | 57 | 13 | 12 | 16 |
| Low income | 50 | 38 | 46 | 27 | 48 | 42 | 57 | 13 | 12 | 16 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | 14 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 28 |
| Students w/disabilities | 36 | 10 | 14 | 16 | 64 | 64 | 59 | 26 | 22 | 25 |

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

| Group | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 506 | 51 | 45 | 41 | 40 | 46 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 28 | 39 | 25 | 21 | 54 | 54 | 47 | 7 | 21 | 32 |
| Asian | 41 | 61 | 56 | 65 | 37 | 32 | 27 | 2 | 12 | 8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 23 | 30 | 26 | 20 | 58 | 52 | 45 | 12 | 22 | 35 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 25 | 53 | 32 | 47 | 42 | 60 | 37 | 5 | 8 | 15 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 31 | — | — | 44 | — | — | 25 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 388 | 53 | 47 | 50 | 38 | 45 | 38 | 9 | 8 | 11 |
| High needs | 177 | 32 | 23 | 23 | 49 | 53 | 46 | 19 | 24 | 31 |
| Low income | 119 | 38 | 24 | 22 | 48 | 54 | 46 | 14 | 22 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 30 | 29 | 20 | 18 | 58 | 53 | 43 | 13 | 27 | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 83 | 17 | 12 | 14 | 44 | 48 | 40 | 39 | 40 | 45 |

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

| Group | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 223 | 70 | 61 | 47 | 25 | 34 | 42 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 9 | 46 | — | 26 | 46 | — | 55 | 8 | — | 20 |
| Asian | 13 | 78 | 92 | 75 | 22 | 8 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | 67 | 50 | 24 | 25 | 38 | 52 | 8 | 13 | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | 51 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 30 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 12 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 31 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 15 |
| White | 181 | 72 | 61 | 55 | 24 | 34 | 39 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| High needs | 60 | 34 | 30 | 26 | 51 | 52 | 54 | 15 | 18 | 21 |
| Low income | 43 | 38 | 35 | 26 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 13 | 12 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | 13 | — | — | 50 | — | — | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 34 | 17 | 9 | 16 | 56 | 59 | 53 | 28 | 32 | 31 |

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

| Grade | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | 231 | 53 | 56 | 44 | 42 | 36 | 40 | 6 | 8 | 16 |
| 4 | 233 | 46 | 48 | 40 | 43 | 40 | 43 | 11 | 12 | 17 |
| 5 | 243 | 59 | 60 | 44 | 36 | 32 | 40 | 5 | 8 | 16 |
| 6 | 267 | 46 | 61 | 42 | 42 | 29 | 34 | 12 | 10 | 24 |
| 7 | 270 | 41 | 50 | 40 | 48 | 41 | 40 | 11 | 10 | 19 |
| 8 | 263 | 58 | 57 | 44 | 35 | 31 | 34 | 8 | 12 | 22 |
| 3-8 | 1,507 | 50 | 55 | 42 | 41 | 35 | 39 | 9 | 10 | 19 |
| 10 | 245 | 76 | 76 | 58 | 23 | 19 | 30 | 1 | 4 | 11 |

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

| Grade | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | 229 | 54 | 58 | 41 | 39 | 37 | 39 | 7 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | 233 | 50 | 52 | 45 | 41 | 41 | 37 | 9 | 6 | 18 |
| 5 | 245 | 57 | 61 | 41 | 40 | 32 | 46 | 4 | 7 | 13 |
| 6 | 267 | 63 | 64 | 41 | 30 | 29 | 42 | 7 | 7 | 17 |
| 7 | 272 | 47 | 55 | 38 | 44 | 34 | 40 | 9 | 11 | 22 |
| 8 | 261 | 57 | 57 | 38 | 38 | 36 | 42 | 5 | 7 | 20 |
| 3-8 | 1,507 | 55 | 58 | 41 | 38 | 35 | 41 | 7 | 7 | 18 |
| 10 | 244 | 71 | 75 | 50 | 26 | 22 | 42 | 4 | 3 | 9 |

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

| Grade | # Included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 5 | 245 | 55 | 53 | 42 | 37 | 39 | 40 | 8 | 8 | 19 |
| 8 | 261 | 48 | 37 | 41 | 43 | 52 | 40 | 9 | 11 | 19 |
| 5 and 8 | 506 | 51 | 45 | 41 | 40 | 46 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 19 |
| 10 | 223 | 70 | 61 | 47 | 25 | 34 | 42 | 5 | 5 | 11 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 1,207 | 49.3 | 53.8 | 49.7 |
| African American/Black | 58 | 49.7 | 55.4 | 48.0 |
| Asian | 105 | 58.7 | 54.5 | 56.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 67 | 44.5 | 49.2 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 68 | 54.9 | 49.5 | 50.0 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 46.7 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 50.5 |
| White | 908 | 48.2 | 54.3 | 50.0 |
| High needs | 420 | 44.2 | 48.3 | 47.3 |
| Low income | 268 | 43.5 | 50.8 | 47.0 |
| ELs and former ELs | 62 | 42.6 | 53.1 | 49.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 197 | 43.2 | 42.3 | 43.7 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 226 | 61.3 | 62.6 | 49.5 |
| African American/Black | 12 | — | — | 45.5 |
| Asian | 15 | 63.5 | — | 56.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | — | — | 45.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | 51.3 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 46.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 45.2 |
| White | 179 | 61.1 | 62.6 | 50.7 |
| High needs | 58 | 58.6 | 52.8 | 44.7 |
| Low income | 42 | 60.2 | 58.2 | 44.9 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | 42.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 31 | 56.6 | 43.7 | 39.9 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 1,208 | 50.2 | 51.1 | 49.8 |
| African American/Black | 58 | 49.7 | 51.3 | 47.8 |
| Asian | 105 | 57.5 | 57.9 | 57.7 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 67 | 43.8 | 51.9 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 68 | 49.2 | 54.4 | 50.3 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 47.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 51.5 |
| White | 909 | 49.9 | 50.0 | 50.1 |
| High needs | 421 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 47.8 |
| Low income | 269 | 49.2 | 48.1 | 47.3 |
| ELs and former ELs | 62 | 49.1 | 55.0 | 49.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 198 | 38.8 | 42.3 | 44.8 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 223 | 59.5 | 56.9 | 49.6 |
| African American/Black | 12 | — | — | 41.4 |
| Asian | 16 | 67.8 | — | 55.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | — | — | 41.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | 51.1 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 45.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 56.1 |
| White | 175 | 58.9 | 57.1 | 52.9 |
| High needs | 58 | 57.2 | 51.6 | 43.9 |
| Low income | 43 | 56.5 | 53.1 | 43.2 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | 40.2 |
| Students w/disabilities | 30 | 50.2 | 40.0 | 41.7 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # Included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 217 | 44.6 | 44.9 | 49.4 |
| 5 | 229 | 54.2 | 53.1 | 49.8 |
| 6 | 253 | 45.1 | 55.7 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 255 | 45.3 | 53.3 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 253 | 56.5 | 60.7 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 1,207 | 49.3 | 53.8 | 49.7 |
| 10 | 226 | 61.3 | 62.6 | 49.5 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # Included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 217 | 38.4 | 38.5 | 49.6 |
| 5 | 230 | 56.2 | 58.6 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 254 | 55.5 | 54.4 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 256 | 45.5 | 43.6 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 251 | 53.7 | 59.6 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 1,208 | 50.2 | 51.1 | 49.8 |
| 10 | 223 | 59.5 | 56.9 | 49.6 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 278 | 97.1 | 96.4 | 95.3 | 90.1 |
| African American/Black | 14 | 90.0 | 82.4 | 92.9 | 86.2 |
| Asian | 14 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 13 | 75.0 | 93.3 | 100 | 81.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 14 | — | 100 | 92.9 | 88.7 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.2 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 223 | 97.8 | 97.0 | 95.1 | 93.2 |
| High needs | 95 | 88.7 | 86.5 | 86.3 | 83.9 |
| Low income | 69 | 89.6 | 91.8 | 87.0 | 83.2 |
| English Learner | 2 | — | — | — | 73.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 50 | 83.3 | 76.6 | 78.0 | 78.0 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2021) | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | State (2021) |
| All | 331 | 97.0 | 97.1 | 97.6 | 91.8 |
| African American/Black | 17 | 93.3 | 90.0 | 94.1 | 88.1 |
| Asian | 22 | 93.3 | 100 | 100 | 97.0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 100 | 75.0 | 100 | 84.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 13 | 100 | — | 100 | 91.2 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 84.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 87.7 |
| White | 264 | 97.2 | 97.8 | 97.3 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 89 | 86.5 | 88.7 | 91.0 | 85.8 |
| Low income | 61 | 88.6 | 89.6 | 93.4 | 85.1 |
| English Learner | 4 | — | — | — | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 47 | 81.4 | 83.3 | 85.1 | 80.6 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 1,095 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 49 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 71 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 63 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 38 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 4.3 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 1.2 |
| White | 873 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| High needs | 315 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 206 | — | — | 0.5 | 3.8 |
| English Learner | 3 | — | 0.0 | — | 7.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 167 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 3.4 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 3,541 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 180 | — | 4.0 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| Asian | 301 | — | — | -- | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 246 | — | 4.1 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 152 | — | — | -- | 1.6 |
| Native American | 5 | — | — | -- | 1.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | -- | 1.4 |
| White | 2,656 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.2 |
| High needs | 1,266 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 2.0 |
| Low income | 823 | — | 4.5 | 1.6 | 2.1 |
| English Learner | 83 | — | — | -- | 1.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 620 | 1.3 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 2.5 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 3,541 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.5 |
| African American/Black | 180 | — | 5.2 | 2.2 | 5.0 |
| Asian | 301 | — | — | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 246 | — | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 152 | — | — | -- | 3.0 |
| Native American | 5 | — | — | -- | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | -- | 3.1 |
| White | 2,656 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.6 |
| High needs | 1,266 | 0.8 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 3.8 |
| Low income | 823 | — | 4.1 | 2.4 | 4.3 |
| English Learner | 83 | — | — | -- | 2.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 620 | 1.7 | 4.6 | 2.7 | 4.7 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 583 | 70.9 | 63.6 | 65.4 | 65.8 |
| African American/Black | 25 | 38.7 | 40.0 | 44.0 | 57.3 |
| Asian | 46 | 97.2 | 78.6 | 65.2 | 84.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 33 | 59.3 | 66.7 | 51.5 | 51.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 19 | 73.1 | 57.7 | 52.6 | 67.4 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50.6 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 60.0 |
| White | 460 | 71.5 | 64.1 | 68.0 | 70.4 |
| High needs | 171 | 34.5 | 39.3 | 36.3 | 49.8 |
| Low income | 112 | — | 42.0 | 36.6 | 50.7 |
| English Learner | 7 | — | — | 28.6 | 31.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 88 | 19.0 | 26.4 | 28.4 | 36.0 |

Table E22. Accountability Percentile and Classification, 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| District | 57 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Roland Green School | — | — | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data |
| Everett W. Robinson | — | — | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data |
| Jordan/Jackson Elementary School | 49 | 67 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Harold L. Qualters Middle School | 72 | 70 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Mansfield High School | 75 | 86 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |

1. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. CURATE: CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Districts with similar demographics and similar wealth are based on [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) (retrieved February 2024).  [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Average SGP ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0—29.9, Low Growth = 30.0—39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0—59.9, Exceeded Typical Growth = 60.0 or higher. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. According to the superintendent, administrators are not required to post evidence within Vector Solutions because she thoroughly documents evidence from meetings and calls with each administrator on an ongoing basis throughout the school year. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)