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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 Randolph Public Schools (hereafter, Randolph) in October 2023. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews and were focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of 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)

Four observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Randolph during the week of October 30, 2023. The observers conducted 67 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). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong emotional support, strong classroom organization and student engagement (Grades 4-5), and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide evidence of generally strong emotional support, consistently strong classroom organization, generally strong student engagement, and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide evidence of strong emotional support, consistently strong evidence of classroom organization, strong evidence of student engagement, and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support.

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

Thea Stovell is the superintendent of Randolph and has served in that role since 2018. She receives support from an assistant superintendent of teaching and learning and directors of human resources, finance, special education and student services, athletics, technology, and facilities. The Randolph school committee oversees and guides the development and implementation of policies, the allocation of financial resources to support the district’s goals and objectives, and the superintendent’s evaluation.

The school committee fosters a collaborative environment, as evidenced by their internal operational protocols and focus group responses. The collaborative working relationships between district leaders, the school committee, and town officials are a strength of the district. In addition, school committee members reported working together with the superintendent to improve student outcomes by making efforts to engage community stakeholders.

Randolph’s district leadership demonstrates a culture of collaboration and joint responsibility for students. The district’s leadership team has 21 members who serve various roles at the district and school levels, including principals from all six schools and all district directors, including leaders for technology, special education and student services, multilingual learners (MLs), and academic departments. The inclusiveness of this team and their regular use of meeting time for collaborative planning is a strength of the district.

The superintendent shares education updates on the district’s website to keep all stakeholders informed about positive developments and initiatives taking place in the district. Stakeholders, particularly parents, expressed a desire for clearer, more consistent communication from district leaders, making this an area for growth in Randolph.

At the time of the visit, the district was preparing to begin a collaborative process for developing a new strategic plan, a process that would involve teachers, other district staff, students, families, and school committee members. The district invited stakeholders to participate in the strategic planning process through a public announcement, including a letter (available in five languages) posted on the district’s website. This inclusive process for improvement planning is a strength of the district. At the school level, staff were generally familiar with literacy as a goal, and some staff of older grades identified the teaching strategy Focus 5 as a goal, but most staff recalled few other common goals in interviews and focus groups. At present, the district may not have a clear set of focus priorities while the new strategic plan is under development, making developing and communicating district priorities an area for growth in Randolph.

Although measures exist for many district priorities, the ongoing development of the district plan means that no specific benchmarks are in place to frame discussions of data. Although the district has several implementation plans for its mission and vision goals, Randolph’s current plans lack specific benchmarks to monitor their progress, which is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph's business office coordinates a budget planning process that includes an interim director of finance, as well as other staff. The current district leadership group has tried to make changes to the budget development process to enhance collaboration, equity among schools, principal responsibility, and strategic alignment with the district’s current priorities. Finalizing a budget process that balances centralized oversight with and site-level collaboration in the budget process to create better alignment with strategic goals, school-level autonomy, and equity in resource use is an area for growth in Randolph.

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

Randolph has established and documented a formal process for reviewing and adopting high-quality materials that involves teachers at all levels, but this process is still in the early stages of implementation for some subjects. Most recently, Randolph formed a literacy team to review and select a new literacy curriculum, which resulted in the district implementing EL Education as the new literacy curriculum for their elementary and middle schools. At the time of the review, Randolph was evaluating and piloting mathematics curricula.

Randolph’s documentation indicates that the district uses a combination of published and locally created curricula. The materials include those that are rated as meeting or partially meeting expectations as well as those that do not have CURATE[[3]](#footnote-4) ratings because teachers create/develop them. Beyond the core curricula, the district implements several supplemental programs for enhancement, including decodable texts at the elementary level and MyPath at the middle and high school levels. Because many selected curricula do not fully meet standards, and other materials are not rated, selecting more materials that meet standards—or verifying the standards alignment of existing materials—is an area for growth in the district. However, a process is in place that may help with the selection of materials. Randolph has a clear, well-defined process for reviewing, selecting, and adopting curricular materials, making this a strength of the district. The district just completed this process for literacy, and the curriculum review and selection process is in its early stages for other subjects.

Beyond selection, multiple teachers and district leaders spoke about the need for a more thorough implementation plan for other curricula once approved and a lack of support in the implementation of new curricula. The need to robustly support the implementation of curricula once selection is complete is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph uses district curriculum maps and scope and sequence charts, which outline expectations and outcomes for students. These maps are publicly available on the district website. A number of teachers teach the standards in these maps using locally created curricula, In other subjects, district staff described a greater reliance on “open source” materials. Aligning instructional materials with scope and sequence charts to create more consistent approaches to instruction within subjects and grade levels is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph’s leaders have a defined instructional vision, which emphasizes the Focus 5 principles. Although instructional priorities are clearly understood at the district level, implementing these priorities more consistently across all grade levels is an area for growth in Randolph. The superintendent described a walkthrough process and tool that district leaders are already using to align instruction with district priorities. Observation data, combined with the plans described in district documents, indicate that the district has clear plans and strategies for creating inclusive learning environments and that these plans are improving instructional environments for students, making this a strength of the district.

Randolph is developing a variety of educational offerings to allow students to engage in rigorous learning experiences, yet access to these experiences is a challenge for all students.

The need for additional advanced coursework opportunities at the elementary and middle school levels is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph High School provides additional opportunities for students to pursue rigorous learning experiences aligned to their interests. The wide array of courses available to students at the high school is a strength of the district.

### [Assessment](#ASSESSMENT)

District and school leaders in Randolph are making strides in how they use data to improve teaching, learning, and decision making, particularly in literacy. Systems for collecting and aligning data are strongest at the elementary and middle school levels. Randolph’s coherent approach includes complementary data systems that allow for tracking student progress of a significant district priority. The coordinated use of literacy data tools is a strength of the district.

The district’s work with Ideal Consulting resulted in a new student performance system (SPS), allowing for central storage of—and more ready access to—district data. The new literacy data sources use this system for storage and dissemination of results among staff. The establishment of this data system is a strength of the district.

Data and assessment systems are less developed at the high school level. In addition, focus group responses indicated that some data sharing systems may be limited to those mechanisms. These comments suggest that providing students and parents with clearer and more timely sharing of results is an area for growth in Randolph. In tandem with focus group data on assessment systems on data use, they also demonstrate a need to strengthen assessment systems at the high school level.

Support for data use in Randolph is stronger at some levels than in others. Restructuring opportunities for data use—such as providing coaching during common planning time (CPT) and facilitating collaboration for teachers with similar responsibilities—is an area for growth in Randolph, particularly at the high school level. Recently, Randolph made strides in communicating data with stakeholders. Data from focus groups indicated that school leaders and teachers have access to relevant data to support decision making. Much of Randolph’s focus is on communicating literacy data to staff and families alike. Sharing data with families is a strength of the district.

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

Randolph’s human resources department is a three-person unit responsible for assisting principals in the hiring process and maintaining employment records; the department includes a director of human resources and two assistants. The district is currently merging traditional human-resources record-keeping systems with more digital tools.

Hiring in Randolph is coordinated primarily at the building level. The district leverages digital platforms such as SchoolSpring and Handshake for job postings and participates in job fairs. In addition, the district attempts to recruit internally by supporting paraprofessional staff in becoming certified teachers, when possible, through a grant focused on diversification. Randolph’s decentralized hiring process, which emphasizes both principal autonomy and district support, is a strength of the district.

However, interview responses highlighted significant staff shortages and turnover rates at some schools and departments, leading to a reliance on emergency licenses and staff waivers as a temporary solution, in some cases. Though the district has made efforts to improve recruitment of diverse staff, retention is still an issue. Addressing these staffing shortages and retention issues for all staff districtwide—but particularly for staff of color—is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph’s supervision and evaluation framework has a structured approach that begins with educator plans tailored to the career stages of its educators. Throughout the process, the school leader and the evaluated staff member are supposed to determine areas of need and areas of growth. District leaders described the process as supportive, but teacher representatives characterized the process as inconsistent in its implementation, saying this inconsistency makes the process lack utility.

In a review of a sample of teacher and administrator evaluation records, the site visit team found only a portion of those reviewed were complete with performance ratings, an assessment of progress toward goals, or identified areas of improvement for administrative staff. Combined, an area for growth in Randolph is more consistently using the evaluation system as designed. Providing written feedback for both teachers and administrative staff as well as using multiple sources of evidence, identifying SMART goals, and including areas for growth for teachers and administrators to support continuous professional growth and positive impacts on student success will lead to improvements in the evaluation system.

Regarding educator professional development, interview responses at the district level indicate an effort to structure offerings in line with developing district priorities. This connection between current offerings and the district’s priorities is a strength. Most offerings take place during eight half-day professional development days and one full-day session at the start of the school year.

Randolph has a mentorship and induction system which shows that the system is in place to support new teachers. The district has three mentor coordinators, and these coordinators hold training every year for mentors. However, issues with assignments and training reported by interview participants suggest that consistency in the implementation of mentoring is an area for growth in Randolph.

Educators in Randolph have some opportunities for growth, leadership development, and career advancement. Pay disparity between roles, said interview respondents, can discourage teachers from seeking new positions. Addressing these barriers to advancement that teacher described is an area for growth in Randolph.

### [Student Support](#_Student_Support)

Randolph’s plans for forming a safe and supportive environment focus on three district priorities: social-emotional learning, equity, and access and inclusion. The district fosters a welcoming and supportive learning environment for many students, as evidenced by data from students and families who report feeling physically and emotionally safe in school, particularly at the elementary level. However, survey and focus group data indicate some room for improvement in providing all students with positive learning experiences, particularly for students in the upper grades. Randolph has multitiered system of support (MTSS) teams at each building and a documented system for how often each team should meet. However, teachers and school support staff described the process as ineffective and unevenly implemented because a lack of communication between departments causes delays in students receiving support, making consistent implementation of these teams an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph has several means of engaging families, such as the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEAPAC), the English Learner Parent Advisory Council (ELPAC), the school site council, the parent advisory board, and the parent teacher organization. The superintendent identified a measurable family engagement goal, aiming for 50 percent of families being regularly engaged through school events and conferences. Parents and district leaders spoke about several community partnerships that the district established across the Randolph community. These community partnerships are a strength of the district.

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

Randolph maintains clear and accessible budget documents. The district’s finance office made district budgets from fiscal years 2018 through 2024 publicly available on their website. In addition, the school committee’s website contains budgets from recent years.

Interview responses indicate no existing written agreement between school and town officials related to educational or other services, which is an area for growth in Randolph. Interview respondents indicated several areas in which school and town officials are having discussions to resolve fiscal issues.

Randolph has exceeded required net school spending in each of the three years preceding the district review (2020—2022) and increased local commitments to the budget. However, several interview participants expressed concern about current and future funding levels in the district given changes in enrollment and the end of some federal funding sources. The district’s director of finance is responsible for financial tracking and reporting to key stakeholders. Systems are in place for tracking spending from the general fund, as well as grants, and for conducting end-of-year reporting. The interim finance director provides regular reports to the school committee and district leaders. Although some participants reported that the district has consistent tracking and reporting in the current year, other evidence from interviews and the document review suggests that the effectiveness of these district financial tracking and forecasting processes could improve, which a review of audit documents and interview data substantiated.

Managing capital planning and maintenance in Randolph is a collaborative effort between the district and the town. Interview participants cited several examples of capital maintenance and improvements in the district in recent years. However, the district does not have a long-term capital plan in place. Interview respondents reported that some unexpected challenges have had a greater budget impact than planned for. As such, the current capital maintenance and planning process may not fully address the needs of students because it lacks a comprehensive, long-term vision, making the need for longer term capital planning an area for growth in Randolph.

## Randolph 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. The design of the comprehensive district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

### Methodology

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

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

### Site Visit

The site visit to Randolph occurred during the week of October 30, 2023. The site visit included 16 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 60 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted two teacher focus groups with 11 middle school teachers and seven high school teachers; the team offered a focus group for elementary school teachers, but no teachers elected to participate. The team conducted two student focus groups with six middle school and nine high school students. The team also conducted one family focus group in English with five parents; the team offered additional parent focus groups in Haitian Creole, Portuguese, and Spanish, but interest was not sufficient to hold these groups. Data collection also included distributing a questionnaire to each principal to gather information on district and school processes and operations.

The site team also conducted 67 observations of classroom instruction in six schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

Thea Stovell is the superintendent of Randolph, serving in that role since 2017. She receives support from an assistant superintendent of teaching and learning and directors of human resources, finance, special education and student services, athletics, technology, and facilities. The school committee has six members who are elected for two-year terms, and a seventh member is a representative of the town council (currently the council president).

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 253 teachers in the district, with 2,563 students (including 102 early childhood students) enrolled in the district’s six PK-12 schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for 2023-2024.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| Donovan Elementary School | Elementary | K-5 | 408 |
| John F. Kennedy School | Elementary | PK-5 | 475 |
| E. G. Lyons Elementary School | Elementary | K-5 | 261 |
| Martin E. Young School | Elementary | K-5 | 275 |
| Randolph Community Middle School | Middle | 6-8 | 602 |
| Randolph High School | High | 9-12 | 664 |
| Total |  |  | 2,685 |

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

Between 2021 and 2024, overall student enrollment increased by 25 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

In fiscal year 2022, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Randolph was $23,664, which is $4,805 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($18,859) and $7,070 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures in districts of similar wealth ($16,594).[[4]](#footnote-5) In-district per pupil expenditures for Randolph were $4,110 more 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

The following section includes selected highlights regarding student performance in Randolph. 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 DESE’s [School and District Profiles (mass.edu)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/general/general.aspx?topNavID=1&leftNavId=100&orgcode=02440000&orgtypecode=5).

#### Achievement

* In ELA, math, and science, the percentage of the All Students group in Randolph meeting or exceeding expectations on the 2023 Next Generation Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) was below the state rate, as detailed below.
  + ELA: the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate by 13 percentage points in Grades 3-8, and by 14 percentage points in Grade 10.
  + Mathematics: the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate by 11 percentage points in Grades 3-8, and by 20 percentage points in Grade 10.
  + Science: the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate by 13 percentage points in Grades 5 and 8, and by 23 percentage points in Grade 10.
* In Grades 3-8, multi-race, non-Hispanic students and White students in Randolph met or exceeded expectations on the 2023 Next Generation MCAS at a lower rate than their statewide peers.
  + Multi-race, non-Hispanic students: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate by 20 percentage points in ELA and 19 percentage points in mathematics.
  + White students: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate by 9 percentage points in ELA and by 7 percentage points in mathematics.
* Sixty percent or more of Randolph students with disabilities in 2023 were not meeting expectations in Grades 3-8 in ELA and mathematics and Grades 5 and 8 science.

#### Growth

* ELA student growth percentiles (SGPs)[[5]](#footnote-6) in Grade 10 were low in 2023 for high needs students and students from low-income backgrounds; these SGPs declined by 11.8 and 12.6 points, respectively, from 2022.
* Mathematics SGPs in Grade 10 declined 10 or more points between 2022 and 2023 for each student group with two years of data. The mathematics SGP was also low for five of the six groups with reportable data.

#### Other Indicators

* Randolph’s four-year graduation rates improved between 2020 and 2022 by 21.9 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and by 28.9 percentage points for students with disabilities.
* Randolph’s dropout rates in 2022 were more than twice the state rate for all students (4.9 percent compared to 2.1 percent) and African American/Black students (6.7 percent compared to 2.8 percent), and more than four times the state rate for White students (5.9 percent compared to 1.3 percent).
* Randolph’s Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students received in-school suspensions at a rate almost three times their statewide peers (4.7 percent compared to 1.6 percent) and out-of-school suspensions at rate more than twice the state rate (7.1 percent compared to 3.0 percent).
* Students completing advanced coursework increased between 2021 and 2023 by 10 or more percentage points for most student groups; among those most notable were ELs by 22.1 percentage points and students with disabilities by 34.9 percentage points.
* The chronic absenteeism rates in Randolph were higher than the state rate for most student groups and approximately double the state rate for White students and multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students (33.4 percent and 45.0 percent, respectively).
* In 2023, Randolph High School was identified as requiring assistance or intervention via the state’s accountability system because the school had a low assessment participation rate (less than 95 percent) for ELs and former ELs on the spring 2023 MCAS assessments.

### Classroom Observations

Four observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Randolph during the week of October 30, 2023. The observers conducted 67 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 Randolph, 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 Randolph is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

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

* Emotional Support. Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (5.4 for K-5, 4.4 for 6-8, and 4.9 for 9-12).
* Classroom Organization. Ratings were in the middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.4) and the high range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (6.4 for both).
* Instructional Support. Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (3.9 for K-5, 3.5 for 6-8, and 3.6 for 9-12).
* Student Engagement. For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (5.9 for 4-5, 4.4 for 6-8, and 5.0 for 9-12).

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

## Leadership and Governance

Thea Stovell is the superintendent of Randolph, and has served in that role since 2018. She receives support from an assistant superintendent of teaching and learning and directors of human resources, finance, special education and student services, athletics, technology, and facilities. The school committee governs the district and has six members who are elected for two-year terms. An additional seventh member, a representative of the town council, often is the town council president.

The school committee is responsible for overseeing and guiding the district’s schools. The committee evaluates the superintendent’s performance, supports the district’s mission through annual budget planning and regular reviews, develops policies and goals, and collaborates with town partners in managing capital improvements. District and school leaders meet regularly to discuss improvement priorities and the district’s progress toward these goals through a large and diverse leadership team.

At the district level, the leadership team includes the superintendent and the assistant superintendent, as well as multiple directors and coordinators who oversee essential areas such as human resources, technology integration, mathematics, humanities, special education and student services, and facilities. Meanwhile, numerous principals and assistant principals support the high school, the middle school, and the four elementary schools. The school committee shares budget documents on the district website. At the time of the visit, an interim finance director and a grants manager coordinated budget planning.

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) | * The school committee maintains strong collaboration with the superintendent and town stakeholders. |  |
| [District and school leadership](#_District_and_School) | * The district has a strong leadership team that serves in diverse roles at the district and school levels, and this team exhibits regular use of meeting time for collaborative planning. | * Providing clearer and more consistent communication from district leaders to the public * Establishing specific benchmarks to monitor district progress |
| [District and school improvement planning](#_District_and_School_1) | * The district created an inclusive and collaborative process for developing a strategic plan. | * Developing and communicating a clear set of common priorities during new plan development |
| [Budget development](#_Budget_Development) |  | * Balancing effective oversight and guidance with school-level autonomy in budgeting |

### School Committee Governance

The school committee oversees and guides the development and implementation of policies, the allocation of financial resources to support the district’s goals and objectives, and the superintendent’s evaluation. According to committee members, the school committee approaches their role by emphasizing data-driven decision making and, particularly in a post-COVID-19 environment, using resources to meet each school’s unique needs to “make sure we’re educating the whole student.”

The school committee’s outlined goals for 2023-2024 include the following:

* Evaluate the superintendent’s performance by conducting both formative and public summative evaluations.
* Ensure that the fiscal year 2025 budget supports the district’s mission, vision, and goals through regular review of districtwide data.
* Develop districtwide learning goals by supporting the superintendent and the teaching and learning team in creating goals for improved student achievement.
* Assist in the development of a multiyear capital improvement plan, including identifying needs, prioritizing projects, and understanding the town’s capital improvement process.

According to *School Committee Goals 2023-24*, the committee evaluates the superintendent’s performance based on her professional learning goals and DESE’s Indicator Rubric for Superintendent Evaluation. The process involves a formative evaluation, completed in February, and a public summative evaluation, completed in June. Key actions in the evaluation process include approving goals and indicators, identifying baselines, articulating evidence toward goals, completing a mid-cycle review, and monitoring progress. The committee completed the most recent superintendent evaluation in June 2023. School committee minutes from the June 29, 2023 meeting indicate comments from several members of the committee, detailing both strengths and areas for growth for the superintendent for the coming year.

Focus group responses and documents indicated that the school committee fulfills its responsibility to evaluate the superintendent. Committee members described how the superintendent presents her goals annually, but the committee also makes time to revisit these goals throughout the year:

Within our committee meetings, there’ll be certain portions of those meetings that are specific to be able to talk about some of those goals and how we tie them back to how she gets evaluated towards the end of the year.

The superintendent reported that the feedback from these sessions could be more constructive in areas for growth; she further noted that the timing of elections, combined with the fact that all members are up for reelection concurrently, can be challenging in the evaluation process because some participating members may lack sufficient context to participate productively. The five committee members who participated in the superintendent’s most recent evaluation gave the superintendent positive ratings, as shown in a review of school committee minutes from June 2023.

The school committee fosters a collaborative environment, as evidenced by their internal operational protocols and focus group responses. The operational protocols detail how the committee represents student interests, governs in an accessible manner, treats members with respect, communicates effectively, improves through training, understands its roles and the limits of those roles, and addresses issues that arise. Committee members who participated in focus groups agreed that the school committee and the leaders from central office “work very closely together . . . we’re able to have open and honest conversations about the needs in the district.” The superintendent similarly characterized her “great relationship” with the school committee. The committee’s structure also supports a collaborative environment: A town council member serves on the school committee to coordinate a clearer understanding of the district’s needs within the broader context of the town’s governance and community and financial priorities. In interviews, representatives from the town government and the superintendent’s office reported that relationships between school and town officials have been productive in recent years, and communication is regular and open. The collaborative working relationships between district leaders, the school committee, and town officials are a strength of the district.

In addition, school committee members reported working together with the superintendent to improve student outcomes by making efforts to engage community stakeholders. Stakeholders reported that this collaboration is especially prevalent following the challenges posed by the COVID‑19 pandemic. Together, committee members and district leaders are focusing on rebuilding family engagement and making themselves more available to the community in the wake of the pandemic. Committee members cited visiting schools and attending community events to be more visible within Randolph: “It was really hard over the last couple of years. So it’s much better to be able to connect with people now.”

A review of the school committee’s monthly agenda confirms that its members gather regularly, with members subdivided into several specialized subcommittees (i.e., building, facility, finance, negotiation, and policy). Furthermore, by making their meeting agendas publicly available online, the committee promotes transparency and openness and allows all stakeholders to stay informed and participate in the decision-making process.

Responses from the school committee focus group revealed how the committee upholds its fiduciary responsibilities to secure funding and effectively manage the district’s financial resources. Respondents stated that the school committee works to align its goals and its budget, prioritizing the effective use of data to inform financial decisions. In addition, school committee members and the superintendent reported being in regular contact with town councilors and state representatives to seek resources to support school needs and then to distribute these equitably within the district. The committee also participates in regular discussions on resource distribution decisions, focusing on staffing, and plays a role in negotiations with the teachers’ association.

### District and School Leadership

Randolph’s district leadership demonstrates a culture of collaboration and joint responsibility for students. Interview and focus group responses at the school committee, district office, and school levels described efforts of shared leadership, including common meeting structures, collaborative decision making, and multilevel involvement in the curricular review process (see Curriculum and Instruction).

The district’s leadership engages in discussions with school leaders and the school committee related to the district’s educational policies and improvements. One school committee member characterized the superintendent as a “facilitator,” further noting as follows:

[The superintendent will] provide us with different options. The data to back those, and maybe her perception on why, she’s leaning towards a particular decision. . . . I think she does a really good job of presenting information and allowing us to be able to be the final decision makers when we put a vote [forward].

Similarly, district and school leaders said that the superintendent and district leaders actively engage in regular discussions about district priorities. The district’s leadership team has 21 members who serve various roles at the district and school levels, including principals from all six schools and all district directors, including leaders for technology, special education and student services, multilingual learners (MLs), and academic departments. A review of meeting agendas revealed that district leadership team meetings occur regularly, often monthly, at the administrative building. During these meetings, district staff and building leaders discuss a wide range of topics, such as student data analysis, budget management, equity efforts, consistency in approaches to discipline, input on improvement plan creation, and educational strategies. The agenda incorporates feedback mechanisms for leadership evaluation, professional development planning, and discussions on evaluations and budgetary matters—all highlighting a comprehensive and interactive approach to feedback collection and implementation. One school leader said that these meetings were both regular and valuable in focusing on building-level efforts, including teaching and learning. The inclusiveness of this team and their regular use of meeting time for collaborative planning is a strength of the district.

At the school level, instructional leadership teams (ILTs) are another structure for facilitating staff involvement and commitment to each school’s improvement efforts. According to principal questionnaires, ILTs include a diverse range of educational roles, including administrative positions such as assistant principals and principals, specialized roles such as ML specialists and special educators, and more general roles such as teachers and instructional coaches. In some schools, department heads and guidance counselors also serve on the ILT.

Randolph leaders are focusing on improving practice and outcomes, but specific plans are still under development (see District and School Improvement Planning). Principals, for example, described a focus on literacy, including specific instructional materials and practices to improve literacy, related professional development efforts, and proficiency targets for students. Principals and district leaders reported that the recent shift in literacy instruction requires significant discussion at the district level, including plans for professional development and teacher feedback. These meetings, said one principal, serve to “calibrate all of the leaders across the district.” A review of meeting materials indicated that the district leadership team often reviews MCAS results and other educational metrics to guide decision making and focus on professional development by addressing topics that aim to enhance administrative and instructional leadership.

The superintendent and district leaders also focus on district leadership development and support, which is still a developing area for the district. District leaders reported in interviews that some principals are new to their positions. Combined with the district’s new instructional efforts and developing priorities, district leaders reported that systems to support principals in implementing district priorities at the building level are still developing. The superintendent described, for example, leadership training for leaders on supervision and evaluation (see Human Resources) as well as a mentoring program for new principals. Similarly, principals reported that, in light of new literacy and other initiatives, they were receiving professional development so they will “know the best way to conduct observations and evaluations and give feedback to teachers.”

The superintendent shares education updates on the district’s website to keep all stakeholders informed about positive developments and initiatives taking place in the district. These updates aim to connect families, teachers, staff, and the broader community. The superintendent emphasizes their commitment to prioritizing the needs and progress of all students in the district’s schools. Nevertheless, the irregular publication schedule of these updates in 2023 highlights the need for a more structured and consistent communication plan. Currently, updates appear sporadically in April, May, June, October, and November, lacking a defined pattern such as monthly or quarterly releases. Stakeholders, particularly parents, expressed a desire for clearer, more consistent communication from district leaders, making this an area for growth in Randolph.

### District and School Improvement Planning

At the time of the visit, the district was preparing to begin a collaborative process for developing a new strategic plan, a process that would involve teachers, other district staff, students, families, and school committee members. This process runs through winter and spring 2024, with facilitation by the district and the Center for Leadership and Educational Equity. This partnership will help Randolph “[make] sure we hear from all voices.” The district invited stakeholders to participate in the strategic planning process through a public announcement, including a letter (available in five languages) posted on the district’s website. This inclusive process for improvement planning is a strength of the district.

At the time of the visit, district and school leaders were operating under a set of priorities that were part of the previous plan:

* Social-emotional learning
* Strong instructional practices
* Literacy
* Family engagement

A small number of district staff characterized these four priorities as the district’s current goals before development of the new strategic plan; however, several stakeholders—including principals, parents, teachers, and town government representatives—could not name the district’s current priorities. A review of documents and information from interviews and focus groups suggested multiple and different understandings of current district priorities while the new strategic plan is in development. District-level interviews indicated that district staff created these priorities by looking at available data, particularly literacy data. Further, district leadership shared a document called *District Improvement Plan 2022-2025*, whose organization follows the same four goals. This plan lays out several theories of action, concurrent initiatives, and assessments of schools, but it has no specific benchmarks. A review of central administration meeting agendas indicated other “major goal areas,” including communication, onboarding, finance, and student achievement.

At the school level, staff were generally familiar with literacy as a goal, and some staff of older grades identified the teaching strategy Focus 5 as a goal (Focus 5 also appears on the district improvement plan document), but most staff recalled few other common goals in interviews and focus groups. One teacher representative said they were familiar with the literacy goal but contrasted the current state of teachers’ awareness of goals with past years, when indicating that plans were shared with staff and teachers who were more familiar with local priorities: “[The plan] is not sent out to us like I feel like it used to be.” Collectively, this information suggests that the district may not have a clear set of focus priorities while the new strategic plan is under development, making developing and communicating district priorities an area for growth in Randolph. As the district strategic plan is in development, so too are school improvement plans, as school improvement plans on the district website were from 2019-2020. District-level staff said in interviews that several principals were new to their roles, and coordination of the improvement planning process with school councils was still in its early stages, so no current school improvement plans were in place at the time of the district review.

District and school leaders described multiple ways of how data inform meetings and the tracking of progress in the district. Although measures exist for many district priorities, the ongoing development of the district plan means that no specific benchmarks are in place to frame discussions of data. During interviews, the superintendent shared various methods for monitoring the district’s progress. As verified by other district and school leaders, staff review academic data from Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) three times per year—at the beginning, middle, and end of the year—with subsequent data meetings to identify students needing extra support or progress monitoring. This approach complements continuous progress monitoring meetings throughout the year at the school level. The superintendent highlighted the positive increase in on-grade literacy rates. In addition, the superintendent identified measures related to family engagement and social-emotional learning. Although the district has several implementation plans for its mission and vision goals, Randolph’s current plans lack specific benchmarks to monitor their progress, which is an area for growth in Randolph.

Furthermore, some school-level interview respondents noted that the district tends to pursue multiple goals concurrently, which makes it difficult to focus efforts. Interviewees suggested that when district goals are too numerous, it is challenging to align school-level activities with the district’s strategic direction, which was still in development at the time of the site visit.

### Budget Development

Randolph's business office coordinates a budget planning process that includes an interim director of finance, as well as other staff who include principals, the superintendent, and the school committee. The Randolph business office has long been the driving force behind the budget process, which the superintendent said left little opportunity for principals to understand or manage their budgets or address equitable distribution of resources. She said past budget practices have instead “created a culture in this district where [principals] don’t necessarily look at their budget. They just call the finance office and go, ‘I need this. Find it for me.’”

The current district leadership group has tried to make changes to the budget development process to enhance collaboration, equity among schools, principal responsibility, and strategic alignment with the district’s current priorities. The superintendent noted that the process, once led almost exclusively by the finance director, now encourages principals to develop and manage their budgets, indicating a shift toward more decentralized decision making and an effort to increase fiscal responsibility at the school level. This change, district leaders reported, aims to align resources more closely with the individual needs of each school, potentially leading to a more equitable distribution of resources across the district. In the past, leaders said, resources were centrally managed and distributed in response to requests from schools whose leaders could more assertively make requests of the district. This shift to allow greater principal involvement is a promising practice in the district, but one that several staff described as incomplete and not yet fully implemented. Principals described their level of budget autonomy as limited. One principal said they felt as if they could make a case to district staff for resources, rather than making site-level decisions with the budget: “I know personally, I’ve used data to show like we need tiered interventions. . . . So, like, we can give that data in and have a conversation around it.” Another principal reported feeling some autonomy about certain “preset budget lines” other than staffing but not over their overall budget.

The district’s long-term goal is to build school-level capacity for more complex zero-based budgeting. District staff said this goal would support prudent budgeting, equity in resources distribution, and more building-level autonomy. However, principals faced challenges with consistently implementing this new and more complex approach last year, which led district leaders to use an alternate process that they hoped could be more site driven but still resulted in high levels of centralized budget planning. The current budget development process is still largely district driven, with schools making requests, but most planning ultimately occurs at the central office level, such as the superintendent making decisions last year to shift teaching positions from one school to another. The budget development process currently consists largely of conversations among the school committee and town council, as well as the superintendent’s office. The superintendent and the finance director said they again plan to try a more collaborative approach with principals in planning for FY25, using more professional development and monthly finance reports. Finalizing a budget process that balances centralized oversight with and site-level collaboration in the budget process to create better alignment with strategic goals, school-level autonomy, and equity in resource use is an area for growth in Randolph.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should develop systems and expectations for how and when district leaders communicate with families and the broader Randolph community.*
* *The district should establish measurable benchmarks to monitor the district’s progress against priorities cited in its strategic plan.*
* *The district should engage students, families, and educators to define a common set of priorities, so that the district can move toward completion and implementation of its district and school improvement plans.*
* *The district should formalize its plans for a revised budget development process with greater principal involvement and pair those plans with individualized training so that school leaders can be prepared to advocate for their communities.*

## Curriculum and Instruction

Randolph has established and documented a formal process for reviewing and adopting high-quality materials that involves teachers at all levels, but this process is still in the early stages of implementation for some subjects. Most recently, Randolph formed a literacy team to review and select a new literacy curriculum, which resulted in the district implementing EL Education as the new literacy curriculum for their elementary and middle schools. At the time of the review, Randolph was evaluating and piloting mathematics curricula.

The district’s website lists the curriculum materials that Randolph uses in ELA, as well as the district’s literacy vision statement, their action plan, and documents related to their approach to literacy and the science of reading. Mathematics and science portions of the district website contain similar lists of curricula and information for families, such as Talking Math With Your Kids; however, the vision does not have the level of development as for literacy. The district’s variety of materials at different grade levels spans a range in ratings from meeting expectations, to partially meeting, to unrated materials created by staff.

Randolph offers a variety of courses at the secondary level (e.g., electives, Advanced Placement [AP] courses, and postsecondary programs), but staff said that access to courses varies. At the elementary level, the district provides opportunities for students to engage in rigorous learning experiences through the curriculum Project Lead the Way (PLTW), which includes immersion in hands-on activities and real-world problems.

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 clear, well-defined process for reviewing and adopting high-quality curricular materials, and this process is currently being used to select new curricula. | * Completing the review and selection process to identify more standards-aligned curricula for more grades and subjects * Supporting the implementation of curricula once selection is complete * Aligning instructional materials with scope and sequence charts to create more consistent approaches to instruction |
| [Classroom instruction](#_Classroom_Instruction) | * District has clear plans and strategies for creating inclusive learning environments that support differences in student learning needs, especially for students with disabilities. | * Implementing the district’s instructional priorities more consistently across all grade levels |
| [Student access to coursework](#_Student_Access_to) | * The high school has a wide array of courses available to students | * Providing additional advanced opportunities for more students at the elementary and middle school levels |

### Curriculum Selection and Use

Randolph’s documentation indicates that the district uses a combination of published and locally created curricula, including the following:

* ELA: EL Education (Grades K-8), Odell High School Literacy (Grades 9-11), and teacher-created units (Grade 12)
* Mathematics: Eureka Math (Grades K-5); Math Perspectives (Grades K-2); Open Up (Grades 6-7); a mixture of Open Up Math, Eureka Math, and Pearson (Grade 8); and Pearson and College Board curricula in addition to teacher-created units (Grades 9-12)
* Science: PLTW (Grades K-5), OpenSciEd and PLTW (Grades 6-8), and PLTW and teacher-created units (Grades 9-12)
* Social studies: Integrated Learning through ELA (Grades K-5), Investigating History (Grades 6‑7), and the Democratic Knowledge Project (Grade 8)

According to CURATE, EL Education (Grades 3-5), Eureka Math (Grades K-5), Odell High School Literacy (Grades 9-12), and Pearson (Grades 9-12) partially meet expectations, whereas Open Up Math (Grades 6-7) and EL Education (Grades 6-8) meet expectations. According to EdReports ratings, for ELA, Imagine Learning’s EL Education (Grades K-5 and Grades 6-8) meet expectations; for mathematics, Eureka Math and Open Up Mathematics meet expectations; and for science, OpenSciEd meets expectations. The district’s other curricula do not have CURATE ratings because teachers create/develop them. Beyond the core curricula, the district implements several supplemental programs for enhancement, including decodable texts at the elementary level and MyPath at the middle and high school levels. Because many selected curricula do not fully meet standards, and other materials are not rated, selecting more materials that meet standards—or verifying the standards alignment of existing materials—is an area for growth in the district.

Curriculum selection and use is a current area of focus for the district. Randolph has a process in place for reviewing and selecting curricula and associated materials and used this process to select a new literacy program as part of the district’s overall commitment to improving literacy instruction (see Leadership and Governance). This process is clear and well-defined for reviewing, selecting, and adopting curricular materials, making this a strength of the district. In Stage 1 of the curricular review process, PK-12 teams analyze formal data (i.e., MCAS, i-Ready, DIBELS, ACCESS, common assessments) and use a five-stage plan for revising new curricula that includes expected outcomes plus timeline and budgetary implications. In Stage 2, the district selects, develops, and/or revises [existing] curricula based on needs identified in the Stage 1 report. Stage 2 includes (a) piloting the new curriculum and identifying professional development needs associated with adoption or (b) evaluating resources and materials currently in use and revising them. During Stage 3, which can last between one and three years, the district implements the new curriculum and materials. The district provides materials and professional development for the revised curriculum, as well as overall support. In Stage 4, the district monitors the implementation of the curriculum and its scope and sequence, collecting data for evaluation and making adjustments to documents or assessments as necessary. The district continues to provide professional development offerings related to curriculum, instruction, assessment, and resources. Lastly, in Stage 5, the district evaluates strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and/or newly adopted materials and/or programs. The district then prepares to begin a new curricular study the following year.

Most recently, the district used this process to review and select the EL Education literacy curriculum for elementary grades. Randolph’s *Literacy Action Plan* outlines the district’s commitment to developing vertically and horizontally aligned standards-based, culturally sustaining literacy curricula and high-quality instructional materials in all content areas. Staff described how the district conducted this process for selecting new materials in line with their literacy plan. One district leader described the process, in which a team of 25 members, including leaders and teachers, chose the district’s elementary ELA curriculum. The process included setting criteria for the curriculum consistent with district needs and high-quality instructional materials. As one district leader described,

Real text was one of our criteria, being aligned to the science of reading was one of our criteria, culturally responsive was one of our criteria. So we had criteria, and then we went to CURATE and EdReports and looked at the top programs.

The district’s literacy curriculum team then piloted select curricula in a sample of classrooms, observed in districts already using the potential curricula, asked participants to rate each curriculum, and then had participants debate the merits of each curriculum. One principal described the process this way: “There were teachers piloting, and then there were multiple meetings with a lot of voices. So the literacy process for selection, I think, was really collaborative, including administrators, teachers, coaches, content folks—the whole gamut.”

The district is currently evaluating new mathematics curricula options and is piloting Illustrative Mathematics (with an EdReports rating of meets expectations). A district curriculum leader said this process is just beginning but will follow the previous model: “The math coordinator is going through a closely aligned process to ELA.” Teachers at the middle and high school described the current state of mathematics curriculum use as inconsistent. At the middle school level, one teacher noted lacking a centralized, consistent program for all teachers, and that most teachers feel as if they are creating their own curriculum. Similarly, at the high school, staff reported sharing teacher-created materials: “A veteran teacher who is great at lesson planning and works together and shares her Google Drive with everybody on the math department.” High school teachers reported that they were possibly aware of upcoming pilots, but most departments did not have an established curriculum at the time of the site visit, and a previous pilot had mixed results:

I don’t even know what the curriculum name would be if there is [one]. [We] do not have a curriculum supposedly . . . again. I guess they tried to pilot something last year, and that didn’t work very well, so I guess in January we’re supposed to try to pilot against something again.

The curriculum review and selection process is in its early stages for other subjects.

Although district and school leaders said the literacy curriculum selection process went well and was inclusive, some middle school teachers expressed frustration with changes, particularly support for implementation (see Classroom Instruction). The superintendent described some disagreement with the changes in the literacy curriculum among elementary school teachers; however, because no elementary school teachers participated in this report’s elementary focus group, corroboration was not possible. According to the superintendent, teachers objected to the selection of a published curriculum versus a curriculum created by local educators: “They’re calling it canned. I’m calling [it] high-quality instructional materials.” A similar program is undergoing implementation at the middle school level, and adoption is challenging, but slowly progressing. At the high school level, teachers reported that the selected ELA curriculum does not support students not on grade level:

English just got a brand new curriculum. They just purchased one. But it’s not friendly to [students] who are not at grade level. . . . [You know how] some programs come with the grade level, and here are your resources to modify or to track kids who are below grade level? It does not have that component.

Secondary teachers mostly agreed that the current ELA curriculum does not meet the needs of their students and expressed the feeling that the adoption process did not include their feedback, a sentiment that potentially contradicts the strength cited above about the strength of curriculum selection process. Although some district leaders said that some teachers spoke publicly about curriculum and their concerns, a review of school committee minutes indicated discussions of objections at only one recent meeting. At the September 21, 2023 school committee meeting, the superintendent reported some complaints from parents regarding the new literacy curriculum, but there were no teacher complaints in school committee minutes, and no parents registered complaints about the new literacy curriculum in the parent focus group.

Multiple teachers and district leaders spoke about the need for a more thorough implementation plan for other curricula once approved and a lack of support in the implementation of new curricula. One district leader acknowledged that the selected ELA program was “a huge, heavy lift for teachers to implement.” The need to robustly support the implementation of curricula once selection is complete is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph uses district curriculum maps and scope and sequence charts, which outline expectations and outcomes for students. These maps are publicly available on the district website. A number of teachers teach the standards in these maps using locally created curricula, particularly in subjects without a completed curriculum review (such as in mathematics). In other subjects, district staff described a greater reliance on “open source” materials: “We have a lot of open source curricula. . . . But in terms of transparency, what we are currently using, that’s all available on our website.” At the elementary level, district staff said the curriculum team maps out the scope and sequence of content, and department leaders review across grade levels to vertically align plans. This description had no corroboration from elementary level teachers, due to non-participation in focus groups. Middle school teachers reported having a scope and sequence chart, though one teacher reported that some colleagues, particularly in subjects where there has not been a recent curriculum review, feel they are creating their own curriculum. Middle school teachers reported that their experiences with social studies and science curricula were more consistent, such as OpenSciEd, with frequent meetings to align efforts. Randolph’s district-created materials follow DESE’s Focus Indicators, known within the district as Focus 5, according to district staff. Focus 5 is a current district instructional priority, and staff at multiple levels of the system consistently described Focus 5 as a priority. However, teachers at multiple levels described the specific use of documented scope and sequence charts as inconsistent. Aligning instructional materials with scope and sequence charts to create more consistent approaches to instruction within subjects and grade levels is an area for growth in Randolph.

### Classroom Instruction

Randolph’s leaders have a defined instructional vision, which emphasizes the Focus 5 principles. District leaders said that their districtwide vision for effective instruction included the Focus 5 principles: Safe Learning Environment, Student Engagement, Objectives for Learning, Criteria for Success, and Checking for Understanding. One district leader said,

We have instructional focuses this year. That’s on our website as well. . . . Overall, our instructional focuses are implementation of the Focus 5. We are moving towards being a project-based learning district. And then each content area has instructional focuses, and that’s where their PD [professional development] is related to.

A review of district professional development plans at the elementary, middle, and high school levels verifies that these priorities are a key part of teacher learning at least monthly. Sessions at all levels have labels indicating each activity’s relationship either to the priority for social-emotional learning, strong instructional practices, or literacy (see Human Resources). However, teacher focus group responses to questions about a district instructional focus were mixed. One teacher representative reported being familiar only with a literacy performance goal, though characterized this familiarity negatively. No elementary teachers volunteered for the offered focus group and thus could not verify priorities at that level. Multiple middle school teachers described Focus 5 as a district effort, citing specific strategies (e.g., engagement) that they were implementing in their classrooms. At the high school level, teachers did not describe a singular focus area, instead remarking that focus areas changed often:

There is a really big lack of institutional knowledge because there’s such a high turnover rate, both at the teacher level and at the building administrative and the district administrative level. . . . Like we’ll end up just switching policies like every year or every other year.

Although instructional priorities are clearly understood at the district level, implementing these priorities more consistently across all grade levels is an area for growth in Randolph. The superintendent described a walkthrough process and tool that district leaders are already using to align instruction with district priorities: “If we’re saying that these are our five focus areas, we need to make sure everyone understands what they are and, like, what kind of feedback they are going to give to teachers to change those practices.”

District leaders described efforts to create a safe learning environment, part of the Focus 5, that walkthroughs, professional development, and other efforts are all designed to support. Randolph’s District Curriculum Accommodation Plan and MTSS framework documents detail a variety of resources and supports designed to meet the needs of diverse learners, such as word banks, multisensory inputs, and simplified vocabulary. However, as high school teachers described previously, some teachers reported that instructional materials made it difficult to accommodate all students. The district nonetheless is working to create inclusive learning environments that support differences in student learning needs, especially for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities receive services through a wide variety of programs depending on their needs, as outlined in their individualized education program (IEP). To account for differences in students’ learning needs, Randolph has an MTSS as well as nine special education programs available at schools throughout the district. (See Tiered Systems of Support for additional details.) A review of the *Family and Student Guide to Randolph Public Schools 2023-2024* indicated that the district has several special education and student services programs available throughout the district, including the following:

* Prekindergarten Program
* RISE Program
* Language Based Program
* GROW (Getting Ready for the Outside World) Program
* Therapeutic Learning Center Program
* Independent Learning Center Program
* Intensive Independent Learning Center Program
* Individualized Learning Community Program
* AIM Academy Program

Within these programs, students receive instruction in inclusive classrooms with individualized support from educational support professionals. These programs emphasize teaching students within the least restrictive environment that is appropriate for their needs.

Related, classroom observations highlighted a strength in classroom organization throughout the district. In the CLASS observation system, classroom organization is “the organization and management of students’ behavior time and attention in the classroom” (Classroom Assessment Scoring System Manual, p.3 )[[6]](#footnote-7). Observations provide evidence that rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and consistently reinforced by the teacher, and teachers provide a steady flow of productive activities for students. These observation data, combined with the plans described in district documents, indicate that the district has clear plans and strategies for creating inclusive learning environments and that these plans are improving instructional environments for students, making this a strength of the district.

Although the district has made strides in developing academic interventions to support all students, their effectiveness is unknown. As one teacher stated, “There are interventions in place, but their effectiveness is another question.” Students from focus groups described having academic support blocks and afterschool help as key avenues for receiving extra support. Related, data from classroom observations suggested additional support is needed. Across all grade bands, the overall Instructional Support domain scores were in the lower middle range. In the CLASS observation system, Instructional Support focuses on the “distinction between simply learning facts and gaining ‘usable knowledge’” and includes concepts such as “feedback, a focus on higher order thinking skills, and presentation of new content within a broader, meaningful context” (Classroom Assessment Scoring System Manual, p. 4)[[7]](#footnote-8) Observations provide evidence that teacher feedback to students is sometimes perfunctory, with few opportunities for students to apply knowledge within familiar contexts or engage in higher order thinking. These data indicate a need to improve instructional rigor.

### Student Access to Coursework

Randolph is developing a variety of educational offerings to allow students to engage in rigorous learning experiences, yet access to these experiences is a challenge for all students. According to the district website, Randolph uses the PLTW Launch curriculum at the elementary level, in which Grades K-5 students explore physical science, earth and space science, life science, and computer science through immersion in hands-on activities and real-world problems supported by fiction and nonfiction texts. Grades K-2 students attend four science and technology classes per week, whereas students in Grades 3-5 attend five such classes per week. No elementary teachers volunteered for the offered focus group, so the site visit team could not verify access to these opportunities with elementary teachers.

At the middle school level, Randolph uses the PLTW Gateway curriculum, in which Grade 6 students learn the design process to design a therapeutic toy for a child who has cerebral palsy; Grade 7 students explore computer science concepts and skills by developing a physical computing device or developing code for microcontrollers; and Grade 8 students play the role of real-life medical detectives as they collect and analyze medical data to diagnose disease. In a focus group, teachers described mathematics as one of the few areas in middle school with advanced learning opportunities. Teachers said the mathematics lab learning experience, where students at higher proficiency levels can get access to advanced learning opportunities and students who need additional support can receive reinforcement, is available this year. Teachers generally characterized advanced learning opportunities at the middle school as limited, with one teacher remarking, “We have an honors cohort in ELA; it is just called honors but actually it is just for students who are reading on level.” In addition, parents in focus groups reported having few current opportunities for advanced coursework at the elementary level or middle school levels. Middle school students and teachers also reported having no world language opportunities, despite opportunities in previous years, with the elimination of language offerings in conjunction with some pandemic-related reductions. Parents similarly lamented the absence of world language learning opportunities at the middle school level. The need for additional advanced coursework opportunities at the elementary and middle school levels is an area for growth in Randolph.

Randolph High School provides additional opportunities for students to pursue rigorous learning experiences aligned to their interests. The high school offers three different postsecondary programs that allow students to gain career exposure. According to the high school’s *Program of Studies* document, these programs include business, dual enrollment, and a computer science innovation career pathway. For all high school students, a variety of opportunities exist beyond the postsecondary programs. According to the *Program of Studies* document, multiple classes are available to students outside the core course offerings, including in ELA (e.g., Creative Writing, Public Speaking, Storytelling/Podcast, Journalism, SAT Prep); performing arts (e.g., Concert Band, Chamber Singers, Concert Chorale, Digital Audio Production, Class Piano, Theater and Broadway, Ukelele); history and social studies (e.g., Psychology, Criminal Justice, AP African American History, Peer Leadership, Gender Studies, Genocide and Conflict); arts (e.g., Commercial Art, Mixed Media, Printmaking); health and physical education (e.g., Personal Training); and world languages (e.g., French, Spanish). The high school also offers several honors courses beyond AP courses. A district leader said that the school is trying to offer these courses in a variety of ways to make them available to more students:

One thing that we experimented [with] last year was offering an honors and [college preparatory] course together in one course so that students had the ability to . . . rise up to honors work throughout a semester. . . . We’re trying to improve our offerings around AP and honors offerings at the high school.

The wide array of courses available to students at the high school is a strength of the district.

Randolph provides opportunities for students to pursue a variety of learning experiences, district leaders and secondary teachers expressed concerns about the equity of access to AP courses for students who are historically underserved. A review of DESE’s advanced course completion statistics shows few, if any, racial gaps among Randolph students. These figures indicate that many students of all racial groups can take an advanced course, including 85 percent of Asian students, 71 percent of Black students, 70 percent of Hispanic students, and 61 percent of White students. Among AP courses, specifically—a subset of advanced coursework-- staff reported a desire to diversify enrollment. One school leader said,

I think Randolph does better than some other districts in terms of [the diversity of] our enrollment in AP classes. However, that’s still not good enough, as far as I’m concerned. I think we really do need to push [to increase diversity].

Further, a secondary teacher noted that only one AP course is open enrollment, and financial and time requirements, including testing fees or Saturday sessions, are barriers to wider participation in AP courses for some students. High school students reported similar sentiments about representation. Multiple staff explained that the district is examining student enrollment data and planning to investigate strategies for enrolling more students of color in AP courses.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should expand its curriculum review and selection process to additional grades and subjects, so that students can receive high-quality instructional materials sooner.*
* *The district should provide greater levels of support to educators adopting and implementing newly selected curricula through professional learning (such as coaching, mentorship, or collaborative planning).*
* *The district should work with its department leaders and teachers to align instructional materials with scope and sequence charts to create more consistent approaches to instruction.*
* *The district should review the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report (Appendix B), in which multiple indicators related to Instructional Support were in the low range across both elementary and secondary levels, to strengthen core instruction for all students.*
* *Where feasible, the district should expand coursework opportunities for all students, but particularly for students who may be prepared to take on more rigorous coursework.*

## Assessment

District and school leaders in Randolph are making strides in how they use data to improve teaching, learning, and decision making, particularly in literacy. Randolph’s director of curriculum and instruction, along with school principals and other district leaders, support this data culture and work together to guide assessment processes. District leaders reported that the district recently contracted with the consulting group Ideal to improve its data collection and storage system. Evidence indicates that educators have access to a wide variety of data to inform their classroom instruction, including DIBELS, i-Ready, and MCAS. The district implemented systems for supporting data use, including grade-level data meetings and MTSS meetings. The district transparently shares data with students’ families through easily accessible online platforms, including PowerSchool, ClassDojo, Clever, and Google Classroom; however, students and families would like more timely results. Areas for growth relate to both data available and the systems and culture of data use at some schools.

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’s Literacy Action Plan includes the coordinated use of literacy data tools at the elementary and middle school levels. * The district has established a data system to allow for easier storage and access to data. | * Strengthening assessment systems at the high school level |
| [Data use](#_Data_Use_1) |  | * Restructuring data use opportunities across all grade levels and departments to include supports like coaching and collaboration for teachers in similar roles * Creating a more uniform and robust system of data collection and use at the high school level |
| [Sharing results](#_Sharing_Results) | * The district has made strides to increase sharing of data with families. | * Providing students and families with more timely information on student progress |

### Data and Assessment Systems

Randolph’s concerted efforts on reading have resulted in strong data and assessment systems, particularly for literacy. Systems for collecting and aligning data are strongest at the elementary and middle school levels, where teachers administer Assessing Math Concepts (K-2), DIBELS (K-8), i‑Ready Reading (Grades 3-8), i-Ready Math (Grades 3-8), and MCAS (Grades 3-8). As part of progress monitoring, teachers administer DIBELS three times per year to Tier 1 students, monthly to all Tier 2 students, and biweekly to Tier 3 students at the elementary level. In addition, teachers administer assessments that gather additional information from targeted student populations, such as ACCESS for ELs (administered to all multilingual students), Quick Phonics Screeners, Quick Spelling Surveys, and oral language assessments. As part of its effort to implement the new literacy curriculum with fidelity, students take assessments embedded within the curriculum, which helps create a more comprehensive picture of student performance. One school leader stated that the district was working hard to “calibrate all of the leaders across the district, so that we are assessing the same things, looking for the same things.” Middle school teachers, for example, described progress monitoring tools such as i-Ready and curriculum-connected assessments in social studies and science as important parts of their data systems. According to a district leader, Randolph has more recently implemented a new mathematics assessment that provides targeted information on foundational concepts.

Randolph’s recent implementation of its Literacy Action Plan and the district’s regular administration of literacy assessments and frequent analysis of literacy data, especially at the elementary and middle school levels, are recent initiatives with major data components. The LAP’s coherent approach includes complementary data systems that allow for tracking student progress of a significant district priority. The coordinated use of literacy data tools are a strength of the district.

The district’s work with Ideal Consulting resulted in a new SPS, allowing for central storage of—and more ready access to—district data: “So that all lives [in SPS], and so then we have data meetings and whatnot. We can pull up students and see their math, their reading, and their DIBELS scores all in one place.” The new literacy data sources use this system for storage and dissemination of results among staff. The establishment of this data system is a strength of the district.

Data and assessment systems are less developed at the high school level, where teachers administer the MCAS (Grade 10) and i-Ready Reading (Grades 9-11). Focus group data from students and teachers suggest that high school teachers more frequently develop their own assessments and rubrics than teachers at lower levels. One teacher characterized data use at the high school as focused on “grades and our own individualized things. It’s kind of like grading and figuring out class work and things like that how they’re doing like basically [with] work samples.” Teachers and district leaders reported also using behavioral and attendance data to inform decisions about student interventions, although one teacher stated that there was “no agreed-upon” data used to identify students for substantially separate classrooms. In addition, several principals and several high school teachers referred to the IEP process when asked about sharing data with families, indicating that some data sharing systems may be limited to those mechanisms. These comments suggest that providing students and parents with clearer and more timely sharing of results is an area for growth in Randolph. In tandem with focus group data on assessment systems on data use, they also demonstrate a need to strengthen assessment systems at the high school level.

### Data Use

Support for data use in Randolph is stronger at some levels than in others. A district leader reported that “[data use is] the strongest at the elementary [schools], we’re getting there at [the] middle [school], and we’re not there at all at [the] high school.” Principals reported having district-level data meetings, as well as some kind of common planning time (CPT) data meetings at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Use of this time for effective data analysis and planning for instructional changes varies by level.

At the district level, leaders use data to make informed decisions about student literacy goals, and the superintendent and district leaders frequently reference the district’s goal of having 80 percent of students reading on grade level and cited yearly growth toward that goal. Each school has an MTSS team, which meets twice per month to discuss student data and develop action plans. However, a member of the student support team reported that some schools were more “rigid” than others in how they collect data, and principals missing MTSS meetings—or canceling them altogether—was more common at some schools than at others. One student support team member reported having had one MTSS meeting by the time of the site visit at the end of October.

At the elementary level, grade-level data meetings occur three times per year to analyze results from screener assessments and create individual action plans for schools. One school leader reported that although the district made improvements in their systems and structures to support the regular use of literacy data, they are still “getting there” with mathematics and implied that adoption of the new mathematics curriculum will influence the data systems for mathematics.

Culture and systems related to data are only partially developed at the middle school level. A middle school teacher noted that a CPT meeting led by coaches supports their data reviews by providing time and space to review i-Ready or MCAS data. Another middle school teacher explained that teachers are expected to review progress monitoring tools monthly and use their CPT to review assessment data. Still, middle school teachers noted having fewer assessment and data cycles with the newly implemented curricula compared with previous years.

High school data use systems are the least developed, with teachers saying they have little common data, and no common structures for data use. High school teachers referenced student data, indicating that they had access to information they collected, but they reported not having meaningful time to analyze it. One teacher stated that they “would love to pour into the data” but that between planning time, instruction, and periods of data collection, “there literally is no time.” Another teacher said of CPT, “If you had teachers teaching one thing, then CPT would make a lot more sense, but for me the CPT ends up robbing me specifically of time,” given that meetings for some teachers combine staff with different teaching responsibilities at the high school level. Teachers across levels also explained that the nature of CPT did not allow for special education and EL teachers to examine relevant data alongside general education teachers. Restructuring opportunities for data use—such as providing coaching during CPT and facilitating collaboration for teachers with similar responsibilities—is an area for growth in Randolph, particularly at the high school level.

### Sharing Results

Recently, Randolph made strides in communicating data with stakeholders. Data from focus groups indicated that school leaders and teachers have access to relevant data to support decision making. Much of Randolph’s focus is on communicating literacy data to staff and parents alike. Parents of elementary school students explained that the district also shares student data in parent conferences; through teachers’ use of ClassDojo and PowerSchool, where parents can view their student’s progress and teacher feedback; as well as schoolwide communications. The district also sends home screening letters, which inform families when students test below grade level on reading. As one principal explained, “This year we all sent out letters to families . . . when their students were in red or orange [and identified as] struggling readers to let them know. We also share with families when a student is brought up [to grade level].” Sharing data with families is a strength of the district.

Middle school students reported mixed opportunities to discuss progress with teachers. They reported that some teachers check in with them on their learning process “to see if you are ready to move on,” but students said this was not a consistent practice. High school students also described mixed experiences with how the district shares their results. A few students reported being unclear about the expectations for getting a good grade, and the standards described in a given rubric do not always align with the grading of their work, which makes it difficult for students to gauge their progress. Another student described how she experienced a delay in grade reporting, causing confusion about her grade in the class.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should strengthen its high school assessment systems by aligning assessments across faculty and sharing results with students and parents on a more timely basis.*
* *The district should strategize with school-level leaders to restructure its data-use practices through structures like common planning time.*
* *The district should support its high school leaders in collecting consistent student data so that it can be used to inform instruction across classes and educators.*
* *In partnership with its school leaders, the district should set expectations for teachers around frequency of grading and communicating that progress with students and their families.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

Randolph’s human resources department includes a director of human resources and two assistants. School-level leaders drive the district’s hiring process, but the district leaders do assist in some recruiting areas and in attempting to diversify the teaching force.

This district’s evaluation system is well-documented. However, implementing Randolph’s framework of supervision, evaluation, mentorship, and educator development consistently is a challenge.

Randolph has various pathways for growth and role progression. The district’s efforts in providing leadership opportunities and supporting career pathways reflects its approach to supporting staff’s aspirations, despite some challenges related to goal prioritization. The district’s assistant superintendent for teaching and learning, as well as staff from the teaching and learning office, coaches, and instructional leaders, lead professional development opportunities. The district also offers a mentoring program, but feedback from teachers indicated variability in implementation.

Randolph has formal professional learning opportunities available to support educators in effectively implementing the curricula. At the elementary level, professional development includes sessions for the new EL Education program, sessions about strong instructional practices, and educator-led sessions. At the secondary level, professional development focuses on school climate, getting to know students, classroom setup, visioning, de-escalation, adult culture, and safe and supportive schools, with some space for content-specific time. In addition, Randolph offers optional out-of-school professional development that focuses on skillful teaching, developing classroom structures, and observing classroom environments.

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_1) |  |  |
| [Recruitment, hiring, and assignment](#_Recruitment,_Hiring,_and) | * The district’s decentralized hiring process emphasizes both principal autonomy and district support. | * Addressing staffing retention issues districtwide, particularly for staff of color |
| [Supervision, evaluation, and educator development](#_Supervision,_Evaluation,_and) | * Randolph’s professional development plan has clear connections to current district priorities​. | * Consistently using the evaluation system as documented, including providing written feedback for both teachers and administrative staff as well as using sufficient evidence and including areas for growth * Consistently implementing the mentoring program, including assigning mentors with sufficient time to prepare and offering mentors sufficient training, guidance, and resources |
| [Recognition, leadership development, and advancement](#_Recognition,_Leadership_Development) |  | * Addressing barriers to advancement, such as pay disparities between teaching and administrative roles |

### Infrastructure

Randolph’s human resources department is a three-person unit responsible for assisting principals in the hiring process and maintaining employment records; the department includes a director of human resources and two assistants. Randolph has a multifaceted approach to managing employment records. As described during interviews with district leaders, this system combines both traditional and digital methods. The district is currently merging traditional human-resources record-keeping systems with more digital tools. Personnel records are what one district leader called “hard copy, regular old school personnel files.” In addition, the district uses a digital platform, Vector Solutions (formerly known as TeachPoint), to monitor tasks such as educator evaluations and Professional Teacher Status. The human resources department manages this hybrid system. Interview participants described how principals and the human resources department have annual conversations to jointly manage which staff are returning, which positions will be open, and which staff are due for evaluations. Some principals reported tracking this information at the building level. A review of documents reveals that the Randolph *Employee Handbook* provides human resources policies and procedures and other information. For example, the district handbook outlines Randolph’s mentoring and induction program (see Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development).

### Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

Hiring in Randolph is coordinated primarily at the building level. With school principals leading the hiring process, the human resources department serves primarily as a “clearinghouse at the end of the process,” checking licensure and other qualifications. As one principal said, “I think we have a lot of autonomy in hiring [in our] buildings.”

The *Hiring Process Manual* outlines Randolph’s decentralized process, which interviewees at the district and school levels confirmed and supported. Another school leader described having notable “autonomy in hiring.” Although principals are the main drivers of this process, the human resources department assists these efforts by advertising positions and verifying licensure of prospective personnel. The district leverages digital platforms such as SchoolSpring and Handshake for job postings and participates in job fairs. In addition, the district attempts to recruit internally by supporting paraprofessional staff in becoming certified teachers, when possible, through a grant focused on diversification. A partnership with Stonehill College is also part of the district’s strategy for recruiting new teachers through a teacher residency program. This one-year master’s program supports hiring new staff, including in two cases hiring a paraprofessional, allowing them to complete residency and their credential, and then become full-time teachers. Randolph’s decentralized hiring process, which emphasizes both principal autonomy and district support, is a strength of the district.

However, interview responses highlighted significant staff shortages and turnover rates at some schools and departments, leading to a reliance on emergency licenses and staff waivers as a temporary solution, in some cases. One district-level respondent remarked that challenges in the profession resulted in a higher level of departures from teachers in the middle of the school year than in the past. Some teachers also echoed this sentiment about high rates of turnover, attributing it to challenges in their working conditions and higher pay and better conditions in neighboring districts. One teacher described it this way:

That [turnover is] all staff, not just our administrators. We lose a lot of really, really solid teachers every single year because of equity issues with, you know, scheduling, for example. A teacher’s not gonna stay in the district if they’re handling three times the workload as their counterpart [in a neighboring district].

Two other teachers, in particular, underscored a sentiment expressed by several staff. One said,

We just don’t have enough teachers . . . I mean, if I had a choice, I probably hire at least another 25 or 30 percent [more] teachers like in each subject area, just because we don’t have enough people to teach enough classes.

A colleague agreed, saying, “We can’t do this anymore. We need to hire teachers. We need to fix this.” A review of state data indicates that the hiring and retention of experienced staff is a challenge in Randolph; the district’s teaching force consisted of 75.5 percent experienced teachers in 2022-23, which is down from 85.6 percent in 2020-21 and below the state rate of 81.3 percent.

Multiple data sources highlight the district’s focus on diversity in recruitment to reflect diversity within the student body. The Randolph *Hiring Process Manual* outlines the district’s recruitment, hiring, and assignment processes. Interview respondents at the district level spoke about the comprehensiveness of the manual, specifically the focus on diversity within the recruitment and hiring process. The district is a member of the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity in Education and uses membership in this consortium to learn about and share best practices with other member districts. A district leader explained the focus on diversity in recruitment by speculating that Randolph may be “the most diverse district in the Commonwealth.” The district leader also hopes to diversify staff in an effort to “teach all our learners.” According to the district’s student enrollment and staffing data from 2022-23, Randolph is still working to achieve an educator workforce that mirrors the student body. The percentages show disparities among Randolph’s African American (17.7 percent of staff compared to 50.9 percent of students), Asian (2.8 percent of staff compared to 16.7 percent of students), and Hispanic (3.6 percent of staff compared to 16.2 percent of students) community members. White staff members constitute a higher percentage (74.4 percent) compared with 11.3 percent White students in the district population. Acknowledging these disparities led to the district implementing the *Hiring Process Manual*, which emphasizes the district’s efforts to recruit and hire applicants from diverse backgrounds. Launching the district’s *Affirmative Action Plan*, mandates interviewing all qualified applicants of color.

Though the district has made efforts to improve recruitment of diverse staff, retention is still an issue. According to one district leader: “I think we do very well with bringing diverse staff in. . . . [The] question now is, we’re focusing on, [is] how do we retain our staff?” Another district leader echoed this sentiment, saying that “we’ve gotten a decent percentage of staff [of color] get hired, but I’ve really seen that retention has kind of [an area of] focus that I don’t know that we have totally tackled. That’s an area of improvement for us.” Addressing these staffing shortages and retention issues for all staff districtwide—but particularly for staff of color—is an area for growth in Randolph.

### Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

Randolph’s supervision and evaluation framework has a structured approach that begins with educator plans tailored to the career stages of its educators. These plans include the Developing Educator Plan, the Self-Directed Growth Plan, the Directed Growth Plan, and the Improvement Plan. In the evaluation process, as written, a school leader works with each person scheduled for evaluation, using the appropriate plan type to develop goals and metrics for the school year. Teacher representatives said they were pleased that many of the evaluation tools had been “individualized” to tailor to different school-level roles, such as guidance counselors.

Throughout the process, the school leader and the evaluated staff member are supposed to determine areas of need and areas of growth. The performance ratings—Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory—play a role in determining the level and type of support an educator receives, as detailed in the procedural documents reviewed. The purpose of school leaders’ engagement in this process is to offer personalized support that allows for individualized professional development, particularly for those educators requiring more targeted support.

District leaders described the process as supportive, but teacher representatives characterized the process as inconsistent in its implementation, saying this inconsistency makes the process lack utility. One district-level respondent said, “It’s not about trying to get someone ‘out’; it’s about support.” The varied levels of principal experience influence their implementation of that support and evaluation, according to interviews with district staff; some principals were new to the role and the evaluation process when the site visit took place. Teacher representatives similarly reported that some administrators follow the process as designed, whereas others miss observations, do not conduct formative or summative evaluations as designated in planning documents, or conduct last-minute evaluations without substantive feedback. One teacher shared:

There are many evaluations that are not done. There are a lot that are kind of, ‘I’m just gonna write a couple of sentences so I can check the box,’ . . . But in terms of their value. I got nothing out of that [process].

District-level interview respondents also reported that some previous principals did not consistently conduct or document staff evaluations. As shown in the following paragraph, few of the reviewed evaluations listed areas for improvement. One district leader characterized the evaluation rubrics, as “watered down”; this person said local adaptations to the state’s model tools made it “a challenge to rate someone as ‘needs improvement.’”

As noted in the Infrastructure section, Randolph uses a web-based evaluation system, Vector Solutions, to house teacher evaluation information. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample of 10 percent of 200 teachers due for summative evaluations for the 2022-2023 school year. Seventeen of the 20 teacher evaluations randomly selected for review were available for review, but only 13 evaluations were complete and not missing the required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating and student learning and professional practice SMART goals. Less than a quarter of the evaluations reviewed (four) indicated multiple sources of evidence, such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence, to support evaluation ratings of progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. Fourteen summative evaluations included feedback for each standard, with feedback including strengths or practices the teacher should continue; only five evaluations included feedback indicating areas of improvement.

Administrative evaluations also are through Vector Solutions; three of the evaluations reviewed used other forms with identical evaluation criteria. Eighteen district administrators had completed summative evaluations for the 2022-2023 school year, and all evaluations were available for review. Of the 18 evaluations available for review, less than half (six) were complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. In addition, only seven evaluations included student learning, professional practice, school improvement SMART goals, plus multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on the summative evaluation standards. Sixteen summative evaluations included feedback for each standard, complete with evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback naming each administrator’s strengths. However, only four evaluations identified areas of improvement for administrative staff.

Combined, an area for growth in Randolph is more consistently using the evaluation system as designed. Providing written feedback for both teachers and administrative staff as well as using multiple sources of evidence, identifying SMART goals, and including areas for growth for teachers and administrators to support continuous professional growth and positive impacts on student success will lead to improvements in the evaluation system.

Regarding educator professional development, interview responses at the district level indicate an effort to structure offerings in line with developing district priorities. A review of district documents indicated Randolph’s plans for professional development and advancement. The district’s professional development offerings align with current initiatives, including the implementation of new high-quality instructional materials, the Focus 5 strategies, data use, and literacy. This connection between current offerings and the district’s priorities is a strength. Most offerings take place during eight half-day professional development days and one full-day session at the start of the school year. Leaders also reported that school-level coaching is a key part of the district’s strategy for instructional improvement; one principal said, “We also leverage the coaches. They know the curriculum the best. They have two hours a week with teachers as part of their [CPT].”

With the focus on current priorities, district-level staff said that teachers have limited choices in professional development. However, according to one district leader, the district does offer some teacher choice by way of a book club in which educators study a text that is relevant to their work, a teacher choice professional development day, and funding toward relevant graduate course credits that will help teachers improve their practice or advance into other positions in the district. Additionally, a committee of teachers and school leaders has traditionally used feedback to monitor the effectiveness and relevance of Randolph’s professional development offerings, though in recent years this group has been “a little shaky since…just because of COVID and hasn’t been…the best implemented,” according to one district staff member. Teachers and school-level staff said that they have limited choices, and some staff—particularly specialists—have limited opportunities for growth. One teacher representative said,

I don’t really get a lot of [professional development] that helps me as a [specialist]. Like, I’ve sat in curriculum meetings, and I’m, like, I have nothing to do with this, like, I don't even use this curriculum. So for those of us who are non-classroom teachers, the PD--I guess it depends on your group—can be lacking.

Similarly, an experienced staff member said that professional development offerings also lacked differentiation: “My skills are a little bit more advanced . . . than a brand new teacher. So they also don’t separate.”

Middle school teachers highlighted school-based coaching and mentoring as a key feature of Randolph’s professional development program. The collaborative coaching model allows teachers to work directly with instructional coaches across various disciplines, facilitating specialized support in diverse areas such as English as a second language and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Although middle school teachers highlighted the coaching model, no elementary teachers volunteered to participate in the scheduled focus group for teachers at that level, so the presence of coaching at the elementary level was not verifiable. High school teachers did not describe coaching as a key part of their professional development.

Documentation about Randolph’s mentorship and induction system shows that the system is in place to support new teachers. The district has three mentor coordinators, and these coordinators hold training every year for mentors. Principals help match mentors with new teacher participants, and all new teachers have a mentor for one or two years, based on their type of licensure. However, some teachers said the mentoring process had inconsistent implementation. The Randolph *Induction Program Handbook* is a guide for new educators and their mentors. The handbook describes an induction program that includes mandatory meetings, a mentorship system, and an orientation process, all aimed at easing the integration of new staff into the district. During interviews, district staff stated that mentors receive training and recommendations from coordinators, but principals ultimately select the mentors. Interviews of middle school teachers confirmed the mentoring program structure but revealed variability in the implementation of mentorships across schools, including the frequency of mentor-mentee interactions, the timeliness of mentor-mentee matching, and the provision of resources—such as training and manuals—for mentors. For instance, a designated mentor teacher did not receive their list of assigned mentees until a day before the school year began; earlier notification would have allowed the mentor to help their assigned mentee locate materials and prepare to start the year, as outlined in the manual. This example suggests that consistency in the implementation of mentoring is an area for growth in Randolph.

### Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Educators in Randolph have some opportunities for growth, leadership development, and career advancement, as highlighted in both interview responses and district documentation. One district leader said that recognition was more common at the building level than the district level. Teacher representatives said that some positions are open to teachers: “Coaches have moved up from like classroom teachers . . . a couple coordinators have moved up, like in terms of leadership. We have one teacher that’s moved up to the assistant principal.” Teachers are eligible to receive up to $1,500 per year in reimbursement for courses that facilitate transitioning into different district positions, according to the district. However, one teacher pointed out some senior teachers moving to junior administrator positions can result in a reduction in salary, which may discourage some staff from making the change. Teachers cited this pay disparity, as well as the filling of some positions by external applicants rather than district staff, as discouraging some teachers from seeking advancement. Addressing these barriers to advancement that teachers described is an area for growth in Randolph.

The advancement of paraprofessionals to teaching positions and opportunities for teachers to lead small programs illustrate Randolph’s commitment to professional growth and leadership for staff members. Focus group responses also indicated the district partnership with Stonehill College to provide paraprofessionals an opportunity to pursue career advancement through reduced-rate courses. The opportunity for teachers to serve on a school’s leadership team, the articulated opportunities for advancement within the district, funding support for a transition to leadership positions, along with support for paraprofessionals to lead programs and move into teaching positions, are other examples of opportunities for advancement.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should diagnose and address (where possible) its issues around staffing shortages and staff retention.*
* *The district should monitor staff’s consistent and complete use of the evaluation system, so that teachers and administrators receive written feedback that addresses gaps, is based on evidence, and is actionable.*
* *The district should streamline implementation of the mentoring system by assigning mentors and mentees prior to the start of the school year, setting clear expectations concerning mentor/mentee interactions, and providing training and resources.*
* *Where feasible, the district should address barriers around educator advancement; some solutions may have budgetary implications.*

## Student Support

Randolph has structures and systems in place to support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of all students. The district has plans in place for positive behavioral approaches to student behavior, has MTSS teams at each school and grade level, and works to embed data reviews within all layers of the system. The district also offers several targeted special education and student services programs.

Randolph recognizes the importance of engaging with families, students, and the greater community and is working to increase family engagement to a broader group of families. The district offers several opportunities for students and their families to get involved in the district, including school councils, the parent advisory board, and parent teacher organizations. Randolph also partners with local organizations (Randolph Community Partnership Inc. and Codman Square Health Center) to provide community supports, such as high-quality primary care and adult education courses.

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) |  | * Creating more supportive environments in the upper grades, particularly in the case of climate and relationships |
| [Tiered systems of support](#_Tiered_Systems_of) |  | * Consistently implementing the MTSS process as designed |
| [Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships](#_Family,_Student,_and) | * The district has several community partnerships that provide valuable services to students and families. | * Creating more frequent and accessible opportunities for parents to provide feedback to the district and/or participate in district decision-making * Increasing opportunities for student voice |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

Randolph’s plans for forming a safe and supportive environment focus on three district priorities: social-emotional learning, equity, and access and inclusion. District leaders described these as major focal points for the district: “It’s one of our focuses as a district is to have those safe, supportive, and welcoming environments and climates for students, families, and staff. So it’s always a topic of conversation.” District staff described several districtwide strategies, including calming corners for students to learn social-emotional regulation, books that reflect equity and cultural competence, and revisions to curricula “really focusing like with the staff on differentiation and UDL [Universal Design for Learning], of really giving the kids what they need to be successful.” The majority of examples that district staff cited reflected practices at the elementary level.

Generally, district fosters a welcoming and supportive learning environment for many students, as evidenced by data from students and families reporting being physically and emotionally safe in school, particularly at the elementary level. The results from the Views of Climate and Learning student survey indicate some room for improvement in providing all students with positive learning experiences, particularly for students in the upper grades. Students across the elementary schools reported a relatively strong school climate, as evidenced by overall school climate scores in the favorable range (51 to 70, with a maximum score of 100). The results for Randolph Community Middle School and Randolph High School indicated overall school climate scores in the somewhat favorable range (31 to 50). Middle school students reported that relationships with teachers were good, but that student conflicts such as fights created concerns about safety. High school students expressed that they felt largely welcomed and supported by other students. Regarding relationships with adults, high school students’ replies were more mixed on relationships, such as reporting some instances of bias among teachers. High school students indicated they had some opportunities for leadership and engagement with teachers and school leaders. Creating more supportive environments in the upper grades, particularly in the care of climate and relationships, is an area of growth for the district.

Regarding access and inclusion, stakeholders reported mixed success with supporting students with disabilities in mainstream settings. One guardian reported a concern for how students who receive special education services, saying that they did “not feel [students with IEPs] were a part of the school,” and another stated that the special education program “needs improvement” for these reasons. Similarly, a high school teacher reported that they see “an issue with the quality of the interventions that are provided outside of the sub-separate classroom,” expressing concern about whether all-inclusive efforts meet students’ needs at that level. Another staff member remarked that they would like to see additional professional development for staff in supporting students with disabilities.

Data from focus groups indicated that Randolph is in the developing stages of how it cultivates culturally responsive and inclusive classroom environments. Although parents and teachers indicated that the district is making headway in being culturally responsive, such as through its curriculum choices and cultural holidays, members of the student support team cited a need for a more robust system to support the district’s growing populations of ELs and Students With Limited or Interrupted Formal Education. As one staff member described, they would like “to improve and actually implement some better practices around how we acclimate newcomer students to our schools, and how we welcome them into the classroom, how we work with their families.”

Randolph is improving its implementation of clear positive behavior approaches, as evidenced by instructional observations, family focus groups, and district documents. The district handbook, which documents the district’s behavior policies and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) program, guides these policies, and staff in focus groups universally acknowledged this practice as a key Randolph effort. One school leader said, “I think most of the schools have participated in the PBIS academies.” Still, as noted in Data Use and Tiered Systems of Support, the district is still building its systems for regular family communication. Each family must sign an acknowledgment of receiving the handbook before enrolling students in the district. Further, staff at the upper grades reported that PBIS has inconsistent implementation at those levels: “There’s literally no structure for PBIS; . . . we don’t have a structure in place that is schoolwide.” A colleague attributed this lack of building knowledge to several high school staff who received training in PBIS in previous years but then left their positions. While schoolwide systems for PBIS are an area for growth, observation scores from the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report were in the high range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (both at 6.2) and in the upper middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.5), suggesting that rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and consistently reinforced by teachers in individual classrooms.

### Tiered Systems of Support

Randolph has tiered systems of support for students’ social-emotional needs and is now trying to build the same strong systems for academic needs. According to one district leader, approximately one quarter (23.5 percent) of Randolph students had an IEP in 2019, which prompted discussions about how students received referrals to special education services. The district leader described how they aligned the assessment systems within the Literacy Action Plan with their MTSS structure. According to the same district leader, the percentage of students with IEPs has decreased, although officially reported figures indicate that approximately 23 percent of students have identified disabilities this year, which is roughly the same percentage as five years ago.

For students’ social-emotional needs, Randolph was responsive in addressing students’ mental health concerns following the pandemic and has since maintained the same supports, according to district leaders. Social workers have check-in/check-out systems at each school to monitor student well-being, and family success partnerships provide wraparound services for families in need. The district also built partnerships with the Aspire Health Alliance and Riverside Community Care, which give students access to therapists, and designed the Bridge for Resilient Youth in Transition (BRYT) program to facilitate students transitioning from a hospital into the school environment. Principals reported that each school had regular times for MTSS meetings.

Yet, Randolph still faces some challenges in building its tiered academic supports. Although the district has MTSS teams at each building and a documented system for how often each team should meet, teachers and school support staff described the process as ineffective and unevenly implemented because a lack of communication between departments causes delays in students receiving support, making this an area for growth in Randolph. One teacher commented about a big “lack of institutional knowledge” given high turnover rates at the teacher, administrator, and district levels. Another teacher stated that “reading intervention services are not adequate because they don’t have enough staff and have large caseloads.” A member of the student support team said, “There is a student support system, but it is inconsistent in how it’s done at each school,” and a teacher reported that the district does not “stick with anything long enough to see if it works.” Other teachers reported a need for a “strategic, comprehensive, and actionable” plan for students who are nonverbal, those with limited or interrupted formal education, and those with few prerequisite skills. Middle school students said they felt a need for more counselors and ways of supporting students both academically and socially emotionally. Consistently implementing MTSS processes as designed is an area for growth in Randolph.

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

Data from focus groups indicated that Randolph has some strong practices for family and community engagement, and has made recent growth in engaging all communities within the district. The superintendent cited family engagement as a district priority, describing events, parent surveys, and engagement with parent groups as key parts of this overall district strategy.

Randolph has several means of engaging families, such as the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEAPAC), the English Learner Parent Advisory Council (ELPAC), school site councils, the parent advisory board, and the parent teacher organization. The superintendent identified a measurable family engagement goal of 50 percent of families regularly engaged. In pursuit of this goal, Randolph created a parent advisory council for ELs and started providing adult English classes. As one focus group participant reported, “We’re doing a lot of outreach through our department to get community parents onboard to [. . .] be able to talk about issues and [. . .] and do some of their own advocating [. . .] with the help of the translators.” According to district staff, the number of parents and families engaging in various school activities and events, such as open houses, parent summits, newcomer workshops, and other family-focused educational activities, is higher than in previous years. Families reported generally feeling informed, saying they got communication from the school through emails and telephone calls and could stay aware of their child’s academic progress through platforms such as Class Dojo and PowerSchool. However, interview participants also reported that the consistent use of such platforms varied by teacher and school. Some parents expressed frustrations with some mechanisms for parent voice and input as being too narrow (such as voting in local elections, see Finance and Asset Management). This parent desire for more frequent and accessible opportunities to provide feedback to the district and/or participate in district decision-making is an area of growth for the district.

Randolph has some opportunities for student voice, with room for improvement. For example, the district conducted an equity audit in May 2023 and invited middle and high school students to share their thoughts and experiences on district policies, procedures, and practices, yet students reported few historically underrepresented students in attendance. High school students shared that the school committee invited them directly to join the school committee, and middle school students reported a lack of equity for student engagement opportunities or how to take advantage of these. Students also have leadership opportunities available to them, such as the National Honor Society, the National Junior Honors Society, and student government, but few opportunities offer students voice in school or district decision making. Increasing opportunities for student voice is an area of growth for the district.

Parents and district leaders spoke about several community partnerships that the district established across the Randolph community. The district partnered with an adult education organization, the Randolph Community Partnership Inc., to offer classes in English, citizenship, and basic computer skills to enrolled students in the English for speakers of other languages program. Most recently, Randolph created and established a community partnership with Codman Square Health Center to open a school-based health clinic at Randolph High School. The clinic’s purpose is to provide all students access to high-quality primary care and mental health/behavioral health care as needed. It is open to students, their family members, and other members of the community. These community partnerships are a strength of the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should reassess implementation and execution of positive behavioral approaches to help support students’ social-emotional needs, and then take steps to strengthen supportive environments, particularly at the secondary level.*
* *The district should deploy resources to support consistent implementation of MTSS in all schools and across each grade level as designed.*
* *The district should survey families to better understand how it might provide greater opportunities for communication and collaboration at the district, school, and classroom levels.*
* *The district should design meaningful opportunities for students to exercise voice in district decision-making and engage in critical conversations related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.*

## Financial and Asset Management

An interim director of finance currently leads Randolph’s finance office. Other staff in the finance office address payroll, grants, food services, transportation, and accounts payable, while also managing timesheets and the accurate tracking of grant fund spending. The finance office staff includes the interim director, an executive assistant, and a finance coordinator. The district shares detailed budget documents on its website, including annual reports from fiscal years 2018 to 2024. These documents include user-friendly reports and presentations to the school committee that outline all funding sources, allocations, administrative costs, school budgets, and shared services. While enrollment has declined since 2019, per-pupil expenditures and the overall budget have increased, with the district consistently meeting and exceeding net school spending requirements.

Randolph’s finance office has historically led the budget development process in the district, although district leaders are currently working to distribute this responsibility with school leaders (see Leadership and Governance). The finance office leads the tracking and reporting of expenses to the school committee, the committee’s finance subcommittee, district leaders, and principals. The district’s capital planning process includes annual lists of requests from the school department to the town. Although all parties described the school-town relationship as collaborative and the town as fiscally supportive, evidence suggests that more robust systems for fiscal tracking and long-term capital planning may be necessary. Interview participants described various funding sources—including federal grants and the town’s budget—for capital needs, but the district still faces challenges funding maintenance needs for aging infrastructure.

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) | * Randolph maintains accurate and transparent budget documents. |  |
| [Adequate budget](#_Adequate_Budget) | * The district consistently meets net school spending requirements. | * Installing the new the annual budget review and budget creation processes |
| [Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits](#_Financial_Tracking,_Forecasting,) | * Randolph leaders use detailed financial reporting and provide regular updates to the school committee. | * Creating more accurate fiscal forecasting and tracking systems |
| [Capital planning and facility maintenance](#_Capital_Planning_and) |  | * Creating a long-term capital plan and planning process to address challenges such as aging infrastructure |

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

Randolph maintains clear and accessible budget documents. District budgets from fiscal years 2018 through 2024 are publicly available on the district’s website. In addition, the school committee’s website contains all budgets from recent years. At the time of the visit in late 2023, the school committee had posted a proposed budget summary for the coming fiscal year (2024), indicating school committee involvement in this process. However, a review of minutes from September to November 2023 did not indicate any budget updates during meetings in this period. Randolph’s budget documents and presentations to the school committee also include pertinent information about sources of funds and the allocation of resources. Many of these documents, such as the fiscal year 2022 budget, show clear and precise figures, including percentage changes by category from the previous year. In general, Randolph maintains accurate and transparent budget documents, detailing all funding sources and resource allocations, which is a strength of the district.

Randolph’s budget documents present a detailed view of expenses across schools, with publicly available and user-friendly reports. These reports include specifics on administrative costs, individual school budgets, and shared services such as curriculum and transportation. In addition, Randolph provides online access to past spending data, enabling historical comparisons. The interim finance director also presents regular reports to the town’s finance committee.

Interview responses indicated that no written agreement exists between school and town officials related to cost sharing for educational or other services. Interview participants indicated that school and town staff are partners, and both sides have a collaborative approach to managing district costs. School department interview participants described the town manager as very supportive of the public schools; town officials expressed similar support and described communication as open. As a result, focus group participants said local stakeholders did not feel the need in recent years for formal agreements or even many joint town-school meetings:

In the past if either members of the school committee or the town council felt that there were issues with—there might be some disagreement starting to brew—then we do have joint meetings. But we haven’t had to do that in a number of years because there has been good lines of communication [between] members of the town council and members of the school committee.

However, interview respondents indicated several areas in which school and town officials are having discussions to resolve fiscal issues, with some respondents suggesting that a formal agreement might be appropriate. Respondents said concerns about health insurance costs for transportation staff and insurance cost increases for all staff, as well as the end of some additional funds, such as Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds, may require more involved discussions or written agreements. Interview and focus group respondents said that greater levels of strategic planning and financial coordination may be required in the future.

### Adequate Budget

Randolph exceeded required net school spending in each of the three years preceding the district review (2020—2022) and increased local commitments to the budget. However, several interview participants expressed concern about current and future funding levels in the district given changes in enrollment and the end of some federal funding sources.

According to both interviews and a review of district documents, Randolph’s operating budget has increased for each of the past five years. District documents show that, from 2020 to 2022, Randolph consistently spent more than the required net school spending each year, which is a strength of the district. In 2020, the district spent 39.3 percent more than the required amount and 29.4 percent more than the required amount in 2021; in 2022, the actual expenditure further increased, exceeding the required amount by approximately 32 percent. (See Table D4 in Appendix D). District documents further suggest that the school exceeded net school spending again in the 2023 fiscal year, with the total district reported budget that year representing an overall increase of 11.8 percent from the 2018 figure. In interviews, town officials reported that “in the last year alone, the town increased the school budget by a record amount.” Interviews and a review of documents indicate this amount was just over $3,000,000. The superintendent called this increase of 6.5 percent historic. Interview participants described the increase in the budget corresponding to improvements in communication, collaboration, and advocacy in recent years between school and town officials.

As per the *FY23 Budget Report*, Randolph also benefits from various grants, including the federal ESSER funds for educational support. The district also is a recipient of the Culturally Relevant Digital Literacy grant for enhancing inclusive learning and the Teacher Diversification Pilot to broaden the diversity of its teaching staff.

Multiple district-level interview and focus group respondents said that the end of ESSER funding was an area of concern, despite increases in local support. One district leader cited an increase in the number of students with special needs and MLs, particularly students with unique needs such as newcomers with limited English proficiency, as a budgetary concern because of the need for more specialized staff. District enrollment figures show an increase in MLs in the past five years, from 15 percent in 2019 to 18 percent in 2024, concurrent with a statewide increase from 10 percent to 13 percent in the same period. Although interview participants cited a number of capital and temporary improvements associated with ESSER funds—such as the high school heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) system; science labs; and teacher professional development—they also said that the end of this funding stream may present a challenge for expenses such as salaries in light of these increased expenses. One district leader said, “ESSER has been a buffer and allowed a lot of gain and things that you wouldn’t always be able to afford.” This leader continued, citing a 3 percent across-the-board salary increase as prompting a need for “dissecting of ratios in the classroom” and discussing “combining positions” or other adjustments to staffing and budgets. As local commitments increase and the district changes its budgeting process while grappling with staffing challenges (see Leadership and Governance, Human Resources), local leaders are discussing how to adjust to these new circumstances. Installing the new the annual budget review and budget creation processes—particularly in light of the end of federal grant dollars-- is an area for growth in Randolph.

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

The district’s director of finance is responsible for financial tracking and reporting to key stakeholders. Systems are in place for tracking spending from the general fund, as well as grants, and for conducting end-of-year reporting.

The interim finance director provides regular reports to the school committee and district leaders. Interview participants described how the interim finance director runs biweekly reports on expenditures and weekly reports on more expensive budget areas, such as capital maintenance and special education costs. A school committee member described the process:

We meet monthly as a finance subcommittee and then report to the full [school] committee. And we have the . . . interim director of finance—and the superintendent there. . . . We have monthly spreadsheets. We go over fees that we’re charging in the district. You know, every line item is presented every month. So it’s a…constant update.

Interviewees noted that the district’s finance office creates monthly reports in the MUNIS system for the school committee, summarizing each department’s salary budget and including details on spending plus district and school fees. Providing detailed financial reporting and regular updates to the school committee is a strength of the district.

The finance office also handles grant tracking. During interviews, the interim finance director described how her office tracks grants:

I have a Google sheet with all our grants that includes every single grant we have and it summarizes how much the grant is, how much we’ve spent, and how much is left. There is also a link to the original, more detailed budget so that you can see the original plan and the accounts. We update this twice a month.

The director described this process, with stable amounts and predictable drawdowns, as a “well-oiled machine.” The district still faces some challenges, however, in creating a clearer fiscal relationship between school sites and the central office, as evidenced by instances when the district had to return unspent grant funds.

Even though some participants reported that the district has consistent tracking and reporting in the current year, other evidence from interviews and the document review suggests that the effectiveness of these district financial tracking and forecasting processes could improve, as indicated by a recent audit. Staff from the central office and the town similarly characterized Randolph as having “strong controls in place” on both the town and school sides, and town officials, staff said, do procure audit services of district finances, such as a payroll audit that was occurring concurrently with the district review. A review of district documents, however, shows some efforts to rectify budgeting challenges from as recently as spring 2023. A May 2023 memorandum from an external business management partner, TMS Business Administrative Services, to the finance and budget subcommittee describes incorrect budget labeling in the general fund (originally found to be greater than $1,000,000 but estimated at approximately $500,000 after some reclassifications) and a spending freeze during the records review. The memo further described the need to rectify approximately $270,000 of misallocated expenses from one fiscal year to another. Interview responses further highlighted the challenges in fiscal tracking and forecasting in the district. One district leader described the challenges related to meeting costs in winters with higher amounts of snowfall or colder temperatures, as well as increases in some student populations described in the preceding section. These documents and interview responses suggest that more accurate forecasting and tracking is an area for growth in Randolph.

### Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

Managing capital planning and maintenance in Randolph is a collaborative effort between the district and the town. Interview participants cited several examples of capital maintenance and improvements in the district in recent years. However, the district does not have a long-term capital plan in place; creating a long-term capital plan and planning process to address challenges such as aging infrastructure is an area for growth in Randolph.

The district’s process for capital maintenance is a collaborative effort between the district and the town and requires the submission of project forms for approval by the town council. Interviews and the document review indicated that this process is deliberative and annual but does not include long-term planning. Updating and reviewing the capital request list involves input from various stakeholders, such as the town manager, maintenance directors, and the superintendent, a process that occurs annually. Focus group participants from the town indicated significant recent financial support from the Town of Randolph for the district’s capital needs: “We’ve committed to another $1.25 million in capital improvements this year,” an amount greater, the superintendent said, than the $250,000 to which they were more accustomed. Participants from this same focus group continued, describing the types of needs requested as well as reiterating the town’s support for these needs: “When [the district is] taking on other capital needs, they often are seeking, you know, windows, doors, boilers, roofs—and we’ve always supported the application.”

A review of district documents indicated that the document *Fiscal Year 2024 Capital Plan Requests* outlines a comprehensive set of requests for capital improvements in Randolph for fiscal year 2024. The document lists various projects that meet specific criteria, such as enhancing municipal services, preserving capital assets, and having a minimum value of $25,000 with a usable life cycle of at least five years. Key projects include districtwide building management systems; roof repairs; upgrades to glycol systems and fan motors for the HVAC system; parking lot repairs; playground equipment replacements; and building envelope repairs at John F. Kennedy School. Each project’s details include its location, priority rating, estimated cost, funding sources, expected completion date, and impact on the operating budget. The estimated total cost of these projects is $1,240,340, with a green energy rebate reducing the net amount. On the school side, school committee members and district leaders described the town as supportive, but the process as unusual—one that is just “scratching the surface” of capital maintenance needs given the “very aging infrastructure within Randolph.” As noted in the preceding section, temporary ESSER funds addressed some capital needs, such as the HVAC system at the high school. In focus group discussions, parents and families expressed concerns about the location and planning of the new Lyons Elementary School. They highlighted issues with situating the school in a neighborhood near a busy road, raising safety concerns, especially for students in the special education program. Parents also questioned the process of decision-making and community involvement, saying that the vote for the school’s construction involved a limited number of town residents.

Capital planning has support from school and town partners, but a long-term plan is lacking. The district is preparing for the opening of a new building, the Lyons Elementary School. Respondents said that applying to the Massachusetts School Building Authority is a joint decision that “needed a vote of the town council” for approval. Once in the process, the superintendent described town partners as supportive, noting that “the town has actually put up an additional $1 million outside of what was planned just because, as inflation went up.”

School and district participants both agreed on recent cooperation and mutual support for capital maintenance and for the new school, but several interview responses indicated a need for stronger long-term planning. Members of the school committee said that although there has been recent support in the district, no true plan existed in the past and one will be necessary given the age of many district buildings:

I would say, in years past [that] we haven’t had a great capital project plan or capital plan. I think, with, like, the additional engagement that we’ve received from the school committee members, from our new facilities director, we’ve been able to put forward, you know, a more meaningful kind of request process with the town,

continuing that “there’s probably a lot more that we need to do here . . . I think if we’re on the current trend of what we’ve seen for the capital plan, it’s probably not going to meet the needs.” In describing factors such as unexpected capital maintenance (e.g., broken pipes), one district leader said, “If something major happened to one of our buildings, we don’t have that money.” As such, the current capital maintenance and planning process may not fully address the needs of students because it lacks a comprehensive, long-term vision, making the need for longer-term capital planning an area for growth in Randolph.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should strategically and proactively plan for anticipated increases in expenses or budget shortfalls, and make decisions well-in-advance to prepare for the end of major grants (such as ESSER).*
* *The district should review its financial tracking for accuracy to ensure financial safeguards and prevent overspending.*
* *The district should develop a comprehensive long-term capital plan that addresses the aging infrastructure.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Randolph. The team conducted 67 classroom observations during the week of October 30, 2023, and held interviews and focus groups between October 30 and November 3, 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
* Randolph curriculum and assessment inventory
* 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.

Four observers visited Randolph Public Schools during the week of October 30, 2023. Observers conducted 67 observations in a sample of classrooms across six 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\*: 5.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 5.2 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 26 | 5.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 5.1 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 21 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 27] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 67 observations = 5.2

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 5.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 26 | 5.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 20 | 5.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 21 | 5.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 21] + [6 x 18] + [7 x 12]) ÷ 67 observations = 5.3

Ratings in the Low Range. In these sessions, the teacher has not been aware of students who need extra support and pays little attention to students’ needs. As a result, students are frustrated, confused, and disengaged. The teacher is unresponsive to and dismissive of students and may ignore students, squash their enthusiasm, and not allow them to share their moods or feelings. The teacher is not effective in addressing students’ needs and does not appropriately acknowledge situations that may be upsetting to students. Students rarely seek support from the teacher and minimize conversations with the teacher, not sharing ideas or responding to questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher is sometimes aware of student needs or aware of only a limited type of student needs, such as academic needs, not social-emotional needs. Or the teacher may be aware of some students and not of other students. The teacher does not always realize a student is confused and needs extra help or when a student already knows the material being taught. The teacher may be responsive at times to students but at other times may ignore or dismiss students. The teacher may respond only to students who are upbeat and positive and not support students who are upset. Sometimes, the teacher is effective in addressing students’ concerns or problems, but not always.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher’s awareness of students and their needs is consistent and accurate. The teacher may predict how difficult a new task is for a student and acknowledge this difficulty. The teacher is responsive to students’ comments and behaviors, whether positive or negative. The teacher consistently addresses students’ problems and concerns and is effective in doing so. Students are obviously comfortable with the teacher and share ideas, work comfortably together, and ask and respond to questions, even difficult questions.

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Regard for Student Perspectives captures the degree to which the teacher’s interactions with students and classroom activities place an emphasis on students’ interests, motivations, and points of view and encourage student responsibility and autonomy (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 38, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 35, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 35).

Table 5. Regard for Student Perspectives: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 3.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 3.7 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 26 | 4.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 4.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 14] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 67 observations = 3.7

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.[[8]](#footnote-9)

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

Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 6.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 26 | 6.8 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 21 | 7.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:   
([5 x 1] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 60]) ÷ 67 observations = 6.9

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

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

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average\*: 5.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 5.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 26 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 21 | 6.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 4] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 30]) ÷ 67 observations = 5.9

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\*: 5.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 5.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 26 | 5.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 6.1 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 6.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 2] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 18] + [7 x 25]) ÷ 67 observations = 5.8

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 5.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 5.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 26 | 5.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 4.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 2] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 21] + [6 x 12] + [7 x 11]) ÷ 67 observations = 5.0

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K−3

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

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

Concept Development District Average\*: 4.1

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

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 2] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 17 observations = 4.1

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

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

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

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

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 50 | 4.3 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 4.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 4.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 4.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 5] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 18] + [5 x 16] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 50 observations = 4.3

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 3.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 50 | 3.0 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 2.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 13] + [2 x 8] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 50 observations = 3.0

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

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

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

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

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 12

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

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

Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 3.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 | 3.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 3.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 3] + [2 x 20] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 67 observations = 3.3

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 3.4 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 3.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 1] + [2 x 8] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 17 observations = 3.4

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 50 | 3.1 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 4] + [2 x 13] + [3 x 15] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 50 observations = 3.1

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4−12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average\*: 4.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 50 | 4.9 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 5.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 4.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 21 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 7]) ÷ 50 observations = 4.9

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

|  | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 24 | 18 | 33 | 104 | 5.4 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 26 | 5.4 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 26 | 6.8 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 26 | 5.2 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 26 | 4.2 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 78 | 5.4 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 26 | 5.5 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 26 | 5.5 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 26 | 5.3 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 2 | 21 | 16 | 12 | 19 | 11 | 6 | 87 | 3.9 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 4.1 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 4.4 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4.3 |
| Quality of Feedback | 1 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 3.7 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 3.4 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.6 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2** | **1** | **2** | **4** | **9** | **5.9** |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 6] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 26 observations = 5.4

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([5 x 1] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 21]) ÷ 26 observations = 6.8. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

|  | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 60 | 4.4 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 5.1 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 20 | 5.2 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 40 | 60 | 6.4 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 6.1 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 10 | 17 | 19 | 29 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 100 | 3.5 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 4.9 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 4.4 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.0 |
| Quality of Feedback | 2 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.8 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.6 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 4.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 6] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.1

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 19]) ÷ 20 observations = 7.0

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

|  | Low Range | | Middle Range | | | High Range | | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 21 | 15 | 6 | 63 | 4.9 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 21 | 5.0 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 4.0 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 42 | 63 | 6.4 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 21 | 6.2 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 6.0 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 21 | 7.0 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 9 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 105 | 3.6 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 4.9 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 4.2 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 8 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 2.5 |
| Quality of Feedback | 0 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3.2 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3.0 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 21 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 21 observations = 5.0

\*\*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 20]) ÷ 21 observations = 7.0
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision. |
| [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/) | 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, and access 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) | This curriculum guide provides curricular overviews for schools to engage students in learning DLCS concepts and skills aligned to the standards 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 align to the Massachusetts 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) | This resource promotes 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 an MTSS for ELA/literacy, and much more. |
| [Massachusetts Blueprint for English Learner Success](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/blueprint/default.html) | A framework for EL education in Massachusetts, with embedded Quick Reference Guides 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) | Kaleidoscope Collective for Learning 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 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 the Department of Early Education and Care 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 examinations, 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 professional development 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) | Provides great information and strategies to support MLs in Massachusetts public schools, and WIDA Professional Development Points (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 and schools related to state requirements related to 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 and 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 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 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 goal of the Breakfast After the Bell Toolkit Series 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 for 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. |

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 districts, childcare centers, family day care homes, adult day health programs, Summer Eats community organizations, U.S. Department of Agriculture food storage and distribution vendors, food banks, and antihunger organizations across the Commonwealth. |
| [Planning for Success](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 Massachusetts](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),%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. Randolph Public Schools: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2023-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | District | Percentage of total | State | Percentage of total |
| All | 2,685 | 100.0 | 914,959 | 100.0 |
| African American | 1,367 | 50.9 | 88,104 | 9.6 |
| Asian | 449 | 16.7 | 67,847 | 7.4 |
| Hispanic | 434 | 16.2 | 229,930 | 25.1 |
| Native American | 11 | 0.4 | 2,178 | 0.2 |
| White | 304 | 11.3 | 484,692 | 53.0 |
| Native Hawaiian | 5 | 0.2 | 790 | 0.1 |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 115 | 4.3 | 41,418 | 4.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023.

Table D2. Randolph 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 | 2,074 | 100.0 | 75.8 | 515,939 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| Students with disabilities | 637 | 30.7 | 23.3 | 187,160 | 36.3 | 20.2 |
| Low-income | 1,631 | 78.6 | 60.7 | 385,697 | 74.8 | 42.2 |
| English Learner | 489 | 23.6 | 18.2 | 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 2,737; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 924,947.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 2,892 | 28.0 | 34.8 | 29.8 | 22.2 |
| African American/Black | 1,462 | 31.4 | 35.1 | 29.7 | 25.3 |
| Asian | 450 | 9.5 | 18.0 | 16.2 | 13.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 511 | 34.7 | 43.9 | 36.0 | 34.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 131 | 39.1 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 23.3 |
| Native American | 10 | 20.0 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 33.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 5 | — | — | — | 28.3 |
| White | 323 | 26.2 | 39.9 | 33.4 | 17.0 |
| High needs | 2,269 | 32.5 | 37.4 | 32.4 | 30.3 |
| Low income | 1,911 | — | 38.9 | 33.9 | 33.5 |
| ELs | 516 | 30.4 | 29.0 | 24.0 | 33.5 |
| Students w/disabilities | 661 | 30.5 | 46.1 | 41.0 | 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. Randolph 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 | $43,261,107 | $43,487,970 | $43,703,125 | $43,571,634 | $44,795,704 | $44,867,014 |
| By municipality | $22,523,461 | $27,820,861 | $22,037,727 | $22,230,206 | $22,928,663 | $22,635,656 |
| Total from local appropriations | $65,784,568 | $71,308,831 | $65,740,852 | $65,801,840 | $67,724,367 | $67,502,670 |
| From revolving funds and grants | — | $5,947,732 | — | $7,488,072 | — | $10,622,959 |
| Total expenditures | — | $77,256,563 | — | $73,289,913 | — | $78,125,630 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aida | — | $18,487,416 | — | $18,986,721 | — | $20,667,301 |
| Required local contribution | — | $22,557,750 | — | $23,490,641 | — | $24,106,610 |
| Required net school spendingb | — | $41,045,166 | — | $42,477,362 | — | $44,773,911 |
| Actual net school spending | — | $57,175,069 | — | $54,980,018 | — | $59,254,184 |
| Over/under required ($) | — | $16,129,903 | — | $12,502,656 | — | $14,480,273 |
| Over/under required (%) | — | 39.3% | — | 29.4% | — | 32.3% |

*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. Randolph Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| Administration | $715 | $1,147 | $1,189 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,577 | $1,702 | $1,997 |
| Teachers | $7,095 | $8,148 | $8,291 |
| Other teaching services | $1,614 | $1,722 | $1,952 |
| Professional development | $374 | $472 | $373 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $686 | $1,105 | $1,911 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $650 | $831 | $1,149 |
| Pupil services | $1,859 | $2,193 | $2,357 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,452 | $2,240 | $2,088 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,766 | $4,104 | $4,368 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $19,788 | $23,664 | $25,675 |

*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>.
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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 | 1,237 | 31 | 29 | 42 | 45 | 43 | 39 | 24 | 28 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 596 | 22 | 18 | 26 | 48 | 49 | 45 | 29 | 34 | 29 |
| Asian | 204 | 57 | 57 | 64 | 31 | 31 | 27 | 12 | 11 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 213 | 28 | 24 | 22 | 47 | 44 | 43 | 25 | 32 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 65 | 34 | 29 | 49 | 46 | 45 | 35 | 20 | 26 | 16 |
| Native American | 7 | — | — | 29 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 28 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | 45 | — | — | 37 | — | — | 18 |
| White | 148 | 35 | 41 | 50 | 48 | 37 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 13 |
| High needs | 968 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 47 | 44 | 45 | 29 | 33 | 31 |
| Low income | 799 | 23 | 21 | 24 | 49 | 46 | 44 | 28 | 34 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 375 | 26 | 23 | 20 | 45 | 44 | 42 | 29 | 33 | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 280 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 32 | 33 | 40 | 63 | 63 | 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 | 147 | 44 | 44 | 58 | 41 | 37 | 30 | 15 | 19 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 59 | 36 | 32 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 41 | 21 | 24 | 17 |
| Asian | 45 | 74 | 69 | 79 | 22 | 27 | 16 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 26 | 18 | 46 | 36 | 53 | 38 | 39 | 29 | 15 | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | 63 | — | — | 29 | — | — | 9 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 11 |
| White | 10 | 46 | 10 | 67 | 54 | 30 | 27 | 0 | 60 | 6 |
| High needs | 103 | 37 | 31 | 37 | 44 | 44 | 42 | 19 | 25 | 21 |
| Low income | 84 | 40 | 32 | 39 | 44 | 43 | 40 | 16 | 25 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | 21 | 30 | 33 | 16 | 50 | 52 | 39 | 20 | 14 | 45 |
| Students w/disabilities | 34 | 4 | 3 | 22 | 48 | 47 | 47 | 48 | 50 | 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 | 1,241 | 26 | 30 | 41 | 48 | 44 | 41 | 26 | 26 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 596 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 53 | 49 | 47 | 32 | 33 | 32 |
| Asian | 204 | 63 | 72 | 71 | 30 | 19 | 23 | 7 | 9 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 216 | 19 | 21 | 19 | 54 | 53 | 47 | 27 | 26 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 66 | 29 | 27 | 46 | 50 | 47 | 38 | 21 | 26 | 16 |
| Native American | 7 | — | — | 28 | — | — | 46 | — | — | 26 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 149 | 29 | 32 | 49 | 49 | 45 | 40 | 22 | 23 | 11 |
| High needs | 972 | 21 | 24 | 23 | 49 | 45 | 47 | 30 | 31 | 30 |
| Low income | 803 | 19 | 21 | 21 | 50 | 46 | 48 | 31 | 33 | 31 |
| ELs and former ELs | 377 | 28 | 29 | 21 | 45 | 43 | 44 | 26 | 28 | 34 |
| Students w/disabilities | 282 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 36 | 33 | 41 | 60 | 60 | 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 | 145 | 37 | 30 | 50 | 47 | 57 | 42 | 17 | 13 | 9 |
| African American/Black | 57 | 25 | 9 | 27 | 52 | 72 | 58 | 23 | 19 | 15 |
| Asian | 45 | 73 | 64 | 80 | 27 | 36 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 26 | 12 | 27 | 25 | 53 | 58 | 57 | 35 | 15 | 18 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 8 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 32 | — | — | 59 | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | 57 | — | — | 7 |
| White | 10 | 46 | 10 | 60 | 54 | 60 | 36 | 0 | 30 | 4 |
| High needs | 101 | 31 | 17 | 27 | 48 | 65 | 57 | 21 | 18 | 16 |
| Low income | 82 | 34 | 17 | 27 | 49 | 68 | 57 | 17 | 15 | 16 |
| ELs and former ELs | 21 | 21 | 14 | 14 | 63 | 67 | 58 | 16 | 19 | 28 |
| Students w/disabilities | 31 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 42 | 65 | 59 | 58 | 32 | 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 | 430 | 29 | 28 | 41 | 45 | 44 | 40 | 26 | 28 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 198 | 20 | 16 | 21 | 48 | 50 | 47 | 31 | 34 | 32 |
| Asian | 71 | 53 | 61 | 65 | 30 | 28 | 27 | 17 | 11 | 8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 80 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 49 | 49 | 45 | 26 | 30 | 35 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 24 | 29 | 25 | 47 | 57 | 58 | 37 | 14 | 17 | 15 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | 31 | — | — | 44 | -- | — | 25 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 41 | -- | — | 16 |
| White | 54 | 38 | 37 | 50 | 42 | 33 | 38 | 20 | 30 | 11 |
| High needs | 335 | 21 | 21 | 23 | 47 | 47 | 46 | 31 | 32 | 31 |
| Low income | 270 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 47 | 50 | 46 | 32 | 31 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 125 | 21 | 24 | 18 | 45 | 46 | 43 | 34 | 30 | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 108 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 45 | 32 | 40 | 54 | 60 | 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 | 117 | 33 | 24 | 47 | 44 | 56 | 42 | 23 | 20 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 46 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 47 | 61 | 55 | 28 | 26 | 20 |
| Asian | 40 | 59 | 48 | 75 | 36 | 48 | 21 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 20 | 7 | 15 | 24 | 43 | 60 | 52 | 50 | 25 | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | 51 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 30 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 12 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 31 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 15 |
| White | 6 | 40 | — | 55 | 50 | — | 39 | 10 | — | 6 |
| High needs | 80 | 27 | 16 | 26 | 46 | 56 | 54 | 27 | 28 | 21 |
| Low income | 68 | 31 | 18 | 26 | 46 | 56 | 53 | 24 | 26 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | 16 | 24 | 6 | 13 | 47 | 63 | 50 | 29 | 31 | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 25 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 48 | 40 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 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 | 224 | 32 | 38 | 44 | 49 | 42 | 40 | 20 | 20 | 16 |
| 4 | 211 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 52 | 43 | 27 | 22 | 17 |
| 5 | 230 | 35 | 27 | 44 | 53 | 49 | 40 | 12 | 25 | 16 |
| 6 | 180 | 34 | 24 | 42 | 30 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 42 | 24 |
| 7 | 191 | 37 | 27 | 40 | 42 | 42 | 40 | 21 | 31 | 19 |
| 8 | 201 | 31 | 29 | 44 | 42 | 40 | 34 | 27 | 31 | 22 |
| 3-8 | 1,237 | 31 | 29 | 42 | 45 | 43 | 39 | 24 | 28 | 19 |
| 10 | 147 | 44 | 44 | 58 | 41 | 37 | 30 | 15 | 19 | 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 | 224 | 29 | 34 | 41 | 43 | 46 | 39 | 28 | 20 | 20 |
| 4 | 211 | 25 | 28 | 45 | 44 | 40 | 37 | 31 | 32 | 18 |
| 5 | 230 | 24 | 29 | 41 | 55 | 53 | 46 | 20 | 18 | 13 |
| 6 | 182 | 32 | 34 | 41 | 48 | 42 | 42 | 20 | 25 | 17 |
| 7 | 191 | 23 | 29 | 38 | 47 | 35 | 40 | 30 | 36 | 22 |
| 8 | 203 | 22 | 24 | 38 | 53 | 47 | 42 | 24 | 30 | 20 |
| 3-8 | 1,241 | 26 | 30 | 41 | 48 | 44 | 41 | 26 | 26 | 18 |
| 10 | 145 | 37 | 30 | 50 | 47 | 57 | 42 | 17 | 13 | 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 | 229 | 26 | 24 | 42 | 49 | 47 | 40 | 25 | 29 | 19 |
| 8 | 201 | 31 | 31 | 41 | 41 | 42 | 40 | 27 | 27 | 19 |
| 5 and 8 | 430 | 29 | 28 | 41 | 45 | 44 | 40 | 26 | 28 | 19 |
| 10 | 117 | 33 | 24 | 47 | 44 | 56 | 42 | 23 | 20 | 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 | 880 | 52.2 | 44.5 | 49.7 |
| African American/Black | 427 | 51.4 | 40.4 | 48.0 |
| Asian | 154 | 58.4 | 53.1 | 56.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 141 | 48.3 | 43.8 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 48 | 52.1 | 46.8 | 50.0 |
| Native American | 5 | — | — | 46.7 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | 50.5 |
| White | 103 | 50.9 | 48.2 | 50.0 |
| High needs | 671 | 50.0 | 43.5 | 47.3 |
| Low income | 557 | 50.2 | 42.5 | 47.0 |
| ELs and former ELs | 245 | 51.6 | 49.1 | 49.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 173 | 40.3 | 39.1 | 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 | 105 | 52.7 | 44.6 | 49.5 |
| African American/Black | 35 | 52.5 | 45.6 | 45.5 |
| Asian | 40 | 60.1 | 47.3 | 56.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 20 | — | 48.3 | 45.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | 51.3 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 46.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 45.2 |
| White | 5 | — | — | 50.7 |
| High needs | 68 | 51.3 | 39.5 | 44.7 |
| Low income | 57 | 51.0 | 38.4 | 44.9 |
| ELs and former ELs | 14 | — | — | 42.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 23 | — | 30.4 | 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 | 884 | 46.8 | 52.0 | 49.8 |
| African American/Black | 429 | 46.0 | 47.7 | 47.8 |
| Asian | 154 | 54.4 | 65.4 | 57.7 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 144 | 44.1 | 50.4 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 48 | 46.1 | 50.5 | 50.3 |
| Native American | 5 | — | — | 47.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | 51.5 |
| White | 102 | 43.0 | 51.3 | 50.1 |
| High needs | 675 | 46.3 | 50.4 | 47.8 |
| Low income | 560 | 46.3 | 48.6 | 47.3 |
| ELs and former ELs | 246 | 49.8 | 54.2 | 49.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 176 | 39.8 | 46.2 | 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 | 104 | 48.8 | 38.6 | 49.6 |
| African American/Black | 35 | 48.2 | 32.5 | 41.4 |
| Asian | 40 | — | 44.3 | 55.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 19 | — | — | 41.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | 51.1 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 45.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 56.1 |
| White | 5 | — | — | 52.9 |
| High needs | 67 | 49.1 | 34.9 | 43.9 |
| Low income | 56 | 48.6 | 36.3 | 43.2 |
| ELs and former ELs | 14 | — | — | 40.2 |
| Students w/disabilities | 22 | — | 30.7 | 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 | 177 | 47.3 | 46.6 | 49.4 |
| 5 | 197 | 59.7 | 53.7 | 49.8 |
| 6 | 156 | 48.9 | 37.4 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 166 | 56.3 | 44.0 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 184 | 49.7 | 39.3 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 880 | 52.2 | 44.5 | 49.7 |
| 10 | 105 | 52.7 | 44.6 | 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 | 176 | 46.7 | 44.2 | 49.6 |
| 5 | 199 | 55.4 | 58.5 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 159 | 53.8 | 60.7 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 166 | 36.4 | 45.5 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 184 | 44.1 | 50.7 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 884 | 46.8 | 52.0 | 49.8 |
| 10 | 104 | 48.8 | 38.6 | 49.6 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 163 | 75.9 | 76.2 | 79.1 | 90.1 |
| African American/Black | 86 | 75.7 | 77.4 | 73.3 | 86.2 |
| Asian | 32 | 100 | 90.7 | 90.6 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 27 | 52.2 | 66.7 | 74.1 | 81.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | 42.9 | — | — | 88.7 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.2 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 14 | 88.2 | 66.7 | 100 | 93.2 |
| High needs | 128 | 68.9 | 69.9 | 75.8 | 83.9 |
| Low income | 112 | 70.2 | 71.9 | 74.1 | 83.2 |
| English Learner | 34 | 73.0 | 71.4 | 70.6 | 73.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 50 | 51.1 | 50.0 | 80.0 | 78.0 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2021) | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | State (2021) |
| All | 193 | 81.1 | 80.7 | 83.4 | 91.8 |
| African American/Black | 93 | 79.2 | 82.2 | 84.9 | 88.1 |
| Asian | 43 | 96.7 | 100 | 95.3 | 97.0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 36 | 70.0 | 56.5 | 72.2 | 84.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 5 | 75.0 | 57.1 | — | 91.2 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 84.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 87.7 |
| White | 15 | 80.0 | 88.2 | 86.7 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 146 | 78.0 | 74.8 | 79.5 | 85.8 |
| Low income | 135 | 73.7 | 75.4 | 80.7 | 85.1 |
| English Learner | 42 | 84.0 | 78.4 | 81.0 | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 40 | 56.8 | 60.0 | 65.0 | 80.6 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 592 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 283 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 6.7 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 129 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 104 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 4.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 25 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 4.3 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 1.2 |
| White | 51 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 5.9 | 1.3 |
| High needs | 434 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 5.5 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 361 | — | — | 5.3 | 3.8 |
| English Learner | 76 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 11.8 | 7.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 126 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 4.0 | 3.4 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 2,865 | 0.6 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 1,453 | 0.8 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 2.1 |
| Asian | 447 | — | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 506 | — | 4.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 127 | — | 5.4 | 4.7 | 1.6 |
| Native American | 10 | — | — | -- | 1.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 5 | — | — | -- | 1.4 |
| White | 317 | — | 3.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| High needs | 2,241 | 0.8 | 4.6 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Low income | 1,885 | — | 4.7 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| English Learner | 535 | — | 1.8 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 627 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 3.7 | 2.5 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 2,865 | 0.7 | 4.6 | 2.8 | 2.5 |
| African American/Black | 1,453 | 0.9 | 6.1 | 3.5 | 5.0 |
| Asian | 447 | — | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 506 | — | 4.7 | 2.4 | 3.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 127 | — | 5.4 | 7.1 | 3.0 |
| Native American | 10 | — | — | -- | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 5 | — | — | -- | 3.1 |
| White | 317 | — | 3.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| High needs | 2,241 | 0.9 | 4.9 | 3.3 | 3.8 |
| Low income | 1,885 | — | 5.3 | 3.4 | 4.3 |
| English Learner | 535 | — | 1.4 | 1.1 | 2.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 627 | 1.5 | 8.1 | 5.3 | 4.7 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 272 | 60.7 | 59.3 | 72.1 | 65.8 |
| African American/Black | 142 | 53.6 | 52.9 | 71.1 | 57.3 |
| Asian | 48 | 90.3 | 87.9 | 85.4 | 84.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 43 | 51.8 | 51.4 | 69.8 | 51.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 13 | 66.7 | 45.5 | 61.5 | 67.4 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50.6 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 60.0 |
| White | 26 | 42.3 | 48.1 | 61.5 | 70.4 |
| High needs | 203 | 50.7 | 50.0 | 66.0 | 49.8 |
| Low income | 175 | — | 51.2 | 66.3 | 50.7 |
| English Learner | 54 | 35.3 | 45.2 | 57.4 | 31.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 50 | 23.1 | 25.0 | 58.0 | 36.0 |

Table E22. Accountability Percentile and Classification, 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| District | 40 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Elizabeth G. Lyons Elementary | 73 | 42 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| J. F. Kennedy Elementary | 62 | 29 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Margaret L. Donovan Elementary | 57 | 35 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Randolph Community Middle | 38 | 19 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Randolph High | 29 | 20 | Requiring assistance or intervention | In need of focused/targeted support: Low participation rate for ELs and former ELs |

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/). (Data 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. Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary.* Charlottesville, VA:Teachstone. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary.* Charlottesville, VA:Teachstone. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. 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-9)