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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 Greenfield Public Schools (hereafter, Greenfield) in November 2024. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews and were designed to understand how districts operate in support of continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.[[1]](#footnote-2) The resulting report provides an in-depth look at district systems, policies, and practices and includes recommendations to promote systemic improvements and advance equitable student outcomes and experiences.

In addition, to collect data on instructional practices, three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Greenfield during the week of November 18, 2024. The observers conducted 63 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[2]](#footnote-3) guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12).

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

In Greenfield, district leaders described an effective leadership teaming structure led by the superintendent that is inclusive of key departments and functions in the district, which is a strength. Teacher association leaders also reported the establishment of a culture of mutual respect between the teacher association, the district, and the school committee, another strength for the district. Greenfield is actively addressing inequities through redistricting to ensure the equitable distribution of resources and student supports among all elementary schools and uses progress monitoring to inform continuous improvement, which are strengths for the district.

The district faces challenges in convening effective school councils across all schools, aligning School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the district’s strategic objectives, and consistently sharing progress with teachers and community stakeholders—all areas for growth. District and school staff reported that leadership roles and responsibilities sometimes lack clarity, and the district has yet to establish strong collaborative working relationships among elected, district, and school leaders, which are areas for growth. Greenfield also lacks strategies to retain district and school leaders and actively recruit staff that mirrors historically underserved student populations in the district. Although the district has made efforts to engage community members and stakeholders, a need exists for more consistent and inclusive outreach to ensure that all voices are heard, particularly those from underserved communities.

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

Greenfield demonstrates a commitment to enhancing classroom engagement and critical thinking by implementing instructional strategies such as questioning, scaffolding, and Think-Write-Pair-Share that promote classroom discourse. This is a strength of the district, as it reflects an active effort to involve students in their learning process. The district’s structured approach to curriculum selection and review, involving diverse school stakeholders, ensures that a range of perspectives inform the adoption of high-quality instructional materials—a strength for the district. Greenfield offers an array of academic interventions across all grade levels ensuring equitable practices are accessible to students, a strength for the district. In addition, the district implemented instructional strategies to create consistency in curriculum implementation, improve engagement, and improve relationships throughout the school building is also a strength for Greenfield.

However, the district faces several areas for growth. A clearly articulated and cohesive instructional vision that encompasses the needs of all students, especially those from underserved communities, has yet to be developed, resulting in fragmented application of strategies and uneven implementation of curricula. The district also grapples with ensuring equitable access to grade-level instruction, given staffing barriers and inconsistent Tier 1 support that limit the effectiveness of academic interventions. In addition, addressing staffing barriers that limit leveraging student support teams (SSTs) to meet students’ needs is an area of growth for Greenfield. Moreover, the lack of consistent behavior management has impacted educators’ ability to deliver effective instruction. Though the district has implemented instructional strategies to strengthen Tier 1 instruction, improving the effective use of collaborative planning time to ensure the consistent implementation of evidence-based strategies is an area for growth.

### [Assessment](#_Assessment)

Greenfield is building a data-centered culture, as evidenced by the collection of both academic and nonacademic data from multiple sources to develop a comprehensive view of student performance. The use of disaggregated data to inform district planning and decision-making is a strength, aligning with the district’s strategic priorities and instructional vision. Furthermore, Greenfield’s partnership with Open Architects to develop a data dashboard allows district leaders to review trends. The district has several areas for growth related to assessment. The district’s focus on informal assessment opportunities and professional development on backward design lesson planning supports educators in aligning instruction with assessments. However, a gap exists in communicating and actualizing a shared vision for data use among district, school, and classroom leaders. The district’s recent efforts to establish data-use intentions has yet to translate into consistent practice across all levels. Therefore, improving data access and literacy for teachers, who report limited data literacy and resources, is an area for growth. With regard to the sharing of data, engaging all students in goal setting and data review to promote student agency is an area for growth. Family engagement is another area for growth, with teachers reporting that the district no longer provides consistent expectations for the frequency and methods of communication about student performance. High school teachers also identified a need for standard practices to calibrate grading and ensure consistency and equity. Finally, the district does not currently have a detailed technology policy, another area for growth.

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

Greenfield divides the oversight responsibility of human resources and professional learning between district leaders. The superintendent has oversight responsibility of human resources, whereas the assistant superintendent oversees professional learning. The district provides training to evaluators for calibrating feedback and recognizing teacher strengths through the evaluation process, ensuring equitable and consistent evaluations is a strength for the district. Furthermore, Greenfield’s professional development opportunities align with the district’s instructional priorities. The district’s evaluation process also highlights teacher strengths—a strength for the district.

Establishing a dedicated staff and systems to fulfill human resources responsibilities is an area of growth for the district. In addition, improving accessibility to human resource policies and procedures is also an area for growth for the district. With regard to staffing practices, the need to establish formal strategies to recruit a diverse workforce and retain effective educators are areas for growth in the district given the discrepancy between the diversity of the student body and the demographics of the teaching staff. Even though the district is working on a redistricting plan to provide more equitable learning opportunities, ensuring licensed, experienced educators are instructing High Needs students is an area for growth. To support the professional development of staff, consistently conducting administrator evaluations and articulating areas of improvement to support teachers' instructional and professional improvement is an area for growth. Related to professional learning, the absence of a consistent system for conducting administrator evaluations undermines the establishment of a culture of high expectations. Although the district provides structured professional development, teachers reported a desire for individualized, actionable feedback and the opportunity to select specialized learning opportunities that align with their instructional needs. Finally, providing supports to enhance the effectiveness of collaborative planning time is an area for growth.

### [Student Support](#_Student_Support)

The district has made significant strides in establishing a supportive environment for students, as outlined in the student support team (SST) guidebook, which offers clear guidelines for implementing its multi-tiered system of support (MTSS), a strength of the district. Within its MTSS, the district provides resources to address students’ social emotional and mental health needs. The district also collaborates with various community organizations to deliver services and enriching experiences. This partnership-based approach not only enhances student support but also strengthens family and community engagement, contributing to a holistic educational experience.

However, several areas for growth exist to support the whole student more effectively. The establishment and implementation of consistent behavioral support systems with specific rules and expectations to create a safer and more respectful learning environment is an area for growth. In addition, creating opportunities for all students to exercise voice and leadership within the district is an area for growth. Furthermore, consistent access to health and physical education courses for all students remains an area for growth. Providing clear guidance to staff regarding consistency of family communication and ensuring communications and plans are available in multiple languages spoken in the district are additional areas for growth. Finally, although the SST framework for Tier 1 and 2 supports is well defined, the absence of structured Tier 3 interventions signifies a gap in providing the necessary support for students who require more assistance.

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

Greenfield has several key strengths regarding their financial and asset management practices, including a well-qualified business office staff with the necessary certifications and the strategic application of state and federal grants. Systems are in place for managing capital assets, inventory, and procurement processes, which reflect compliance with state laws and demonstrate effective contract management. The district’s transportation and meal services provide equitable support to students, and capital planning efforts incorporate comprehensive input from district leadership and the school committee.

The district has several areas for growth related to financial and asset management, particularly in ensuring funding for key instructional resources and support roles and providing user-friendly and accessible budget documents. Furthermore, the maintenance and repair of aging buildings is an area for growth in the district.

## Greenfield Public Schools: District Review Overview

### Purpose

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

### Methodology

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

Following the site visit, all interview and focus group data are transcribed using automated transcription. The transcripts are then coded using both deterministic coding, based on the protocol questions, as well as natural language processing models. Team members analyze the coded data to develop a set of objective findings. The team lead and multiple quality assurance reviewers, including DESE staff, then review the initial draft of the report. DESE staff provides recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas 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 Greenfield occurred during the week of November 18, 2024. The site visit included 18 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 three teacher focus groups with eight elementary school teachers, five middle school teachers, and four high school teachers; two focus groups with three middle school and three high school students; and one family focus group with 12 parents. Data collection also included distributing a questionnaire to district leaders, as well as to each principal, to gather information about district and school processes and operations; respondents in Greenfield completed the district questionnaire and 4 of 6 principal questionnaires.

The site team also conducted 63 observations of classroom instruction in five schools.[[3]](#footnote-4) Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

The City of Greenfield is in western Massachusetts and borders the towns of Deerfield and Shelburne. According to [census data](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/MA%2Cchelseacitymassachusetts/PST045223), Greenfield’s median income from 2019 to 2023 was $53,961, which is below the state median income of $96,505. In 2023, the City of Greenfield had an estimated 17,628 residents.

The superintendent of Greenfield is Karin Patenaude, who was appointed in 2024. Governance of the district is through a seven-member school committee, of which six members are elected for four year terms while the city mayor is an appointed member.

In the 2024-2025 school year, the district served 1,370 students across six schools. Since the 2020-21 school year, total enrollment has decreased by 175 students. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for the 2024-2025 school year.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School  | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| The Academy of Early Learning at North Parish | Prekindergarten | PK | 87 |
| Discovery School at Four Corners | Elementary | K-4 | 185 |
| Federal Street Elementary School | Elementary | K-4 | 195 |
| Newton Elementary School | Elementary | K-4 | 174 |
| Greenfield Middle School | Middle | 5-7 | 325 |
| Greenfield High School | High | 8-12 | 404 |

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

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

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

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

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

Greenfield’s High Needs students, who comprise 69.8 percent of the district in 2024, met or exceeded expectations on the 2024 MCAS assessments at rates 3 to 16 percentage points below High Needs students across the state (see Figure 4).

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

Greenfield’s 2023 4-year cohort graduation rate (73.9 percent) was 15.3 percentage points lower than the state rate (89.2 percent). Furthermore, the district’s dropout rate is more than two times greater than the state rate for All Students.

Of students who graduated from the district in 2021-2022, 59.2 percent went on to attend a college or university by March 2023, which is 3.2 percentage points less than the state rate of 62.4 percent. In addition, 25.4 percent of 2022-2023 graduates planned on entering the workforce or an apprenticeship after high school, compared with 14.7 percent of students across the state.

In 2024 statewide accountability results, two schools (Federal Street Elementary School and Greenfield High School) were identified as requiring assistance or intervention. Federal Street was identified as being among the lowest performing 10 percent of schools statewide, while Greenfield High School was identified as requiring assistance for low student group performance among several groups. Three other schools in the district (Discovery School at Four Corners, Greenfield Middle School, and Newton Elementary School) were identified as not requiring assistance or intervention and made moderate to substantial progress toward their targets. Of the two schools identified as requiring assistance or intervention, both were classified as requiring focused/targeted support due to low performing student groups, and one was also classified as such due to low assessment participation rates. Overall, the district’s classification was “not requiring assistance or intervention” and made substantial progress toward targets.

In fiscal year 2023, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Greenfield was $21,769, which is $2,097 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($19,672) and $3,682 more than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures in districts of similar wealth ($18,087).[[4]](#footnote-5) In-district per pupil expenditures for Greenfield were $1,002 more than the average state spending per pupil ($20,767). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D5 in Appendix D.

### Classroom Observations

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Greenfield during the week of November 18, 2024. The observers conducted 63 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 Greenfield, ratings are provided across three grade bands: K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. For each grade band, ratings are provided across the overarching domains, as well as at individual dimensions within those domains. Figure 5 shows average ratings, by domain, for each grade band. The full report of findings from observations conducted in Greenfield is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

Figure 5. Greenfield CLASS Domain Averages by Grade Band

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

## Leadership and Governance

This section examines the extent to which school committees, district leaders, school leaders, and advisory council members work collaboratively and strategically to promote high-quality teaching and learning that (a) is antiracist, inclusive, multilingual, and multicultural; (b) values and affirms each student and their families; and (c) creates equitable opportunities and experiences for all students, particularly those historically underserved. It also focuses on the extent to which districts establish, implement, and evaluate policies, plans, procedures, systems, and budgets by focusing on achieving districtwide strategic objectives through the equitable and effective use of resources, which ultimately lead to high-quality teaching and learning for all students.

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

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

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Leadership and Governing Structures](#_Leadership_and_Governing) | * The superintendent established and leads an effective leadership teaming structure.
 | * Convening effective school councils across all schools
 |
| [Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring](#_Strategic_Planning,_Implementation,_1) | * Greenfield is employing redistricting to address inequity concerning school assignment and funding.
* Greenfield uses progress monitoring data to inform continuous adjustments to district initiatives in support of the district’s mission.
 | * Developing school improvement plans (SIPs) that align with the district plan
* Sharing progress monitoring results with teachers and community stakeholders
 |
| [District Culture](#_District_Culture_1) | * The superintendent and school committee have developed a culture of mutual respect with the teachers’ association.
 | * Working relationships between elected, district, and school leaders
* Strategies for retaining district and school leaders
* Actively recruiting participation in district governance and removing barriers to participation for historically underserved groups
 |

### Leadership and Governing Structures

A review of the school committee handbook, meeting minutes, and website along with interviews with school committee members reveal that the school committee has a functioning governance structure and implements policies that provide most students with equitable opportunities to excel. In focus group discussions, school committee members stated that their responsibilities include conducting policy reviews, approving the school budget, overseeing and evaluating the superintendent, and engaging with the community to include diverse stakeholder input. School committee members reported using student achievement and district progress monitoring data to inform policy reviews. They also described that the evaluation of the superintendent consists of the school committee approving the superintendent’s proposed annual goals, the superintendent providing annual interim and final reports that present evidence of progress toward successfully meeting their goals, and a final evaluation by the school committee based on those indicators. Regarding their other responsibilities, one committee member described holding listening sessions with parent-teacher organizations, including the Special Education Parental Advisory Council (SEPAC) and the English Learner Parental Advisory Council (ELPAC), to gather community input that will inform budgetary recommendations. The school committee has a nonvoting student member, though committee members noted that student involvement is limited to reading announcements and updates.

Discussions in multiple focus groups indicated that shared, clear expectations for the committee’s responsibilities have only recently been articulated. As one committee member stated, “Where we draw the line around some of [the school committee’s areas of purview] gets a little fuzzy at times.” Similarly, the clarity of these responsibilities is reflected in the working relationships between the school committee and the district. District leaders described this relationship as "tumultuous” at times, noting that several members are clear on what the role of the school committee is and is not, and the focus of other members has shifted to daily operations rather than overall student experience. District officials attributed this lack of role clarity in part to turnover because three of the seven committee members were newly elected in the past year. According to committee members, Greenfield has not historically had a supportive onboarding process for new members that includes a clear description of responsibilities. To address this, members reported that the committee established an ad hoc subcommittee responsible for creating an annual calendar and a new member handbook that “spells out for new members exactly what they are there to do and not to do and provides guidelines and parameters for them. “The committee’s website also has a “New School Committee Member” page that includes relevant trainings and resources, including the policy manual, Massachusetts Association of School Committees new member orientation, collective bargaining agreements, and budget documents.

The teachers’ association described a positive working relationship with the school committee, noting that they collaborate with the superintendent to provide teacher input to the school committee at the committee’s request. A designated committee member also attends contract negotiations with the teachers’ association to monitor progress. In focus groups, school committee members explained how—during the last negotiation cycle—they successfully advocated for budget funding at city council meetings to support salary increases for the Unit A contract.

The superintendent has developed an effective leadership teaming structure, which is a strength of the district. Greenfield’s executive leadership team consists of the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, school principals, and department directors (pupil services, food services, nursing, facilities, transportation, technology, and behavior services). According to district leaders, the team meets twice per month, and these meetings focus primarily on staffing, strategic planning, resource allocation, program implementation, and operations. School leaders reported meeting with district staff monthly, and the general focus of these meetings is on reviewing student data aligned to the district’s instructional priority and planning, attending, and debriefing instructional leadership team (ILT) meetings. The director of pupil services is responsible for ensuring compliance with the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, overseeing special education needs and supports, and managing English Learner needs across schools, whereas the Director of Pupil Services oversees the health and wellness programs in the district. Moreover, the district leadership team further outlined their responsibilities in strategic planning, resource allocation, professional development, and monitoring instruction. For example, one district leader described how the district worked with DESE’s Statewide System of Support (SSoS) to develop a plan that prioritizes the implementation of high-impact instructional strategies in the classroom. District leaders then partnered with Teaching Lab, an organization that offers curriculum-based professional learning, to provide professional development to educators that supports the use of these strategies, and they conduct weekly learning walks to monitor the implementation of the strategies districtwide.

In focus groups with staff from across the district**,** participants provided mixed responses about whether the district empowers school ILTs to establish an inclusive environment and foster positive and collaborative learning. District leaders provided several examples of how the district supports school leadership teams, which include providing an *Instructional Strategies Timeline* and agendas to guide ILT meetings and collaboration time, periodically reviewing notes from collaboration times, and modeling data analysis protocols. School leaders echoed the support that district leaders provided with data expectations, stating, “At the district level, there’s an expectation that our assistant superintendent and superintendent have set for themselves . . . and then that trickles down to us looking at our data, because they’re doing it. They’ve modeled it for us.” However, school leaders also described that although the district has an expectation for the scope of work of ILTs, their function “varies wildly” by building because many ILTs were newly established this year, so members are still learning their roles. Furthermore, school-level staff noted that having predetermined collaboration time agendas limits the autonomy of school leadership teams. School leaders and teachers noted that the “prescribed” meetings allow little time for staff to collaborate on building- or student-specific matters as needed. In addition, school leaders reported that they have little autonomy over staffing and scheduling decisions within their buildings, which is partially the result of an overlap in staff and resources across schools in the district. School leaders also described additional teams that are active at schools across the district, which include student support teams (SSTs), grade-level teams, and administrative leadership teams**.**

District leaders reported that the district established representative parent advisory councils, including SEPAC that meets monthly and ELPAC that meets every other month. However, few school leaders reported engaging their parents and community members through representative school councils to align with district initiatives and comply with state requirements. In focus groups, caregivers reported that because “there hasn’t been a lot of energy behind getting school councils up and running in Greenfield,” several schools are not actively convening a school council. Furthermore, they noted several limitations of school councils that do meet regularly. For example, they reported that community knowledge of school councils varies by building, and many councils do not advertise their meetings. Parents also raised concerns about the purpose and efficacy of school council meetings, with one parent reflecting, “Is it supposed to just be these awkward meetings where we don’t get anything done?” Consistent with the focus group findings, a review of school webpages and principal newsletters revealed that three schools provide information to stakeholders about the purpose of school councils, along with specific meeting times and locations, and three do not. Convening effective and representative school councils across all schools in Greenfield is an area for growth for the district.

### Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring

According to the district’s public website, Greenfield’s mission is as follows: “The Greenfield Public School District is a place where every child is supported on their path to success.” Focus group responses indicate that this mission is widely shared across the district. Moreover, respondents across focus groups described how, in support of this mission, Greenfield identified a need to address inequity regarding school assignment and funding, which they are working to remedy through redistricting—a strength of the district. According to school committee meeting minutes, the district began the redistricting initiative in response to a study conducted in 2022 by the New England School Development Council regarding the best use of school facilities. The superintendent emphasized that the purpose of redistricting is to “make an equitable experience for all of our students,” explaining that

...right now one of our elementary schools does not have Low Income students attend, and so in our redistricting for 2025, we will be redrawing the catchment lines of street addresses in Greenfield so that each elementary is representative of the population of Greenfield.

A review of school committee meeting minutes showed that the district obtained stakeholder input on redistricting efforts through public comment and listening sessions throughout the community.

The district has a five-year District Strategic Plan. As described in the June 14, 2023, school committee meeting, the process for developing the plan was as follows: a strategic planning task force consisting of representative community members reviewed district data, including MCAS data, attendance rates, course completion data, graduation rates, and student discipline, and identified preliminary goals. They then used data from a strengths, challenges, opportunities, and threats analysis to survey the community and develop protocols for focus groups with community members. Using the community’s feedback, the district’s executive team then developed an initial draft of the plan that the task force reviewed. The District Strategic Plan identifies four strategic areas of focus (Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Supports, Communications and Outreach, and Operations), each with its own specific improvement goals centered on meeting the needs of all students. According to district leaders, the district’s main focal areas for the year are improving business operations and instructional practices.

The district also worked with the SSoS staff to develop a 2024-2025 Instructional Prioritization Plan. District leaders described reviewing MCAS data, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data, attendance data, ninth-grade course completion rates, and graduation rates, all of which were disaggregated by specific student populations, to identify the top instructional priority for the 2024-2025 school year:

Greenfield Public Schools will ensure that all students (particularly English learners, students with disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students) will have access to high-quality, grade-level, culturally responsive instructional materials and practices focused on literacy. Through the continued implementation of evidence-based, district-adopted instructional strategies and the routine practice of looking at student work, all students will improve academic achievement in grade-level standards.

Focus group responses indicated that this priority is well-known and widely shared across the district.

Mixed evidence suggests that school leaders have developed individual SIPs. For all schools, the plans that are accessible on the district’s public website are out of date, and several school leaders reported that they do not have a SIP. Two school leaders who reported having a SIP identified the same priority that is established in the district’s 2024-2025 Instructional Prioritization Plan and described an identical process for developing these plans. This finding suggests that school leaders are using the prioritization plan that the district developed in partnership with the SSoS to guide individual school improvement efforts rather than developing annual SIPs. The lack of current SIPs that align to the District’s Strategic Plan for all schools is an area of growth for the district.

Discussions with school leaders and the superintendent revealed that district and school leaders have established formal processes to assess the effective implementation of existing improvement plans. The superintendent described partnering with the SSoS and Teaching Lab to develop a rubric for formal district learning walkthroughs, which occur six times annually across the district and center on monitoring teachers’ implementation of Tier 1 literacy practices. In addition to the formal walkthroughs, school and district leaders reported conducting weekly informal walkthroughs in each building using the same rubric. District leaders present the results of these walkthroughs to building leaders and ILTs to guide collaboration time, and in December 2024 the district’s executive team planned to review the findings from these learning walks in a midyear progress monitoring meeting with SSoS and Teaching Lab. Moreover, district leaders described using progress monitoring data to make mid-course corrections to district initiatives. For example, after conducting the first formal district learning walkthrough, district leaders and Teaching Lab identified a need to support teachers with lesson internalization to promote the use of effective instructional strategies. Consequently, they built lesson internalization into collaboration time agendas and adjusted the curriculum for the next professional development day to include content on lesson internalization. In addition, school leaders and teachers across grade levels emphasized the focus on lesson internalization during their professional learning time. One teacher said of the district’s continuous improvement efforts: “I feel like [the district leaders] are reacting to what’s happening, making adjustments to better align instruction or better align the strategies with what’s happening on the ground.” It is a strength of the district that Greenfield uses progress monitoring data to inform continuous adjustments to district initiatives in support of the district’s mission.

The district has formal processes in place to regularly share progress toward improvement goals with some but not all stakeholders. School committee members noted that the superintendent directly connects the items in her monthly reports to the committee to the relevant strategic area of focus. A review of school committee meeting materials supports this assertion; for example, in the November 2024 report, the superintendent explicitly connected the results of the second district learning walkthrough to the “Curriculum and Instruction” and “Instructional Supports” areas of the District Strategic Plan. However, family focus group respondents reported that they receive updates on district progress only annually, and district and school leaders did not identify any formal processes for sharing progress with teachers. Consistently sharing progress monitoring results with teachers and community stakeholders is an area for growth for the district.

### District Culture

The school committee, superintendent, and district administrators foster collaboration and shared decision making to improve opportunities and outcomes for all students. The mayor of Greenfield holds a seat on the school committee as a voting member, and the superintendent and the school committee present at monthly city council meetings. School committee members described times during which they acted as “thought partners” for the superintendent; for example, they collaborated on staffing decisions after an increase in late kindergarten registrations and decided to open a new kindergarten classroom in each elementary school to keep class sizes equitable. In interviews, district administrators reflected on their shared responsibilities, saying “we’re all in this together. Part of our job as a municipality is to educate children.” Both district leaders and elected officials reported attending community events, including city parades, Greenfield’s Annual Harvest Supper, and various fundraisers to engage with stakeholders and build support for the district.

Elected, district, and school leaders do not always adhere to their defined roles, as described in interviews. Municipal officials reported that sometimes “pushback” from the city council or school committee occurs regarding their division of responsibilities. District leaders and the school committee also reported strained working relationships with municipal officials. School committee members reported that turnover with the city’s finance staff has complicated their relationship with the city. Both school committee members and district leaders reported the superintendent’s exclusion from city department meetings. In addition, according to district leaders, “The things [the school district] needs to focus on are not the priority of city councilors . . . the majority [of councilors] are not concerned about student growth and progress. I think they’re concerned about student behaviors.” The superintendent reported that these competing priorities between the district and the city alter the focus of city council meetings, which impedes the district’s ability to advance its strategic objectives. Improving the working relationships between elected, district, and school officials is an area for growth.

The superintendent and the school committee maintain a strong working relationship with their teachers’ association. The superintendent and teachers’ association representatives hold a monthly labor relations meeting during which both parties can give districtwide updates and provide feedback. Teachers’ association members reported that under previous administrations, they felt unheard in these meetings and noted the difference with the current superintendent: “[The superintendent] is absolutely very interested in working with the union, listening to what teachers have to say, and hoping to have a really open dialogue with respect, which is something [the union] has been looking for quite a while.” They also noted that the superintendent is proactive about collecting their perspectives, especially on matters that could lead to conflict. Similarly, they described how the school committee and the superintendent collaborated with teachers’ association representatives to gather input from teachers across the district regarding their perceptions of safety in their buildings. The superintendent and school committee have developed a culture of mutual respect with the teachers’ association, which is a strength of the district.

District staff reported that Greenfield does not have strategies for recruiting and retaining diverse leaders. According to DESE’s most recent staffing data, Greenfield did not have any Hispanic or Latino administrators between 2021 and 2023, yet Hispanic or Latino students made up 21.2 percent of the district in 2023. District leaders described one of Greenfield’s barriers to recruiting diverse staff: “When you are the only person of color working in an all-White district, that’s not a work environment some of [the candidates] want to be a part of.” Moreover, staff in focus groups identified challenges with retaining administrators. For example, Newton Elementary had three principals in three years, and according to DESE’s district profile, from 2019 to 2023, the district retained fewer than 67 percent of their principals each year. Consequently, frequent turnover has made it difficult for district leaders to sustain district initiatives. The superintendent explained as follows:

Greenfield unfortunately has a historically high turnover rate with staff in many departments. And when you get a new department head or a new principal or new staff on board in classrooms, it’s this learning curve of trying to get everyone on the same page. And I think that’s been a hiccup.

Teachers across grade levels also described school and district initiatives getting “lost” with multiple administrative turnovers, with one reporting, “We were just constantly churning through administrators . . . It’s been hard to keep track of all the initiatives. It’s been hard to keep consistency.” Greenfield has had challenges with sustaining district initiatives because of administrative turnover, so developing strategies to retain district and school leaders is an area for growth for the district.

Greenfield partners with key stakeholders and intentionally seeks input from underrepresented groups in decision-making. Teachers reported that the district collects their input through surveys and representative council meetings that the teachers’ association leads. During the 2024-2025 school year, the school committee created a community engagement subcommittee, whose stated function includes to “enhance communication and foster strong relationships between the school committee and the community by creating opportunities for dialogue and listening.” As noted previously, the district regularly convenes a SEPAC and ELPAC, though there are inconsistent opportunities for family members to provide their input through school councils (see *Leadership and Governing Structures* for more information). School committee members described holding listening sessions with parent advisory councils to gather stakeholder input on budget priorities for the upcoming fiscal year. In addition, they reported specific efforts to engage historically underserved groups, including providing transportation to meetings and hosting feedback sessions at low-income housing complexes in the community. Despite this, family focus group members reported an overall perception that the district does not successfully employ strategies to reach underrepresented groups. As one parent stated:

[Our school system] does a very poor job at diversifying the voices that are heard from the parents. I think it’s often the upper middle-class White families that have their voices heard, and the rest of the parents seem to be often left behind.

Parents noted, for example, that although the district held feedback sessions in low-income communities, they did not advertise the sessions well enough to get involvement from the parents who live in those communities. Moreover, municipal officials and family members identified a lack of access to translation services as a barrier to engaging families that do not speak English. One parent reported that “access to bilingual communication in our school district is not what it needs to be.” Although district officials reported engaging in community outreach, they did not identify any specific strategies to remove barriers to participation for this population. Greenfield has made some attempts to engage community members but actively recruiting historically underserved groups to participate in district governance and removing barriers to participation are ongoing areas for growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should partner with its school leaders in convening a school council at every school site.*
* *The district should assist its school leaders in developing school improvement plans that are aligned with the district plan and tailored to each school’s needs.*
* *The district should develop a system for sharing updates on progress toward its strategic goals with school staff and families.*
* *The district should diagnose its barriers to having strong working relationships with its municipal partners and identify common goals to collaboratively improve their work moving forward.*
* *The district should develop and implement a clear set of strategies for retaining school and district leaders from year to year.*
* *The district should systematically identify and remove barriers to participation in district-level decision-making for families who have been historically underrepresented in the district.*

## Curriculum and Instruction

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

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Instructional Leadership](#_Instructional_Leadership) | * The district implements three instructional strategies—questioning, scaffolding, and Think-Write-Pair-Share—that promote high-level thinking and discourse in classrooms.
 | * Clearly articulating the district’s instructional vision
 |
| [Curriculum and Instructional Materials](#_Curriculum_and_Instructional) | * The district follows a structured process for curricular selection and review that involves multiple school stakeholders.
 |  |
| [Equitable Practices and Access](#_Equitable_Practices_and) | * The district offers an array of academic interventions across all grade levels.
 | * Ensuring all students have access to grade-level instruction
* Addressing staffing barriers that limit leveraging SSTs to meet students’ needs
* Ensuring Students with Disabilities and English Learners have access to necessary supports
 |
| [Effective Instruction and Curricular Implementation](#_Effective_Instruction_and_1) | * The district implemented instructional strategies to create consistency in curriculum implementation, improve engagement, and improve relationships throughout the school building.
 | * Implementing curricula with fidelity
* Establishing behavior management systems that promote effective instruction
* Improving effective use of collaboration time to ensure the consistent implementation of evidence-based instructional strategies
 |

### Instructional Leadership

According to both school leaders and teachers, the district does not have a clearly articulated instructional vision that prioritizes the needs and experiences of all students, especially students from historically underserved groups and communities, which is an area for growth for Greenfield. Teachers added that literacy is the main goal for this year but reported that the instructional vision “doesn’t always feel super clear.” One teacher elaborated by saying:

I understand the goal is to look at our subgroups that are underperforming. And this year is a focus on literacy . . . but I think in terms of a vision that feels cohesive, that our leaders, instructional leader, that our admin leaders and our leadership team feels like is a cohesive, well thought out, backwards design plan; I don’t quite agree with that.

Developing a clearly articulated and communicated instructional vision is an area of growth for Greenfield. Despite the lack of a clear instructional vision, Greenfield’s district leaders identified three priority instructional strategies (questioning, scaffolding, and Think-Write-Pair-Share) that promote high-level thinking and discourse, which school leadership teams monitor—a strength for Greenfield. These strategies actively engage students in their learning process, encouraging them to think critically and collaborate with their peers.

District and school leader questionnaires reported that principals, assistant principals, teachers, and special education teachers make up the ILTs that oversee decisions and monitor the implementation of curriculum and instruction at each school in the district. However, district leadership noted directives regarding curricular implementation from the district were not effectively reinforced in schools, resulting in a lack of fidelity of implementation at individual schools. Many ILTs were just established or have faced staff retention issues, leading to a lack of consistency in implementation, monitoring, and continuous improvement. Teachers added that instructional strategies and methods are effective in fostering a more interactive and thoughtful classroom environment, but the overarching instructional vision remains fragmented. They reported that this fragmentation leads to inconsistencies in applying strategies across different classrooms and grade levels, impacting the overall effectiveness of the district’s educational goals. School leaders agreed that the district sets clear expectations for the ILT’s authority and scope of work [see *Leadership and Governing Structures* for more information]. School leaders also reported that some ILTs do not include representation from diverse stakeholders, including English as a second language (ESL) teachers and specialists for Students with Disabilities, which can limit the team’s ability to address the unique curricular needs of all students.

School and district leaders reported that the district has systems in place to implement, monitor, and continuously improve instructional initiatives. Leaders reported that they analyze data from monthly learning walks and evaluate grade-level assessment data. Leaders added that walkthroughs and observations are carried out with fidelity through a partnership with Teaching Lab, which, besides providing feedback, provides professional development on the three instructional strategies the district has implemented.

### Curriculum and Instructional Materials

The district selected high-quality instructional materials (see Table 4) in the last few years, and staff are continuing to implement these curricula. Reports from district leaders and a review of the district’s curricular review cycle document confirm that the district follows a structured process for curricular selection and review that involves multiple school stakeholders, which is a strength. Committees are formed with representatives from each subject and grade level to field-test various curricula. The current review process is ongoing in the district and spans five years, with specific content areas mapped each year until all content areas are reviewed by the end of the 2027-2028 school year. During this period, teachers provide regular feedback, and district leaders facilitate meetings to discuss best practices and curriculum application. The process includes the establishment of content area curricular working groups, professional development on curriculum mapping and unpacking standards, and the inclusion of social-emotional learning components. Conversely, district staff did not report any specific primary resources for evaluating curricular decisions, and class observations reported uneven implementation of these materials across the district.

Table 4 summarizes the status of all curricula used districtwide.

Table 4. Curricula Used in Greenfield

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade level(s) | Subject | Curriculum | Type | CURATE Rating | EdReports Rating |
| K-2 | ELA | Amplify CKLA Skills (2020) | Supplemental | NR | ME |
| K-5 | ELA | Amplify CKLA (2020) | Comprehensive | NR | ME |
| 6-8 | ELA | Amplify ELA | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| 9-12 | ELA | Teacher Developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| K-4 | Mathematics | Eureka Math Square (2021) | Comprehensive | PM | PME |
| 5-8 | Mathematics | Illustrative Math | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| 9-12 | Algebra 1, Algebra 2, Geometry | Illustrative Math | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| 9-12 | Pre-Calculus | Teacher Developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| K-4 | Science | Teacher Developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 5-8 | Science | OpenSciEd | Comprehensive | PM | ME |
| 9-12 | Biology, Chemistry, Physics | OpenSciEd | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 5-7 | Social Studies | Investigating History | Comprehensive | NR | NR |

*Note*. ME = meets expectations; PM = partially meets expectations; NR = not rated; CURATE = CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers; OpenSciEd and Investigating History are DESE developed or informed.

As part of the structured curricular review cycle, the district is piloting a new social studies curriculum, Investigating History, at the middle school level. Other subject curricula, such as Eureka Math Square, Illustrative Math, and Amplify CKLA/ELA are in various stages of implementation. District leadership and teachers added that the district provides formal professional learning opportunities to support effective curricular implementation, particularly for ELA, secondary mathematics and science, and middle school social studies. They also reported a focus on improving vertical alignment for ELA and music in 2023-2024 and mathematics and physical education in 2024-2025.

### Equitable Practices and Access

The district’s array of academic interventions across all grade levels is a strength of the district. School leaders reported that the following specific academic interventions are available in ELA and mathematics at the district: Grades K-4 use Title I Services for ELA Tier 2 and Lindamood-Bell Phoneme Sequencing for Reading, Heggerty, and SPIRE for ELA Tier 3; Grades 5-7 utilize Read Naturally for ELA Tier 2; SPIRE (Specialized Program Individualizing Reading Excellence), Newsela, and Leveled Readers for ELA Tier 3; and a pullout/push-in Title I mathematics intervention and Imagine Math for Tier 2 and 3 supports. Elementary and middle schools implement daily intervention blocks for all students. Grades 8-12 implement Imagine Math as a Tier 2 support.

District and school leaders reported that they are working to strengthen Tier 1 instruction to better support the needs of all students. School leaders describe their MTSS as an “upside-down triangle” focusing more on Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports, which include services such as individualized education programs (IEP) testing, Section 504 plans, push-in/pull-out supports, and substantially separate programming, with each school having at least one special education substantially separate program. The district works with SST members to regularly review data from benchmark assessments and adjust groupings to provide more individualized support during intervention blocks. However, the implementation of Tier 1 support is not consistent across the district, reflecting a need for the district to ensure that general educators have the skills and knowledge to provide effective Tier 1 instruction. As one school leader noted,

While pull-out interventions can provide targeted support, they often don’t address the underlying issues that students face in the general education classroom. We need to focus more on integrating supports within the classroom environment to ensure that all students can benefit from high-quality instruction and make meaningful progress.

Teachers agree that Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are in place throughout the elementary and middle schools. However, teachers in the high school focus group noted the absence of a reading interventionist, which exacerbates their literacy concerns at the secondary level, and teachers across grade levels shared concerns regarding the consistency and effectiveness of tiered supports. For example, they reported a lack of consistent Tier 1 strategies to address issues with the alignment of grade-level materials and instruction given scaffolding limitations and students’ varied academic proficiency. One teacher reported, “Teachers are doing their best, but out of 20 kids, you have two who are at grade level and 18 who are not. So should you teach at grade level? The answer is no.” Another teacher noted the high number of students who are struggling, saying,

The curriculum can be very challenging for our populations. So, we must try and give students access to work on their own. It seems right now like it’s a little more teacher-directed than I would like.

In addition, teachers reported they lack time to properly internalize and adapt the curriculum to meet student needs. Providing more cohesive and supportive Tier 1 strategies to ensure that all students can access and benefit from the high-quality grade-level curriculum is an area for growth for the district.

Principals and district leaders reported that they use disaggregated, student-centered data from screeners such as Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) or the Universal Screener for Number Sense (USNS), MCAS, MAP testing, classroom walkthroughs, and benchmark assessments to select academic intervention materials that align with the common curriculum, but they do not leverage SSTs to match students to Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to meet students’ needs. Leaders also noted the need for more consistent Tier 1 strategies to address differentiation in the classroom because a pull-out intervention alone is not sufficient to close the gaps. Teachers reported that the process of problem solving with teams before starting an SST process and using note catchers to document progress can be time-consuming and complex to an already overburdened staff, further complicating the effective use of SSTs. These factors contribute to the difficulty in fully using SSTs to meet students’ needs.

Teachers also reported a lack of sufficient staff and time allocated to implement and adapt Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to meet students’ needs. Some schools throughout the district develop schedules that allow teachers sufficient time to support students who can benefit from Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. For example, at the elementary level, teachers have collaboration time every day, during which they review student data and determine shifts in grouping for individualized support. This collaboration time is structured to include grade-level classroom teachers, Title I mathematics and reading teachers, and special education teachers, ensuring a comprehensive approach to addressing student needs. Despite these efforts, the heavy workloads of interventionists and the need for more consistent Tier 1 strategies across classrooms continue to pose significant challenges in fully leveraging SSTs to meet students’ needs, which is an area for growth.

District leaders reported that Greenfield is committed to providing English Learners and Students with Disabilities access to necessary services in the least restrictive setting, as mandated by law. District leaders noted that this commitment includes actively monitoring the quality of instructional materials and content delivered through specially designed instruction and ESL programs, as well as continuously evaluating the effectiveness of its ESL and special education programs. However, teachers reported that insufficient support and training, high staff turnover, and the lack of a clear vision for push-in models impede English Learner students’ access to the general curriculum.

In 2023, DESE’s Public School Monitoring (PSM) team issued a corrective action to the district around ensuring that Students with Disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment. PSM found that the IEP Teams do not always consider the least restrictive environment for students. Furthermore, in 2022-2023, Greenfield students aged 6 to 21 were educated in full inclusion settings at a rate that is 13.4 percentage points lower than the state rate and were placed in substantially separate classrooms at a rate 7.1 percentage points higher than the state rate. The district is continuing to engage in corrective action around these data with PSM. In 2023-2024, Greenfield received a special education determination of Needs Intervention from DESE’s Office of Special Education Planning and Policy and is working with a technical assistance provider around key data points. Combined with teachers’ reports of gaps in support for English Learners, the data indicates an area for growth in ensuring that Students with Disabilities and English Learners have access to the necessary supports.

School leaders have focused on improving literacy and math outcomes for Students with Disabilities and English Learners through collaborative efforts around program models and tiered interventions. Teachers noted that the creation of a districtwide curriculum coordinator position has improved alignment, especially in mathematics, where there was previously an overlap in content across grade levels. Student Support staff mentioned that the district actively monitors the quality of instructional materials and content through the CKLA curriculum for ELA, which includes Language Studio to support English Learners. The district is also participating in a next-generation ESL curriculum project, with ESL teachers reviewing high-quality materials and developing an action plan for implementation. District leaders also stated Greenfield is committed to evaluating the effectiveness of its ESL and special education programs by using data literacy initiatives to enhance program evaluation and ensure consistent grading practices. Further, district leaders reported collaborative efforts also include setting priorities and making necessary adjustments based on data reviews.

Despite these positive strides, teachers throughout the district reported a significant lack of support for working with English Learners. One teacher said, “I’ve had almost no help . . . no IA [instructional aide] and no training,” whereas another reported, “I feel very not familiar and supported in how to develop my professional practice around [supporting English Learners], personally.” Teachers consistently expressed that IAs have received no training to work with English Learners, and many agree that turnover and a lack of a clear vision for English Learner support have led to inconsistent implementation of instructional strategies and support programs. In addition, parents reported significant challenges in getting IEP testing and services implemented for their children. They described the process as lengthy and frustrating, often taking much longer than it should. Several family focus group members described their experiences with the IEP process, noting yearlong delays between their child’s initial evaluation and their child receiving the necessary services. Relatedly, the district’s 2023, Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM) review included a corrective action to the district around the timeline for determining eligibility for special education. In this review, the PSM team stated,

“A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation, the district does not consistently determine whether the student is eligible for special education and provide to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility.”

Since then, the district has worked with the PSM team to implement the corrective action.

A review of the district’s courses indicated that Greenfield provides most students with equitable access to a range of coursework across most grades. In the elementary schools (Grades K-4), students have access to subjects such as art, music, and physical education. In the upper elementary levels and middle school (Grades 5-7), students can choose from a wider range of electives, including technology, world languages, unified arts, and STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics)-related courses, allowing them to explore diverse interests and develop essential skills. At the high school level, students have access to various coursework pathways. Greenfield High School offers career and technical education courses, Advanced Placement (AP) courses, Early College Program/Early Transition Program in partnership with Greenfield Community College, and Digital Literacy and Computer Science courses (offered from Grade 5 through Grade 12, with 30 percent of the student population enrolled). In addition, 86 percent of all students enroll in arts courses, indicating strong interest in and support for arts education. However, the relatively low enrollment compared with the state average in digital literacy and computer science courses (30 percent) and advanced courses (46 percent) suggests there may be barriers to accessing these courses or a need for increased encouragement and support for students to enroll in rigorous coursework.

Principals within the district reported that the design of elective courses and extracurricular activities makes them equally accessible to and inclusive of all students. They emphasized the district’s efforts to use disaggregated data to monitor disproportionalities and underrepresentation in specialized elective and advanced courses. For instance, the district has been focusing on improving access to rigorous coursework for English Learners and Students with Disabilities by ensuring that educators possess the required licenses or endorsements. However, school leaders explained that there are ongoing challenges in ensuring equitable participation in the Honors, AP, and International Baccalaureate programs.

Middle school student focus group participants added that they generally feel supported and have access to various electives and extracurricular activities, such as makerspace, art, band, library, theater, gym, and health, which rotate every seven weeks. Although students have opportunities to participate in clubs after school, they cannot create new clubs themselves. Students also noted that they have access to academic support through options such as staying after class, meeting teachers during lunch, and using resources such as multiplication charts and calculators. However, they expressed a desire for more consistent feedback on their lessons and more opportunities to provide input on school changes. High school students reiterated these points, emphasizing the accessibility honors courses, the availability of dual enrollment programs, and the importance of having supportive teachers and counselors, but they also noted barriers to AP courses:

I think honors classes are (accessible), but AP classes . . . you need a guardian’s permission signature, and some people might have more difficulty getting that

However, high school student focus group participants also expressed a desire for more structured supports, noting,

they have afterschool time where you can stay with the teacher and stuff . . . But I wish what they had is tutors with each subject that could help after school. Because some teachers can’t stay after school every day.

### Effective Instruction and Curricular Implementation

Teachers from across the district generally agreed that their district provides support for developing a safe and supportive learning environment in which most students can engage in academic content. These supports are a strength of the district and include the use of instructional strategies (see *Instructional Leadership*) meant to promote consistency, create engagement, and improve relationships throughout the school buildings, with efforts to create a cohesive unit rather than isolated schools by implementing unified approaches to instructional practices and community building. As one teacher reported,

I think that we have had a really big cultural shift in the last few years where students and staff are definitely trending more towards feeling like they have a really strong community here, safe community, good relationships throughout the building, throughout the district.

However, students disagreed, explaining that although they feel safe and welcomed, significant issues exist with administrative support for rule enforcement and respect between students and teachers that limit teachers’ ability to effectively deliver the curriculum. They noted that behavioral expectations are understood but inconsistently enforced, leading to a lack of respect and a feeling that rules are not taken seriously. Teachers also reported frequent student misbehavior that is “challenging to teach through” and impacts their ability to effectively deliver instruction. One teacher explained, “We need to get started talking about the ability to have a classroom that you can manage and have one child not distract or wreck it for everybody else. There are constant evacuations of classes.” They noted that these behavioral disruptions reduce instructional time and can make other students feel unsafe and unprepared to learn.

Classroom observation scores primarily in the middle range for dimensions in the Emotional Support domain support what stakeholders shared about behavioral challenges and inconsistent disciplinary actions. For example, some classrooms observed scored in the middle range for Negative Climate, suggesting the presence of mild negativity and inconsistent control measures, supporting student and teacher concerns about the lack of consistent behavior management and the impact it has on the learning environment. Similarly, the middle-range scores for Positive Climate indicate that although there are efforts to create a warm and supportive relationship between teachers and students, these efforts are not consistent across all classrooms. Teacher Sensitivity scores in the middle range further highlight that teachers are sometimes aware of and responsive to student needs, but this awareness and responsiveness are not consistent, highlighting what teachers and students shared about a lack of warmth and respect among students and staff in some classrooms. These observations align with the feedback from students and teachers about the need for more consistent support, better communication, and improved behavior management to create a truly supportive and effective learning environment, which is an area for growth for the district.

The district has set expectations for and supports educators in implementing lessons that reflect grade-level standards and WIDA English Language Development standards. However, implementing curricula consistently and with fidelity is an area of growth for the district. Teachers and school leaders agreed that teachers must identify both content and language objectives for all lessons, and the district upholds the expectation that teachers identify strategies for providing supports that enable students to engage in grade-level content. Student focus group participants agreed, adding that although they recognize the efforts to set clear objectives and provide necessary support, they feel that the implementation is inconsistent. They noted that some teachers are more effective than others in integrating these strategies into their lessons, which can lead to variability in their learning experiences. For example, a student reported that some teachers will explain the lesson objectives when students enter the class, stating “the ones that [explain] it well . . . [say] this is what we are doing today and give a brief rundown of what that is actually meaning to us.” However, students reported that not all teachers do this. In addition, students expressed a desire for more consistent feedback and support to help them meet these objectives effectively.

According to teachers, the district mostly supports them in implementing evidence-based instructional practices by providing professional development opportunities. These opportunities include regular training sessions at the beginning of the school year, in November, in January, and in May, which are geared toward the curriculum and instructional strategies. The district employs Teaching Lab to train administrators, who then train ILTs to further disseminate this training to the staff. However, teacher focus group participants reported that they do not benefit from districtwide walkthroughs aligned with the district-implemented instructional strategies because they lack individualized feedback. Teachers also reported challenges with incorporating the instructional strategies into lessons because they have limited collaboration time to effectively plan and internalize lessons.

Classroom observation scores in the low to middle range for dimensions in the Instructional Support domain suggest that district support for the implementation of instructional practices are not yet fully effective. For example, scores for Instructional Learning Formats indicate some efforts to engage students, but these efforts are inconsistent, with many lessons remaining at a rote level. Concept Development/Understanding scores show that teachers often focus on basic facts and skills rather than promoting deeper understanding and higher-order thinking skills. Analysis and Inquiry scores reveal limited opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking skills. Quality of Feedback scores suggest that although students receive feedback, it often is perfunctory and not sustained long enough to be effective. Language Modeling scores indicate that conversations in the classroom are limited and do not consistently promote advanced language use. Finally, Instructional Dialogue scores show that meaningful, content-based discussions are infrequent and often lack depth. These observations and the limited collaborative planning time noted by teacher focus group participants highlight the need for improving the effective use of collaboration time to ensure the consistent implementation of evidence-based instructional strategies, which is an area for growth for Greenfield.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should develop a clear and coherent instructional vision that guides pedagogical strategies across all schools and grade levels.*
* *The district should provide teachers with additional supports in adapting lessons to ensure that all students have access to high-quality, grade-appropriate instruction.*
* *The district should assess existing challenges to delivering Tier 2 and 3 interventions.*
* *The district should continue its work with DESE and its technical assistance provider to ensure that Students with Disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment and to address the underlying challenges to providing high-quality services for English Learners.*
* *The district should strengthen its Tier 1 instruction by working with teachers to support skillful implementation of the general curriculum.*
* *The district should implement consistent behavior management systems to prevent disruptions to student learning.*
* *The district should diagnose barriers to supporting its teachers in implementing evidence-based instructional practices and consider leveraging teacher collaboration time as one potential avenue for training.*

## Assessment

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

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Data Collection](#_Data_Collection) | * The district collects both academic and nonacademic data from multiple sources to develop a comprehensive view of student performance.
 |  |
| [Data Use and Culture](#_Data_Use_and) | * The district uses disaggregated student data to inform district planning and decision making.
 | * Developing a shared vision for data use across district, school, and classroom leaders
* Improving data access and literacy for teachers
 |
| [Sharing Data](#_Sharing_Data) |  | * Consistently engaging all students in goal setting and data review to promote student agency
* Developing consistent expectations for the frequency and method of student and family communication
* Establishing policies that allow teachers to calibrate the scoring and grading of student work at the high school
* Maintaining a detailed technology policy
 |

### Data Collection

The assistant superintendent of teaching and learning is responsible for assessment in the district. The district gathers multiple types of academic (e.g., DIBELS, MAP, MCAS, ninth-grade course completion) and nonacademic (e.g., attendance, behavior incident reports, reset room referrals) data about each student, which is a strength of the district. These data are available on an Open Architects dashboard for district leaders to review. In focus group discussions, district staff expressed that the collected data provide a comprehensive understanding of each student. For example, one district leader described using academic performance data, attendance rates, and behavior referrals to inform conversations with students and families and ensure that students receive the correct supports. In contrast, teachers reported no support for using data to form a comprehensive picture of the students in their classes because they can access only the classroom-level academic data that they collect.

According to school and district staff,Greenfield strategically selects and implements formal andinformal assessments that align with instructional content; however,the district does not publicly share the assessment plan or schedule. Greenfield uses DIBELS for Grades K-7 and MAP for Grades 2-8, both of which are administered three times per year. For district-implemented curricula, teachers use the formative and summative assessments included in the curricula. For subjects and grade levels without a set curriculum, teachers reported that no standard process exists for selecting or developing assessments. Both district leaders and teachers reported a districtwide focus on providing informal assessment opportunities in the classroom, which include exit tickets, whiteboard responses, and the Fist to Five strategy. In focus groups, teachers noted that the district provided professional development on backward design lesson planning, which aims to assist teachers in designing lessons that allow students to meet the learning targets on which they will be assessed.

According to teacher focus group participants, the district does not consistently provide the necessary accommodations for all students to access formal and informal assessments. One teacher reported confusion whether they could provide translated assessments for English Learners in general education classes. Overall, district and school leaders did not report any processes regarding their assessment strategy that demonstrate a commitment to equity.

### Data Use and Culture

Drawing from district (e.g., superintendent, assistant superintendent) and school staff (e.g., principals, teachers) focus groups and interviews, it is evident that district staff understand how data collection and use connect with Greenfield’s broader instructional vision and strategic priorities. District leaders reported that previously there have been “pockets of data analysis over the years, where it’s not been an intentional, districtwide, building-based mentality,” but noted steps taken recently to establish an intentional vision for data use. For example, Greenfield partnered with Open Architects to develop a data dashboard for district leaders to review districtwide trends across multiple academic and nonacademic data sources. In addition, the district works with Teaching Lab to provide teachers with professional learning and specific data review protocols. District leaders noted that the main goal for this professional learning is to support educators in using data to determine how they can adjust instructional practices to improve student outcomes.

According to the superintendent, Greenfield collects multiple data points and disaggregates student group data to inform district planning, decision making, policies, and practices. For example, disaggregated attendance data, MCAS data, advanced coursework enrollment, and four-year graduation rates influenced the focus on Students with Disabilities, English Learners, and Hispanic or Latino students in the district’s annual instructional priority. District leaders reported using disaggregated academic data to inform student course placements and teacher assignments. District leaders also emphasized a focus for teachers to review data disaggregated by student groups in collaborative time, which teacher focus groups echoed and is evident in the district’s Data Analysis Protocol: Teacher “Notecatchers.” The district’s use of disaggregated student data to inform district planning and decision making is an area of strength for Greenfield.

Although Greenfield is beginning to establish a vision for data use, this understanding is not yet shared among all district, school, and classroom leaders. School leaders described an expectation that “staff use their data to drive everything they’re doing.” They explained that district leaders model this expectation by frequently reviewing disaggregated student data and providing staff with data review protocols. However, focus group discussions revealed that this vision does not extend to classroom teachers. When asked about the district’s vision for data use, teachers responded, “I don’t know if there is any.” Furthermore, teachers reported a perception that across the district, “we just keep talking about the data, but we don’t do anything with the data,” indicating that the district has not clearly communicated their vision of using data or developed a systematic approach to drive practice at the classroom level. Developing a shared vision for data use across district, school, and classroom leaders is an area for growth for the district.

According to school leaders and teachers, the district does not provide educators with access to all relevant data and the resources necessary to understand and analyze it. District leadersexplained that the districtsupports teacher understanding and use of data throughprofessional development, access to data analysis protocols, and collaborative time. However, they noted that because these supports are newly established, teachers are not yet consistently able to analyze their own data and adjust their instructional practices. Similarly, teachers reported a perception that they do not have “the time or the skills” to access and analyze relevant student data. They attributed this to the district’s adoption of new initiatives before teachers had the chance to develop their skills with current initiatives. As one teacher explained,

I feel like we started different ways of looking at [data], but we’ve not broken the surface yet . . . We’re going to use this protocol and then we’ll do it kind of . . . but then nothing. Then it changes the next year.

Although district leaders and teachers agreed that teachers do not yet have the resources and knowledge to analyze student data, focus group discussions revealed conflicting opinions about the availability of data. District leaders reported that teachers have access to classroom-level academic data, DIBELS data, MAP data, USNS scores, trends in MCAS data, and behavioral data through attendance meetings and SST meetings. In focus groups, teachers at the elementary level agreed that they have access to relevant data sources. However, middle and high school teachers reported that they do not have access to behavioral data or student specific MCAS results. The district uses PowerSchool for teachers to track and analyze most forms of student data, but not all data sources are available on this platform. Improving data access and literacy for teachers is an area for growth for the district.

According to district leaders, district staff regularly use course grades, attendance, SST reports, and office referralsto evaluate students’ academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs. Most data, including grades, attendance, SST reports, and MCAS, are disaggregated by specific categories, namely race and/or ethnicity, English learner status, and disability status. In focus groups, school staff further explained that the district sets expectations regarding student data review and developed structures that facilitate regular data review cycles, which sometimes lead to adjustments in teachers’ instruction. The district provides specific protocols for teachers to review student data, including universal screener results and student work, that teachers should use during their collaboration time. Collaboration times vary by grade level; elementary schools get 25 minutes daily, the middle school gets 30 minutes daily, and the high school gets 45 minutes two days per week. Despite this dedicated collaboration time, some teachers reported having insufficient time to review data. District leaders and school staff reported using data to evaluate student needs and provide appropriate interventions. For example, one teacher reported reviewing behavioral data to connect a student with additional supports through Sprout, an organization that provides direct behavioral support to students, and other focus group participants reported using academic performance data to form small groups for in-class targeted interventions.

### Sharing Data

Reports from teacher and student focus group participants indicate that the district does not set consistent expectations about engaging all students in goal setting and data review in developmentally appropriate ways to promote student agency. For example, students explained having a general expectation to check their own grades, and some teachers will reach out to them directly if their performance declines, but such communication does not happen consistently. Students also reported some opportunities to perform grade revisions or use rubrics to reflect on their own performance, but these opportunities were not available across all subjects or grade levels. Special education teachers reported that they share specific goals and progress monitoring data with students during sessions, but general education teachers did not report using similar practices. Consistently engaging all students in goal setting and data review to promote student agency is an area for growth for the district.

District leaders have established baseline expectations for how teachers should communicate with families about student performance. Teachers and families noted that the district communicates evidence of student performance through progress reports and teacher conferences twice per year, but both groups noted variations in the frequency and method of additional communications. Greenfield uses PowerSchool districtwide to enable families to monitor student academic data, including grades on assignments and overall course grades; however, in focus groups, no parents identified PowerSchool as a way that the district communicates student performance with families. Instead, some parents and teachers identified the platforms Remind, ClassDojo, and Clever, although they reported that these platforms are not used consistently across grade levels and buildings. In addition, focus group discussions with families revealed that some teachers have established schedules for communicating with parents (e.g., weekly check-in and update emails), but this practice is not consistent across teachers. For example, one parent explained as follows:

I don’t remember seeing anything in the handbook or any kind of written policy about the number of times that we should expect communication from the teachers or from administration. From my experience, it’s up to us to reach out to the teacher and prod them for additional information if we feel like something might be amiss or just to check in.

Similarly, teachers reported that they formerly received clear expectations from school and district administrators about the frequency of parent communication in addition to dedicated time to perform that outreach, but they noted that those expectations are no longer in place. In addition, discussions in focus groups revealed that the district does not always accommodate parents’ requests for more accessible communication methods (e.g., communication that does not require the use of a computer). Developing consistent expectations for the frequency and methods of student and family communication about student performance is an area for growth for the district.

According to teachers, school leaders, and district staff, the district does not implement a transparent, accessible, and calibrated grading system across all schools. As noted earlier, the district uses PowerSchool to allow student and families to monitor grades on assignments and course grades. Although teachers at most grade levels did not report any concerns about equitable grading practices, high school teachers noted that they do not have standard practices for inputting grades in PowerSchool, which leads to disparities. As one teacher described, “There’s a lot of autonomy . . . and not a lot of checking in.” For example, they reported that differences in how teachers input missing assignments can lead them to count as a “zero” or can cause them to be removed from overall course grade calculations entirely. Another high school teacher shared, “What I do and what my neighbor does is totally different,” indicating a need for the district to establish policies that allow teachers to calibrate the scoring of student work to ensure that grading is consistent and equitable, which is an area of growth for the district.

According to district leaders, dedicated staff are responsible for reviewing and monitoring the digital platforms that collect, store, and share student data quarterly to ensure ongoing compliance with student data privacy laws and regulations. In addition, district staff reported that the district offers professional learning for staff about student data privacy law, policies, and best practices for safeguarding student information yearly. Although the district provides resources for data privacy, internet safety, and responsible use on the district website, Greenfield does not maintain a detailed technology policy, which is an area for growth.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should work with school leaders and teachers to develop and disseminate a clear vision for using student data to inform decision-making.*
* *The district should continue its efforts to increase teachers’ access to data and should implement professional learning opportunities that build teachers’ data literacy.*
* *The district should set expectations around sharing data with students and engaging them in goal setting and progress monitoring in ways that promote student agency over learning.*
* *The district should consider selecting a single, consistent platform to communicate with families about student academic progress, and should reinforce staff expectations around the frequency of communication.*
* *The district should establish a consistent grading policy at the high school level and provide high school teachers with opportunities to calibrate the scoring of student work.*
* *The district should develop a technology policy that aligns with and reinforces its existing efforts to protect student data privacy.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

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

Table 6 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development in Greenfield.

Table 6. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices](#_Human_Resources_Infrastructure,) |  | * Establishing staff and systems to fulfill all human resources and payroll responsibilities
* Improving accessibility of human resources policies and procedures
 |
| [Staffing](#_Staffing) | * The district provides training to evaluators that enables them to calibrate their feedback and provide equitable evaluations.
* The district highlights areas of strengths of teachers through the evaluation process.
 | * Implementing strategies to recruit a diverse workforce
* Assigning licensed, experienced educators to High Needs students
* Consistently conducting administrator evaluations
* Articulating areas for improvement to support teachers in continuous instructional and professional improvement
* Establishing formal strategies to retain effective and diverse educators
 |
| [Professional Learning](#_Professional_Learning) | * Greenfield’s professional development opportunities, collaboration time, and walkthrough process align to support the district’s instructional priorities.
 | * Providing teachers with individualized, actionable feedback
* Allowing teachers to choose differentiated and specialized professional learning opportunities
* Supporting educators in effectively using collaborative planning time
 |

### Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices

According to district staff, Greenfield does not have a dedicated Human Resources department; rather, several staff, including the superintendent, the payroll and benefits manager, a personnel assistant, and the executive assistant to the superintendent divide responsibilities for maintaining employee records, controlling positions, posting vacancies, and tracking employee time and attendance. Focus group discussions indicate that the existing staff and systems are not sufficient to uphold all these responsibilities effectively. For example, teachers reported consistent errors with payroll that require them to check their paychecks for accuracy, and district leaders reported that the number of staff responsible for payroll is insufficient to meet the workload. The district recently hired another staff member to assist with payroll and benefits, but as one district leader noted,

There are so many issues that we just do not have the staff to keep up . . . Luckily the school committee has been embracing the additional staffing, but I still think we could use at least one more body to assist with all of the issues we have.

Putting the necessary staff and systems in place to fulfill all human resources responsibilities is an area of growth for the district.

The district has some human resources policies and procedures in place that set expectations and provide sufficient support for district staff, but these policies are not accessible to all staff. Members of the teachers’ association reported that the district does have formal processes in place to resolve staff conflicts and grievances. Similarly, human resources staff discussed in their focus group that the district has policies and procedures in place to verify educators’ licensure status, respond to benefit inquiries, address staff conflicts and grievances, and resolve staff misconduct professionally and promptly. However, discussions with teachers revealed that the district does not clearly communicate human resources policies to them. As one teachers’ association member reported, teachers “don’t feel like they know where to go” to get their human resources questions answered. In addition, the district does not have an accessible employee handbook with resources for district staff. Improving the accessibility of human resources policies and procedures is an area for growth for the district.

### Staffing

Central office staff agreed that their district has effective policies and processes in place to hire and onboard new staff, but they noted that recruitment is a challenge for the district. Greenfield’s policies and processes are minimally aligned with DESE’s hiring guide; for example, they leverage existing pipelines by posting open positions internally and offering educators pathways to advanced licensure, but they do not institute earlier hiring timelines or support job candidates by sharing how the district builds a culturally and linguistically sustaining work environment. Members of the district’s teachers’ association agreed with these sentiments, adding that no language in the collective bargaining agreements promotes the recruitment of a diverse workforce. The district uses SchoolSpring to post all open positions, and district representatives attend Mass Hire Workforce Development Career Fairs to recruit new staff. However, focus group discussions revealed that recruitment is an ongoing challenge for Greenfield. At the time of the review and according to the district website, Greenfield had 47 unfilled positions for which they were hiring. As one district leader explained about the district’s recruitment challenges:

Getting a diverse workforce that represents our student body has been a bane of the existence of Greenfield for as long as I’ve been here. We live in a city that has no affordable housing, that has no public transportation, and we are the lowest paying district in Franklin County. A lot of folks that over the years we have interviewed that we would have loved to have on board, that represent the composite makeup of our students, can go to Holyoke or Springfield, make a lot more money, and also work in a community where there are other people like them…. It’s a constant struggle for us to really attract and have people commit to our district that represent our student body.

Consistent with this report, according to the most recently available data (2023), the average teacher salary in Greenfield was $15,627 lower than the state average. In addition, staffing data for the 2023-2024 school year showed that although 22.1 percent of Greenfield’s students are Hispanic or Latino, only 3.9 percent of the teachers are Hispanic or Latino, and the district had no Hispanic or Latino administrators between 2021 and 2023. Implementing strategies to recruit a diverse workforce is an area for growth for Greenfield.

According to district leaders, the district’s department heads (e.g., building principals, director of food services) are responsible for hiring their own staff, and these staff reported that Greenfield clearly defines these hiring responsibilities. For example, the district uses a hiring checklist with steps for all department heads to follow to identify viable candidates. However, district leaders reported that the district does not offer any formal training to hiring leads. Staff reported that the district’s leadership team notes challenges with the hiring process throughout the year and revises the process annually at the summer leadership retreat.

Teachers said that newly hired staff attend a two-day orientation before the start of the school year, during which they meet with their assigned mentor. In addition, district staff reported that supervisors and mentors are responsible for orienting new hires to their specific school. Prior to the beginning of the current school year, the superintendent conducted a tour for new staff around the city of Greenfield. The district also provides hiring packets to all new staff that outline the specific paperwork and trainings that new staff must complete.

Human resources staff reported that the district tries to equitably distribute licensed, experienced educators across its schools, but this is not always the case. The superintendent explained of the district’s efforts: “We are constantly assessing, reviewing, talking to principals, seeing what the needs are that are popping up. . . . We really do try to address equitably the needs that kids have so that they have the supports they deserve.” For example, after receiving an influx of late kindergarten registrations prior to this school year, the district opened additional classrooms across each elementary school to avoid overburdening one school with increased class sizes. In addition, district leaders reported working with community partners to ensure balance among student and teacher placements across all school buildings. However, district leaders also recognized a current trend of placing many Students with Disabilities and English Learners in classes with frequent teacher turnover or substitutes. They identified a need to be more intentional with teacher assignments to ensure that all students have access to high-quality instruction from licensed, effective educators. District leaders noted that Greenfield’s planned redistricting process will address the unbalanced assignment of students to school buildings, such that the district’s population of High Needs students will no longer attend a single elementary school. Although the potential redistricting efforts will improve all students’ access to high-quality instruction from effective educators, intentionally assigning licensed, experienced educators to High Needs students remains an area for growth for Greenfield.

District staff reported that educator evaluations are conducted in accordance with staff contracts. The district uses DESE’s rubric for educator evaluations, specifically the focus indicators. Staff are expected to write professional goals that align with the district’s Instructional Prioritization Plan, which district leaders reported helps create a culture of high expectations. However, some teachers expressed frustration that they could not write their own professional practice goals. In addition, teachers reported that under previous building administrators, not all teachers received evaluations, which prevented the district from establishing consistent, high expectations for all educators. Members of the teachers’ associationreported that mentors assist new staff with completing the evaluation process, including helping them write goals and submit evidence.According to the superintendent, all evaluators are to use language from the DESE rubric in their evaluations. Moreover, for the past two years, evaluators have used the Educator Evaluation tool to calibrate their responses to practice lessons. As one district leader stated, “I think that was helpful to just try to keep everyone on the same page about what we’re actually watching in classrooms and then how to actually provide constructive feedback in a way that’s helpful for the educator.” Providing training to evaluators that enables them to calibrate their feedback and provide equitable evaluations is a strength of the district.

District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently completed using Vector Solutions. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample of 10 of the 56 teachers due for summative evaluations for the 2023-2024 school year. All teacher evaluations selected for review (10 of 10 or 100 percent) had a summative evaluation available for review. All teacher evaluations available for review (100 percent) were complete and did not omit required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. None of the summative evaluation documents reviewed included a student learning SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goal and a professional practice SMART goal within the document. However, progress reported toward achieving the student learning and professional practice SMART goals is not consistently part of the summative evaluation report. All summative evaluations (100 percent) included feedback for each standard and overall feedback related to the teacher’s overall rating. Nearly all of the evaluations (80 percent) included feedback naming strengths or practices the teacher should continue, but less than half of the evaluations (30 percent) included feedback indicating areas of improvement.

District records also suggest that administration evaluations are completed using Vector Solutions. Of the 40 administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2023-2024 school year, only one evaluation was available for review. Consequently, there is an insufficient number of administrator evaluations to identify and assess trends. In addition, district leaders reported that “administrators have randomly received evaluations over the past years.” Consistently conducting administrator evaluations is an area for growth.

The review of teacher and administration evaluations reveals that the district excels in identifying teachers’ strengths through the evaluation process. However, it also indicates a need for improvement in clearly communicating areas for growth to support teachers in continuous instructional and professional improvement.

In focus groups, teachers did not report any processes that their district has established to recognize their work and effort. However, district leaders reported formal and informal systems to recognize staff, including annual nominations for the Harold Grinspoon Foundation’s Excellence in Teaching award, commendation letters to the school committee, and shout-outs at school faculty meetings. In relation to career advancement, teachers felt that their district has the resources to support their professional learning or pathways to advancement. District staff and school leaders agreed with these sentiments, adding that the district offers certificates for professional development toward advanced licensure and includes a $40,000 professional development fund in the annual budget to reimburse teachers for college credits. In addition, the district offers teachers some opportunities for distributed leadership, including mentor roles and positions on schools’ ILTs.

District leaders did not identify any specific strategies used to retain educators, and staff retention is a self-identified challenge for the district. According to DESE staffing data, teacher retention in Greenfield has been below the state rate for the past five years, with a low of 70.5 percent in 2023. Staff across focus groups described numerous instances of educators resigning shortly after being hired by the district, noting that it is especially common for IA roles. Members of the teachers’ association reported that under the new administration, the district started collecting information from staff who choose to leave the district. District leaders identified that Greenfield’s lower salaries relative to neighboring districts is a main reason that staff leave the district. Participants in the district’s teacher focus groups added that other reasons for staff leaving include changes in their assignment and student behaviors. Teachers reported that because of absences and unfilled positions, staff (especially IAs) often are pulled from their original role to cover another position, which causes them to feel “disrespected and unheard” and leads to burnout. Staff also noted that removing educators from their assigned positions impedes the district’s ability to consistently deliver necessary instructional supports to Students with Disabilities and English Learners. (See *Equitable Practices and Access* for more information.) In addition, teachers reported that many staff leave the district because of persistent student behaviors in the classroom and the lack of consistent behavior expectations. According to teachers, district schools do not employ consistent behavior protocols, and schools do not deliver consistent consequences for student misconduct, which leads to frequent behavior incidents in the classroom (see *Safe and Supportive Climate and Culture* for more information). Teachers said the recurring misbehaviors are “degrading and demoralizing,” and because of these recurring misbehaviors, “there’s a lot of stress” within the classroom. One district leader noted that the district recently implemented a system to connect students’ safety plans to PowerSchool so that the plans follow students throughout any schedule changes, which they hope will improve teachers’ awareness of students’ behaviors and help reduce teacher burnout and turnover.

District leaders noted that these challenges with staff retention hinder Greenfield’s ability to diversify its workforce. As one leader explained of staff turnover, “We’re plugging holes on top of positions that hadn’t been filled anyway. . . . Every time we’re plugging a hole, we’re creating another hole somewhere else. And this is with diverse staff or not.” Establishing formal strategies to retain effective and diverse educators is an area for growth for the district.

School leaders did not describe how the district fosters a positive, productive, and inclusive work environment for staff, and teacher focus group participants provided mixed opinions about the working environment. As noted earlier, some educators reported that student behaviors and removal of support staff from the classroom to address classroom coverage lead to consistent stress for teachers. However, other teachers reported feeling supported by their coworkers and their building administration. As one educator reported, “We’re all in our own lanes, but we are all able to collaborate in deeply meaningful ways and support each other because it’s not an easy job sometimes.” Teacher focus group participants indicated that their district does not provide them with adequate mental health and wellness supports, with one teacher claiming, “I really have to just laugh at that, because I don’t think there are any [supports].” In addition, educators reported a reluctance to use sick days for mental health. One teacher explained: “It’s even more stressful to be out because of the substitute plans you have to do and knowing that you might be burdening your team member. There really isn’t a lot of support for taking a mental health sick day. It’s challenging.” Other educators noted occasional celebrations, such as staff luncheons, but reported that they are “not super frequent.”

### Professional Learning

A district-provided rubric offers school leadership guidelines for observation and feedback cycles with the goal of enhancing teachers’ instruction. The district created this rubric in partnership with the SSoS and Teaching Lab for the formal learning walkthroughs, but district and building administrators use the same rubric during weekly informal walkthroughs. Leaders reported that the rubric emphasizes literacy and the district’s three instructional strategies of focus (Think-Write-Pair-Share; questioning; and scaffolding). Outside these walkthroughs, however, school leaders at the elementary and middle school levels reported conducting daily informal observations, and leaders at the high school reported conducting informal observations several times per week. Staff at the elementary level agreed that they receive frequent informal observations, but middle and high school teachers reported inconsistent or infrequent observations. District staff reported a “filter-down” system for targeted coaching, wherein Teaching Lab trains administrators, administrators train ILT members, and ILT members train building staff. However, Greenfield does not offer teachers access to individualized instructional coaching.

District staff reported that because their learning walks are not evaluative, teachers receive only building-level feedback after both formal and informal walkthroughs. The district recently allowed teachers to request their individual feedback from the formal learning walkthroughs, but teachers reported that none of the staff who requested this feedback have received it. In addition, building leaders reported providing informal feedback to teachers after observations, such as on a sticky note or with a brief follow-up email, but teachers across all buildings reported that they do not receive individualized feedback following observations. One teacher reported that they “haven’t seen [building leaders share individual feedback] in recent years,” and another reported their perception that “I think we’re all very desperate for feedback.” The district shares building-level observation data and trends with staff, but providing teachers with individualized, actionable feedback about their instruction is an area for growth for Greenfield.

The district provides ongoing evidence-based, data-informed, and relevant professional development opportunities that align with the Massachusetts Professional Development Standards through its partnership with Teaching Lab. In addition, district staff described how Greenfield’s professional development opportunities, collaboration time, and walkthrough process align in support of the district’s instructional priorities, which is a strength for the district. As the superintendent described, district leaders identify trends in instruction from walkthroughs, which inform the instructional strategies covered in professional development offerings and collaboration time agendas. Leaders then monitor the implementation of these strategies in subsequent walkthroughs. For example, district leaders noticed a lack of lesson internalization during one of their formal learning walkthroughs and worked with Teaching Lab to provide training on lesson internalization during the next professional development day. They also included lesson internalization in the agendas for collaboration time. Overall, Greenfield’s professional development opportunities have focused on improving Tier 1 instruction using the district’s three identified instructional strategies and embedding literacy into the use of those strategies. Teachers did note, however, that their professional development experiences are not sufficient in helping them identify ways to implement these strategies to reach the district’s three targeted student groups: Students with Disabilities, English Learners, and Hispanic or Latino students. The district provides evaluation forms to staff following each professional development day so that teachers can provide feedback on different aspects of the professional development program (e.g., relevance, practicality, presentation), but teachers do not have the opportunity to provide input on what professional development topics would be relevant and useful to them.

Similarly, school leaders and teachers disagreed that teachers have agency in selecting the offerings that best suit their needs as educators. Many teachers attributed this to the district’s focus on providing offerings that relate directly to the prioritization plan. District leaders concurred, explaining as follows:

We would love to be in a place where [building administrators and teachers] can have voice and choice in [selecting professional development opportunities], but the continued identification of schools and targeted assistance districtwide really exposes what we all need to be working toward as a unit.

Regardless, teachers expressed frustration at their lack of agency in selecting professional development offerings. For example, in focus groups, general education teachers reported they would like professional development on specific strategies to provide high-quality instruction to English Learners and Students with Disabilities. In addition, educators across focus groups reported a lack of specialized or relevant offerings for special education teachers and noncore content teachers (e.g., physical education, art, music). Teachers reported a perception that the district “just needed a place to put them,” so they had these staff members attend professional development programs that were not relevant to their roles. The ability of teachers to choose differentiated and specialized professional learning opportunities is an area for growth for Greenfield.

District teachers agreed that they have time to collaborate with other educators, but they noted differences across buildings. At the elementary schools, teachers meet in grade-level teams for 25 minutes per day, and the building principals attend one meeting per week. Staff reported that special education teachers and interventionists attend collaboration time as needed. At the middle school, teachers meet for 30 minutes per day; two days per week they meet with content teams, and one day per week they meet with grade-level teams, building administrators, and student services, respectively. Teachers noted that this schedule can feel “very disjointed.” At the high school level, teachers meet in mixed-grade and mixed-content teams for 45 minutes twice per week. High school staff noted their collaboration time can be less effective because teachers do not meet with grade-level or subject-matter peers.

District principals agreed that their district provides them with protocols that promote the effective use of staff collaboration time. These protocols include agendas, “notecatchers,” and materials for collaboration time, during which staff members review student data and work on lesson internalization and embedding the district’s three instructional strategies into lessons. As one district leader described, “The theme is the same for everybody, K-12. They’re getting the same agenda.” However, teachers indicated that the district-provided protocols do not always promote the effective use of collaboration time. For example, teachers reported that the agendas included more topics than the teams could cover during their scheduled time, which required the district to reduce the number of materials (e.g., articles, guiding questions) they provided with each collaboration time agenda. Other teachers noted a lack of support in using the district-provided protocols. According to one educator,

This year feels very structured in terms of ‘We’re going to look at internalization. Use this tool.’ But no one really understands. I don’t really get what we’re doing. I think it’s this attempt at increased time for this material that we’re learning . . . but there’s not a lot of instruction around it.

Teachers also noted that the structured nature of their collaboration time limits their ability to collaborate on matters not included on the district-provided agenda. They reported, for example, that they lack time to plan lessons collaboratively, discuss concerns about individual students, and handle operational tasks. Teachers’ reports about the effectiveness of district-provided protocols indicate that supporting educators in effectively using collaborative planning time is an area for growth for Greenfield.

Teacher focus group participants indicated that, when novice educators start in Greenfield, the district provides these educators with the resources to be successful, such as partnering them with a mentor. Staff described that all educators new to the district receive mentor supports for one year, and all novice educators receive mentoring for two years. Mentors meet with the new educators twice per month and have check-in meetings with the assistant superintendent every other month. Teachers described that mentees observe instruction in other classrooms in addition to the instructional observations they receive from their mentors.

School staff disagreed that their district intentionally matches new hires with a mentor. One staff member described that mentees may not have a mentor in the same grade level or subject area as them. However, they noted that the district takes an “all-hands-on-deck approach to supporting new folks,” so new staff can rely on department members to learn the expectations of that department. A review of the district’s mentor program documents showed that there is a process to annually evaluate and refine the program, though program leaders did not discuss this process in focus groups.

District staff did not identify any training or professional development opportunities for their non-instructional staff (e.g., administrative support staff, food service employees, custodians, and technology staff). A review of professional development day agendas from the 2023-2024 school year revealed consistent offerings for nursing staff; one specific training for food services staff; and no specialized opportunities for technology, transportation, custodial, and administrative support staff. A review of the district’s most recent professional development day agenda (November 2024) shows that the district provided specific training for transportation, food services, and nursing staff.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should continue its efforts to adequately staff human resources roles and develop the necessary systems to support regular operations.*
* *The district should systematically distribute its human resources policies and procedures so that all staff can access them.*
* *The district should expand upon its existing recruitment strategies and develop a plan for recruiting and retaining staff that reflects the racial and ethnic makeup of the district’s student body.*
* *The district should systematize its efforts to equitably distribute licensed and experienced educators amongst its highest-need student populations.*
* *The district should set and maintain expectations around consistently conducting administrator evaluations.*
* *The district should issue clear guidance to evaluators that emphasizes the importance of including constructive feedback in teacher evaluations in addition to positive feedback.*
* *The district should develop a comprehensive plan for addressing staff retention that addresses systemic staffing challenges including frequent changes in staff assignments and persistent student behavioral challenges.*
* *The district should implement a system for ensuring regular informal observations of each teacher and providing individualized feedback and/or coaching.*
* *The district should examine its approach to professional development, identify opportunities for greater differentiation, and create a mechanism by which teachers and non-instructional staff can provide input on professional development topics.*
* *The district should revise its collaborative planning time protocols to increase flexibility and support educators in using the allotted time effectively.*

## Student Support

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

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support in Greenfield.

Table 7. 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) | * The district provides resources to address students’ social emotional and mental health needs.
 | * Establishing and implementing consistent behavioral support systems with specific rules and expectations
* Creating opportunities for all students to exercise voice and leadership
 |
| [Health and Well-Being](#_Health_and_Well-Being) |  |  |
| [Family and Community Partnerships](#_Family_and_Community) | * The district has developed strong partnerships with various community organizations to provide services and enriching experiences.
 | * Providing clear guidance to staff regarding consistency of family communication
* Ensuring that all plans are easily accessible online and in multiple languages
 |
| [Multitiered Systems of Support](#_Multitiered_Systems_of) | * The district’s SST guidebook outlines how the district applies an adaptable MTSS to implement academic and nonacademic interventions and robust progress monitoring procedures across all school levels.
 | * Providing structured Tier 3 interventions
 |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

According to district leaders, the district collects and uses staff surveys, the U.S. Department of Education School Climate Survey, the 2024 Franklin County/North Quabbin Student Health Survey, and professional development feedback forms to regularly monitor school and district culture. The superintendent and other district leaders reported that counselors, behavior specialists, SST teams, and administration work collaboratively to identify, monitor, and address student needs. The district uses attendance meetings to track data and identify reasons for chronic absenteeism, leading to collaborative interventions. Greenfield uses PowerSchool to log incidents and behaviors, ensuring that events related to students’ experiences are recorded. District staff reported a focus on consistently documenting and reviewing behaviors and challenges to monitor student behavior effectively. However, district student support staff noted a lack of social-emotional learning practices implemented across the district.

A review of district documents indicated that all schools within the district have a bullying prevention plan. This plan includes comprehensive procedures for reporting and responding to incidents of bullying or retaliation, ensuring the safety and support of the targeted students, and implementing appropriate disciplinary actions for aggressors. The plan also emphasizes the importance of collaborating with families and community partners, providing education programs for parents and guardians, and promoting a safe and inclusive school environment through skill-building and positive behavioral supports.

However, despite these measures, teachers, students, and families reported a lack of clear expectations for student conduct and inconsistent consequences for student misbehavior, which contribute to some students experiencing an unsafe learning environment. For example, students and teachers reported experiencing physical fights and aggression that led to classroom evacuations. Focus group participants described an overall lack of behavior expectations districtwide. One teacher reported, “There is no consistent behavior protocol. If there is stuff in the handbook, it’s never followed.” A parent shared that “I would love to have any idea of what the discipline structure is. I don’t think there is one, to be honest.” Moreover, teachers described how the lack of consistent behavior expectations across elementary schools prevents students from experiencing a safe and supportive environment upon entering middle school:

We have a group of kids that arrive and there’s absolutely no consistency with what is expected, what the culture of school is, because the culture is so different in different places. . . . How can kids possibly feel safe coming into a building when the culture is so foreign to them so quickly?

In addition, students shared a perception that student behavior impacts the relationships between students and teachers, with one noting that “there is a big problem with students not respecting teachers and therefore a lot of teachers not respecting students.” Consistent with this, districtwide CLASS observation scores for Positive Climate (Grades K-5: 5.3, Grades 6-8: 5.1, Grades 9-12: 4.9) and Behavior Management (Grades K-5: 5.6, Grades 6-8: 5.3, Grades 9-12: 5.4) in the middle range indicate that students do not consistently experience classroom environments characterized by warmth and mutual respect, and teachers do not consistently provide and enforce clear behavioral expectations in the classroom. Establishing consistent behavioral support systems in which specific rules, behaviors, and expectations are taught and reinforced is an area for growth for Greenfield.

According to the district’s school counselor and student support staff, Greenfield provides resources to address the social emotional and mental health needs, which is a strength of the district. These resources include social skills groups, individual and group counseling, mindfulness activities, and specific intervention programs, such as the prevention program for substance use and the iDECIDE program for students caught vaping. Schools also organize themed weeks focused on mental health topics, such as healthy relationships, consent, and suicide prevention. At the elementary level, schools use programs such as Second Step to teach social-emotional skills, and some have positive behavioral support systems in place to serve students. However, these programs are not consistent across all schools. In addition, student support staff reported using restorative practices, community-building circles, and harm conferences to resolve conflicts and build a supportive school environment, even though family and teacher focus group participants reported a lack of restorative practices across the district. The district also collaborates with outside agencies to provide therapy and other support services to students. These efforts are complemented by regular screenings, surveys, and data collection to monitor student needs and adjust interventions accordingly.

School leaders discussed some meaningful ways for students to give feedback and exercise leadership in their schools. For instance, high school students formed a Students of Color group and initiated a project to educate middle school students about the impact of racialized language. The school also hosts a “Taste of World Culture” event during which students share their cultural backgrounds through morning greetings and a culminating dinner, fostering a sense of community and cultural appreciation. District and school leaders reported that the district has worked on shifting the responsibility of learning from teachers to students, emphasizing student engagement and discourse. As a result, Greenfield implemented three instructional strategies—questioning, scaffolding, and Think-Write-Pair-Share—to increase student involvement in their own learning processes. However, CLASS observation scores in the low range for Instructional Dialogue (Grades 4-5: 3.6, Grades 6-8: 2.3, Grades 9-12: 2.9) and in the middle range for Regard for Student Perspectives (Grades K-5: 3.4, Grades 6-8: 3.3, Grades 9-12: 3.6) suggest that students do not have consistent opportunities to exercise autonomy; take responsibility for their learning; or engage in extended, content-focused discussions.

High school students had mixed feelings about the instructional practices allowing them to take ownership of their learning, noting that although teachers and staff provide some opportunities for feedback, the feedback is not always implemented. One student reflected as follows:

Most of the time, we’d go to a class meeting that the administration was holding. And at the end, they’d be like, “Can we get some questions and comments?” And people would give their opinion. Then it felt like the administration wasn’t taking anything we were saying seriously.

Middle school students also had mixed feelings about the opportunities for feedback and leadership in their school. Although they appreciated aspects of their learning environment, such as engaging and fun teaching methods, they noted a lack of direct opportunities to provide feedback on lessons. For instance, when asked if their teachers ever provide opportunities for feedback on lessons, one student responded, “No, not really. I don’t really think so.” Students noted that although they engage in reflection activities and complete exit tickets, these tasks focus on engaging with the lesson content rather than providing feedback on teaching methods. In addition, students did not report significant involvement in collaborative planning sessions or leadership projects, and they expressed a desire for more meaningful ways to give feedback and exercise leadership. Creating opportunities for all students to exercise voice and leadership at the classroom and school levels is an area for growth for Greenfield.

### Health and Well-Being

According to school leaders and teachers, the district offers health and physical education courses that align with the Massachusetts Comprehensive Health and Physical Education Framework to most students. Elementary school leaders reported that students receive a full year of physical education, and teachers integrate nutrition and physical education into the broader curriculum. As indicated by the elementary schools’ master schedule, elementary students have 30 minutes of recess each day. Middle school teachers noted that students have access to a daily 30-minute lunch/recess block and added that all middle school students have a physical education and health class in a seven-week program held twice per week after school. However, this system results in middle school students receiving less than a semester of physical education and health education throughout the school year. The high school course catalog specifies that all students must successfully complete four years of wellness education and two semesters of health to graduate. Greenfield’s wellness committee monitors and assesses the implementation of health instructional materials. A review of Greenfield’s school schedules indicated that the district provides students with multiple opportunities to engage in physical activity during and after school.

School leaders stated that the district has robust tiered mental and behavioral health services that support all students’ mental and emotional well-being. For example, the district employs adjustment counselors and social workers who provide individual and group counseling, conduct social skills groups, and engage in restorative practices. The district also uses screeners such as Screening, Brief Intervention, Referral to Treatment (SBIRT), and Signs of Suicide and conducts teen health surveys to monitor students' well-being. SSTs meet weekly to address student behavioral concerns. The district uses multiple nonacademic interventions such as reset rooms/buddy rooms, incentive plans, and Second Step to meet the specific needs of students. In addition, according to school leaders and other support staff, the district supports students, their families, and caregivers by providing information and referrals to health providers when requested or needed, and the district collaborates with community resources such as Clinical and Support Options (CSO) and employs programs such as Second Step to support social-emotional learning.

Teacher and family focus group participants had mixed agreement with district and school leaders’ assessment of these supports. For example, some teachers agreed that the district connects students to necessary supports, stating “I think we’re trying to be proactive and give kids the tools they need to be successful socially and emotionally versus waiting for them to fall apart and then dealing with them.” Other teachers reported that although they have noted some improvements in student behavior since implementing Second Step, they do not receive training or have time to internalize the content, which limits the efficacy of the curriculum. In addition to staff perceptions, several family focus group participants described specific incidents in which their students were not connected with appropriate mental health supports or in which their child’s mental health concerns were not taken seriously by school and district staff. These focus group participants reported an overall perception that “there just is no support” for students’ mental and behavioral health.

The district maintains a local wellness policy, as required by law. The policy provides comprehensive protocols to establish a supportive environment that prioritizes student health, well-being, and the ability to learn. It includes guidelines for nutrition services, ensuring all foods and beverages available during the school day meet strict federal and state standards. The policy also emphasizes physical activity, mandating daily recess and physical education aligned with state standards. In addition, it addresses social-emotional learning, promoting a positive school climate and integrating wellness activities across the school setting. Greenfield’s wellness committee. Composed of diverse stakeholders, oversees the wellness policy, and the committee meets regularly to review and update wellness goals and programs. A review of the allergy verification protocol indicated that the district has a clear allergy collection and verification protocol in place—in alignment with U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines—and updated annually.

### Family and Community Partnerships

District leaders have implemented several strategies to communicate with parents, including the superintendent’s weekly newsletter; monthly principal newsletters; biannual parent-teacher conferences (with translators available); individual teacher updates via email, telephone, the Remind app or Clever; and school-organized events. However, the district and its schools do not provide guidance on family communication, and family focus groups participants reported inconsistencies in communication methods and frequency across different schools and teachers. District leaders reported some policies to engage multilingual families, such as translated newsletters, whereas family focus group members identified multilingual communication as a weakness for the district. Providing clear guidance to staff regarding consistency of family communication is an area for growth for the district.

To enhance transparency for families, the district has developed and shared several plans with the school community, including a multiple-hazard evacuation plan, an emergency response plan, a bullying prevention plan, an attendance policy, a local wellness policy, and an allergy collection and verification protocol. Of these, the bullying prevention plan, the wellness program policy, and all school family handbooks are available on the district and school websites. Ensuring that all plans are easily accessible and available in multiple languages is an area for growth.

District staff and school leaders have established strong relationships with various community organizations to provide services and enriching experiences to students and families during and outside the school day, which is a strength for Greenfield. These partnerships include Community Action Pioneer Valley, which offers a range of support services including the Family Resource Center; Clinical and Support Options providing wraparound mental health services; Strings for Kids offering music education; Big Brothers Big Sisters running a Lunch Buddy program; Just Roots delivering nutrition education and agricultural experiences; and the YMCA, providing transportation for students to access recreational activities at their gyms. Greenfield Community College supports the early college dual enrollment program and provides professional development for teachers. The district also collaborates with private therapists to provide in-school therapy sessions and engages with the Beacon Program to help students accelerate their learning and recover credits. The district also has partnered with local dental care providers to offer dental services in schools, addressing attendance issues related to dental problems and ensuring that students receive necessary dental care.

According to the superintendent, Greenfield identifies and connects students with wraparound services through several specific methods. Adjustment counselors and building-based SSTs are responsible for identifying and referring students to necessary services. For high school students receiving special education services, the assistant director conducts transition planning to ensure that students receive appropriate support as they exit Greenfield High School. The district also has a director of behavior services who oversees connections with organizations such as Community Health, Clinical and Support Options, and the Department of Children and Families to support families. The district also has implemented a second-chance bus system to provide transportation for students who miss the regular bus, ensuring that they can still access learning opportunities. The assistant directors of pupil services and the Section 504 coordinators connect families with needed services during team meetings. Despite having access to multiple services, the superintendent noted that staffing may sometimes limit the district’s ability to meet the needs of its student population, stating,

I think that’s a place where we’re trying to be thoughtful on how to make sure the staff that we do have are recognizing all students and making sure that we can meet them where they need with those just-in-time supports.

### Multitiered Systems of Support

The district’s SST guidebook outlines district guidelines for an adaptable MTSS to implement academic and nonacademic interventions and progress monitoring procedures across all school levels, which is a strength of the district. According to district leaders, several academic interventions (see *Curriculum and Instruction*) and nonacademic interventions are in place to support students across the district. At the elementary level, nonacademic supports include Board-Certified Behavior Analysts (BCBAs), the Second Step program for social-emotional learning, all-school meetings focused on social-emotional learning themes from the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning framework, and adjustment counselors who provide support for nonacademic needs. At the middle school level, students have access to advisory sessions, BCBAs, registered behavior technicians, and adjustment counselors. The high school uses crisis teams, the Signs of Suicide program, attendance meetings, community partnerships with organizations such as Clinical & Support Options, the “recovery pass” system, and social skills groups. These interventions aim to support students’ mental health, attendance, and overall well-being.

The district provides clear guidance for school leaders on implementing each component of the MTSS through the SST guidebook. This guidebook outlines the roles and responsibilities of district leaders in the SST process, ensuring that they provide oversight and support for effective implementation. For example, the guidebook emphasizes the importance of providing “each student with the opportunity to receive as much support in their general education program as possible.” The SST aims to fulfill this goal through a five-step process in which the team:

1. “Determines the strengths and needs of the student.
2. Develops and implements appropriate interventions.
3. Involves partners in the process as needed.
4. Collects data to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions.
5. Determines whether to refer for further assessment.”

These procedures include regular data collection and analysis relying heavily on teacher collaboration. The process begins with a teacher submitting a “Referral to SST Summary of Information,” which provides context about a student’s academic capabilities and challenges particularly via benchmark assessment data, DIBELS reading-level data, and other assessments. The SST then develops an action plan that includes a specific intervention and a responsible staff member(s) for the student. Intervention implementation data are then reviewed in six-week cycles to monitor progress and determine the effectiveness of interventions. In addition, the guidebook highlights the composition of the SST as a multidisciplinary, collaborative team that includes general education teachers, specialists, and school support staff, as well as community-based agency partners when appropriate. District leaders help organize professional development for school staff, allocate resources, and oversee data collection and analysis. They support school-based administrators who facilitate SST meetings and ensure consistency and fidelity in the implementation of the SST process across all schools.

The district clearly defines the system’s three tiers of support in the SST guidebook. Tier 1 support consists of high-quality instructional materials and best teaching practices used in daily problem-solving by teachers. Tier 2 supports involve additional general education services for students who continue to struggle despite Tier 1 interventions, based on assessment data. Tier 3 supports provide more intensive interventions for students who do not make expected progress with Tier 2 supports, with the SST evaluating and adjusting interventions as needed. Despite this solid foundation, it is unclear if Tier 3 supports are consistently implemented across the district because, when asked via questionnaire, district leaders did not identify any Tier 3 interventions at any school level. Providing structured Tier 3 interventions for students who need additional support to access the common curriculum is an area for growth for Greenfield.

Similarly, the guidebook emphasizes the importance of family involvement in the SST process by detailing processes for

family members as partners with SST and providing guidelines for engaging families as partners in defining the problem, setting the objective, brainstorming possible interventions, developing an action plan, implementing the action plan, and monitoring and evaluating the effects in SST meetings.

However, conversations with family focus group participants revealed that some families and students are engaged in decision-making and the delivery of tiered support by the district, including small-group interventions for Title I students, but other participants reported not being as involved in decision-making. Students also noted that some teachers are proactive in reaching out to students who are struggling, either through email or in-person check-ins. However, this level of support varies among teachers. Another parent highlighted the variability in teacher responsiveness: “Some teachers are very responsive. Others are not responsive. And others can be a little bit . . . quick to respond in the negative sort of connotation.” These staff and student reports indicate a lack of clear, consistent communication policies across the district, hindering effective family involvement in the SST process and limiting the effectiveness of overall support provided to students.

For Students with Disabilities and English Learners, the district ensures necessary services through differentiated instruction using tools such as Language Studio, Diffit, and the Amplify CKLA curricula. District leaders reported that these tools help tailor instruction to meet the diverse needs of students within the general education setting. However, focus group participants noted a need for more collaboration between general educators and special education teachers to create a cohesive unit and ensure that all students consistently receive the support that they need to succeed.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should develop and thoughtfully implement a district-wide behavioral support system in which specific rules, behaviors, and expectations are taught and reinforced.*
* *The district should continue its efforts to increase student discourse in the classroom and build formal mechanisms through which students can authentically participate in decision-making at the school and district levels.*
* *The district should develop clear guidance that supports school leaders and teachers in consistently communicating and building authentic partnerships with families.*
* *The district should ensure that all relevant district-level plans are posted to the district website in a timely manner, in multiple languages, and are updated regularly.*
* *The district should evaluate student access to Tier 3 instruction and select appropriate interventions for students in need of intensive services and support.*

## Financial and Asset Management

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

Table 8 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management in Greenfield.

Table 8. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure](#_Business_Office_Staffing) | * The business office has qualified individuals holding appropriate certifications and licenses.
 |  |
| [Budgeting and Budget Process](#_Budgeting_and_Budget) | * The district effectively applies for state and federal grants aligned with its strategic plan and ensures adherence to grant requirements.
 | * Funding for key instructional resources and support roles
* Providing user-friendly and accessible budget documents
 |
| [Operations](#_Operations) | * The district has established processes for purchasing supplies and services, ensuring compliance with state laws and effective contract management.
 |  |
| [Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning](#_Managing_Capital_Assets) | * The district has systems in place to manage and track its inventory of capital assets and critical supplies.
* The district collaborates with the city on capital projects and has a capital plan that incorporates input from district leadership and the school committee.
 | * Maintaining and repairing aging buildings
 |

### Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure

Greenfield has a contract with The Management Solution ([TMS](https://teamtms.org/about-us/)), a business that provides financial management support and other services to schools, nonprofit organizations, and businesses. According to the district organizational chart, the business manager is on the same level as principals and other district leaders, including the director of technology, the facilities manager, and the director of pupil services. Key business office staff include the following: contracted business administrator, president and CEO of TMS, an assistant business manager, and an accounting assistant. District staff descriptions of their roles and responsibilities indicate that the business office has sufficient staff to support daily operations and annual planning.

Focus group participants were asked if any qualifications, licenses, or credentials were missing or lacking within the business office. District leaders cited their own qualifications and listed multiple industry licenses and certifications (e.g., Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials and Certified Public Purchasing Official, government finance manager by the Association of Government Accountants certification, Association of School Business Officials certification). Overall, the responses suggest that the business office has qualified individuals holding appropriate certifications and licenses—a strength of the district.

District staff discussed the challenges faced by Greenfield in ensuring appropriate staffing to support their functions. In the district finance focus group, staff members mentioned insufficient staff to handle the workload, and “payroll issues are a hot-button issue for employees.” The district has six bargaining units, and each has different agreements, which makes it difficult to manage the payroll. Focus group participants also mentioned that it took a long time to find someone to fill the payroll position, having experienced a revolving door of applicants. District staff indicated that the district needs at least one more person to assist with the workload.

I don’t think folks understand outside of education the nuances that [the lone payroll staff member] deals with on a daily basis. We have six bargaining units. They all have different caveats in their agreements on if they’re covering for somebody in a particular moment and how that piece of time gets documented and paid out, what’s MTRS [Massachusetts Teachers’ Retirement System] eligible and what’s not MTRS eligible? And there are so many issues that we just do not have the staff to keep up.

District staff also discussed the challenges of working with the city’s payroll department. They mentioned that the district has been trying to upgrade their payroll system but are at the mercy of the city’s decisions.

The business office hascomprehensive written policies that ensure compliance with state and federal requirements and offer an internal system of checks and balances. The Greenfield [Online Policy Manual](https://z2policy.ctspublish.com/masc/browse/greenfieldset/greenfield/z20000074), available on the district’s website, includes fiscal management goals, information on the budget (e.g., deadlines and schools, the planning and adoption process, budget transfer authority), funding proposals, payroll approval, fiscal accounting and reporting, audits, purchasing, procurement, and capital improvement planning.

The district uses the MUNIS financial management system to monitor and control resources. This system aligns with the Uniform Massachusetts Accounting System through the use of a long account code that includes both the DESE function and object codes via MUNIS. District leaders explained how the district manages financial records, including procurement records, invoices, purchase orders, and receipts. For every order, a purchase order is necessary, which is filled out by teachers or department heads, approved by the business manager and superintendent, and then sent to vendors. The district then checks the invoices, asks departments if they received the items, and then makes payments. Greenfield stores physical records for seven years.

According to school committee members, a formal process and timeline exists for incorporating the school committee’s budgeting process into the municipality’s budgeting process. The district and city work together on finance, but they do not share departments they have in common, such as information technology or payroll. The district proposes a budget, which the school committee reviews and then shares with the city. The district and city have an informal shared agreement about addressing maintenance. The city procurement officer (CPO) handles all capital projects for the district. The city’s maintenance department handles repairs and maintenance on the district’s vehicles, electricity, and other larger items, including plowing school parking lots and mowing and landscaping for all schools except the high school, which has a contracted service provider. The district handles internal custodial work and building maintenance.

According to a school committee member, issues with staff turnover in the city finance offices have caused some problems. They also acknowledged disappointment with how things have played out with the city-school relationship in the past 10 months. This school committee member said:

The responsibility of the mayor is to be a leader in forging positive relationships between different entities and different department heads, which has been an issue. There has been some friction with the superintendent being left out of meetings with other department heads. The superintendent has taken it upon herself to set up her own meetings with other department heads.

District leaders also expressed frustration about limited collaboration with the city. Even though the district is the largest city department, district leaders have not been included in the city’s department head meetings.

### Budgeting and Budget Process

According to DESE data, Greenfield exceeded net school spending requirements for fiscal year 2024 by 24.2 percent, but per pupil funding was $20,571**,** which is $806 lower than the state average. Although approved district budget documents do not identify funds associated with distinct grants, student activities and organizations, fees, and revolving funds, budget presentations on the district website do include projected estimates of grants and special revenue funds.

For the 2023-2024 school year, the average teacher salary was $73,949, which is considerably lower than the state average of $89,576. The teachers’ contract indicates that teacher salaries increased by 3 percent from the previous year and were due to increase another 3 percent in the 2024-2025 school year.

School leaders and teachers expressed their views that the district’s budget does not provide appropriate levels of funding for key instructional resources. Teachers explained that there is no support for formerly paid roles (i.e., department heads) for facilitating collaboration and professional development activities. Teachers also described difficulties related to understaffing and identified the need for additional teachers for special education, English Learners, and Title I teachers trained in English and mathematics. Although the district uses IDEA funds to cover expenses, these funds are not always sufficient to meet students’ needs. However, district leaders explained that the district budget for special education placements and related transportation costs uses funds in the local budget and has sustainable funding sources to cover unexpected increases. A district leader explained:

I’m going to use the word “healthy contingencies” in their school choice revolving account. And circuit breaker, obviously, we always try and use just a prior year amounts as allowed and carry over at least a prior year’s balance so that, if we needed to, we would be able to have those funds available to us. So, there’s decent enough contingencies in place, and primarily in the revolving accounts, where if there was an unanticipated cost, we would look to see about taking it from any of those available sources.

Lastly, a city official expressed frustration with the state funding formula, stating that it does not adequately account for the increased transportation needs of rural districts, which constrains the district’s budget. Ensuring that the district budget is adequate to address students’ instructional needs is an area for growth.

A proposed budget and a detailed PowerPoint presentation is available on the district website. The district also publishes an annual budget calendar in multiple languages that lays out critical meeting dates and milestones for the budget, including many opportunities for community participation. In addition, monthly meetings with reports to the school committee and the public are televised on the local cable station and via Zoom.

District leaders, school-based staff, school committee members, and city officials further described the budget process: The city puts out an annual budget calendar that the schools must adhere to, and the superintendent starts getting the word out to any program or building administrator with budget authority to start developing a needs-based budget. The building principals and administrators work with their teachers and department heads to present their needs. The superintendent, assistant superintendent, and the business manager meet individually with each administrator with program and budget authority to review their needs-based budget. After discussions and some debates, district leadership compiles the information and presents it to the school committee’s budget and finance subcommittee multiple times for their input.

As part of the budgeting process, district leaders and school-based staff explained they have detailed discussions to make sure that budgeting decisions are based on data, “whether it’s test scores, attendance, [or] class size.” A district official explaining the process said, “even the technology side, they’ll even look at usage of programs as to making sure that the programs that they’re purchasing are actually used by the staff and they’ve made decisions based on that sort of data.” To determine future budget requirements, district leaders also review special education requirements and programming, ACCESS scores and English Learner needs, SST and behavior referrals, building space availability, department head budget requests, redistricting information attendance, and enrollment projections. According to district leaders, enrollment is projected to decrease. District leaders shared that they considered consolidating some or all of the elementary schools, but it will not happen in the near future. However, a redistricting plan due to be implemented next year will better align resources to meet enrollment needs.

School leaders agreed that they have opportunities to request positions and supplies or to solicit other budgetary adjustments during the budget season, but they also acknowledged that “it has been tricky . . . [we] really plead our case for additional staff and maybe not [get] the right staff or the right type of staff.”

Budget documents indicate that the district effectively applies for state and federal grants that align with the district’s strategic plan and ensures adherence to grant requirements, which is a strength for Greenfield. One district leader said of his colleagues, “They’re very smart here as to how it is that they, you know, go after the grants to make sure it is relevant to the district’s school improvement plan, mission, [and] vision.” Also, district leaders reported that systems are in place to ensure timely adherence to grant terms and requirements, with regular communication between the business office and the program side to ensure adherence to all grant requirements.

District leaders further explained how the district blends restricted and unrestricted funds in accordance with what is allowable to maximize benefits to students. In addition, district leaders described sustainability plans as incorporated into the budget process. All spending comes under the umbrella of the needs-based budget, so if grant funding goes away, there will be a larger discussion and negotiation within the district and with the city.

Based on the information provided on the district’s website, Greenfield’s budget planning process is ongoing and covers a single fiscal year at a time. However, the district’s strategic plan spans five years. Although the district does not have a published multiyear financial plan, city officials discussed the district budget and explained that, given contract negotiations are complete and salaries make up 70 percent to 80 percent of the budget, the district can make multiyear projections. Maintenance, curriculum, and technology expenses also require appropriate planning. However, according to city officials, the largest unpredictable expense is out-of-district placement tuition. The City of Greenfield hires an independent financial auditing service each year to publish a report about applying agreed-on procedures over compliance applicable to DESE’s end-of-year financial report.

As shared by district leaders and school committee members, and included in school committee meeting minutes, the district regularly provides budget updates to the school committee and works with a contracted budget manager to track and adjust current year spending. District leaders and school committee members also agree that the review and approval process is timely, culminating in publicly available budget documents, but the documents are not necessarily user-friendly. According to a school committee member, the budget manager

provides a verbal presentation and spreadsheets, basically. . . . So, it can be confusing, and committee members have asked for a long time for them to be put in a more palatable, layperson-friendly kind of format. We just haven't really gotten that.

Providing stakeholders with user-friendly and accessible budget documents and presentations is an area for growth for the district.

### Operations

According to family focus group participants, students’ street addresses are the basis for assignment to elementary schools, and school registration materials are available in English and Spanish on the district’s website, making it accessible for parents to register their students. Exceptions to school placement can be made if students require specific services through an IEP. There is only one middle school and one high school. District leaders discussed the decrease in enrollment and plans for redistricting (see Leadership & Governance). School committee members also addressed the redistricting, explaining that “equity was a huge component of the push for redistricting . . . to resolve some long-standing disparities in the way the district was organized geographically.” For instance, one elementary school has a super majority of students of color, which is not reflective of the larger district.

According to the district’s online policy manual, Greenfield provides transportation for elementary school students living more than one mile from school, middle school students living more than 1.5 miles from school, and high school students living more than two miles from school. The superintendent will make exceptions to this policy to ensure the safety of any student who must travel in a hazardous area to and from school.

Greenfield’s “Food Services” webpage states that all Greenfield students qualify for free school meals under the Community Eligibility Provision through 2026-2027. Menus vary and include student favorites and local foods. Meals consist of a mix of scratch-cooked recipes and processed items that adhere to strict nutritional guidelines. Every school offers fresh fruits and vegetables and a variety of alternative choices. Also, a Farm-to-School partnership, supported by the Massachusetts Farming Reinforces Education and Student Health (FRESH) grant, is available to all elementary school students.

The district website indicates that the district provides its students and staff with the hardware, software, and related licenses and support for everyday learning and daily operations. District leaders mentioned that the information technology department manages the Chromebook laptops.

District staff explained that the district has an established process for purchasing supplies and services, which aligns with state laws, and effectively manages those contracts with vendors, which is a strength for Greenfield. The building administrators submit their internal requisitions electronically through a purchase order. The purchase orders are then reviewed to ensure that they meet legal procurement requirements and available funding, possibly from a revolving account. District leaders reported that the district’s “purchase order systems are very simple but powerful internal control system[s], and it’s very effectively used here.”

District staff and city officials added that, with its municipal partners, the district executes and manages contracts with its vendors and has established timelines to proactively track the end of contracts, providing sufficient time for renewal or re-bidding for core district contracts**.** The district has signed contracts with their vendors. Attorneys are involved in signing or drafting of contracts, or, in rare instances if done through the city’s procurement office, the CPO might use a contract template to issue a contract. According to city officials, the district purchases their own supplies and services and manages their own contracts and vendors.

### Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning

District leadership discussed that Greenfield has a system to manage and track its inventory of capital assets and critical supplies. Inventory control happens at the department level in the district. For example, the technology department keeps inventory lists of all technology (i.e., Chromebooks), and the transportation department monitors vehicles and ensures that they are in the capital replacement cycle. The district’s system to manage and track its inventory of capital assets and critical supplies is a strength.

The district’s capital plan describes future capital needs, based on future enrollment projections and facility assessments, and incorporates input from district leadership and the school committee. The city is responsible for capital projects. A city official explained: “If there needs to be something done within a school to fix something like windows or an elevator, et cetera, et cetera, that comes from capital projects. It goes to the capital committee here.” The city and district collaborate on the district’s needs, but, as the city official explained, the city has many needs to address with its limited budget and addressing the district’s capital needs can be a challenge.

District leaders explained that the administrators (superintendent, assistant superintendent, and building administrators), the facility director, and the transportation coordinator (if there’s a need for a new van or something related to the transportation fleet) provide input into the district capital plan. The facility director is primarily responsible for the facility component of the capital plan, whereas other administrators focus more on the technology side. One district leader reported a perception that there has been good progress recently addressing capital needs:

Our facilities director, who’s new though, is pretty crafty and savvy and got a lot of things accomplished at like half the price or less than half the price because he’s quite capable and our maintenance folks were quite capable, so a lot of those capital projects that were sitting there, we were able to just kind of get off the list and put things that are really necessary on [the list].

The district’s collaboration with the city on capital projects and creation of a capital plan that incorporates input from district leadership and the school committee is a strength for Greenfield.

However, keeping the three aging elementary schools open requires the district to plan to keep them operational. The district has an elementary construction subcommittee within the school committee that is working with the city planning department to think about a 10-year plan for one elementary school. A school committee member explained,

People are seeing with the age of our buildings and the upkeep and trying to keep all of them open and operational, why we’re still in this format of three K to four elementaries. Newton was built in 1829, and most of [the other buildings were built soon] after that.

Addressing the maintenance and repair of the district’s aging buildings is an area for growth.

According to school committee members, being involved in capital planning is new this year, and the budget subcommittee made a formal recommendation about what to request from the city, which the whole school committee approved. The school committee also authorized their legislative representative to make

earmark funding requests for additional capital improvements . . . that either could be put off if that funding takes a long time or doesn’t come through or are less pressing than the [needs] that we need the city to immediately address.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should continue its efforts to strategically allocate funding to ensure adequate resources to support instruction and hire staff in support roles.*
* *The district should restructure its budget documents to increase accessibility and user-friendliness.*
* *The district should leverage its strong collaboration with the city around capital projects to focus efforts and resources on its aging buildings.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Greenfield. The team conducted 63 classroom observations during the week of November 18, 2024, and held interviews and focus groups between November 18 and November 20. 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
* Greenfield curriculum unit template
* Published educational reports on the district by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
* District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district’s end-of-year financial reports
* All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations
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Introduction

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

Three observers visited Greenfield Public Schools during the week of November 19, 2024. Observers conducted 63 observations in a sample of classrooms across five schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 30 | 5.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 19 | 5.1 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 1] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 22] + [6 x 16] + [7 x 7]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.1

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 | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 30 | 5.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 5.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 4.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 20] + [6 x 17] + [7 x 12]) ÷ 63 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\*: 3.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 3.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 3.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 3.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 14] + [3 x 22] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 63 observations = 3.4

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher exhibits an inflexible, rigid adherence to his or her plan, without considering student ideas or allowing students to make contributions. The teacher inhibits student enthusiasm by imposing guidelines or making remarks that inhibit student expression. The teacher may rigidly adhere to a lesson plan and not respond to student interests. The teacher does not allow students any autonomy on how they conduct an activity, may control materials tightly, and may offer few opportunities for students to help out with classroom responsibilities. There are few opportunities for students to talk and express themselves.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher exhibits control at times and at other times follows the students’ lead and gives them some choices and opportunities to follow their interests. There are some opportunities for students to exercise autonomy, but student choice is limited. The teacher may assign students responsibility in the classroom, but in a limited way. At times, the teacher dominates the discussion, but at other times the teacher allows students to share ideas, although only at a minimal level or for a short period of time.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher is flexible in following student leads, interests, and ideas and looks for ways to meaningfully engage students. Although the teacher has a lesson plan, students’ ideas are incorporated into the lesson plan. The teacher consistently supports student autonomy and provides meaningful leadership opportunities. Students have frequent opportunities to talk, share ideas, and work together. Students have appropriate freedom of movement during activities.

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K− 3
Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4− 12

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 55, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.[[5]](#footnote-6)

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

Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 6.7 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 6.8 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 19 | 6.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 6.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:
([4 x 1] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 46]) ÷ 63 observations = 6.7

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\*: 5.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 30 | 5.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 5.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 5.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 9] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 21] + [7 x 15]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.4

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

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

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

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Productivity District Average\*: 5.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 5.8 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 5.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 3] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 13] + [7 x 23]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.5

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 5.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 30 | 5.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 5.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 5] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 37] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.1

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K−3

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

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

Concept Development District Average\*: 2.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 2.2 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 4 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 4] + [2 x 10] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 2]) ÷ 21 observations = 2.2

\*\*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\*: 2.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 42 | 2.9 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 4] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 14] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 4]) ÷ 42 observations = 2.9

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 42 | 2.2 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 16] + [2 x 11] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 3]) ÷ 42 observations = 2.2

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

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

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

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

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 12

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

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

Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 3.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 3.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 3.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 3.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 3] + [2 x 8] + [3 x 26] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 63 observations = 3.5

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 3.2 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 1 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 5] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 3]) ÷ 21 observations = 3.2

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 2.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 42 | 2.8 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 3.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 2.3 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 7] + [2 x 18] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 42 observations = 2.8

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4−12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average\*: 5.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 42 | 5.0 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 5.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 4.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 4] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 25] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 42 observations = 5.0

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

|  | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 9 | 10 | 16 | 27 | 22 | 36 | 120 | 5.3 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 30 | 5.3 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 6.8 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 30 | 5.6 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 3.4 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 27 | 21 | 25 | 90 | 5.5 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 30 | 5.6 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 5.8 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 30 | 5.1 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 11 | 27 | 28 | 17 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 99 | 3.1 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 4 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2.2 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.2 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2.4 |
| Quality of Feedback | 1 | 4 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 3.6 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 1 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3.2 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 3.6 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **3** | **1** | **4** | **9** | **5.9** |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 30 observations = 5.3

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 7] + [7 x 23]) ÷ 30 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 | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 1 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 12 | 4 | 57 | 4.6 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 19 | 5.1 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 5.4 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3.3 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 22 | 57 | 5.7 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 5.3 |
| Productivity | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 5.3 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 19 | 6.6 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 15 | 23 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 95 | 3.1 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 5.0 |
| Content Understanding | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2.7 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 6 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2.4 |
| Quality of Feedback | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 3.3 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 5 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 2.3 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 4.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 19 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: ([5 x 1] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 12]) ÷ 19 observations = 6.6

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

|  | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 42 | 4.4 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 4.9 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 4.7 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 3.6 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 17 | 42 | 5.8 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 5.4 |
| Productivity | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 6.6 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 9 | 14 | 20 | 9 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 70 | 3.3 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2.9 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 7 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1.8 |
| Quality of Feedback | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.6 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2.9 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 4.9 |

\*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 4] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 14 observations = 4.9

\*\*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: ([4 x 1] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 11]) ÷ 14 observations = 6.6
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

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

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

Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

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

Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment

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

Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

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

Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support

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

Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

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

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table D1. Greenfield Public Schools: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | District | Percentage of District | State | Percentage of State |
| All | 1,370 | 100.0% | 915,932 | 100.0% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | 0.1% | 2,272 | 0.2% |
| Asian | 13 | 0.9% | 68,608 | 7.5% |
| Black or African American | 62 | 4.5% | 93,245 | 10.2% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 304 | 22.2% | 236,839 | 25.9% |
| Multi-Race, Not Hispanic or Latino | 72 | 5.3% | 42,303 | 4.6% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 3 | 0.2% | 800 | 0.1% |
| White | 915 | 66.8% | 471,865 | 51.5% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D2. Greenfield Public Schools: 2024-2025 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

| Group | *N*(District) | Percentage of High Needs(District) | Percentage of District | *N*(State) | Percentage of High Needs(State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 937 | 100.0% | 67.2% | 517,093 | 100.0% | 55.8% |
| English Learners | 103 | 11.0% | 7.5% | 127,673 | 24.7% | 13.9% |
| Low-Income | 843 | 90.0% | 61.5% | 385,161 | 74.5% | 42.1% |
| Students with Disabilities | 311 | 33.2% | 22.3% | 190,967 | 36.9% | 20.6% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. District and state numbers and percentages for Students with Disabilities and High Needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,394; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 926,057.

Table D3. Greenfield Public Schools: Chronic Absencea Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All students | 1,502 | 45.1 | 21.8 | 27.8 | 19.7 |
| High Needs | 1,079 | 52.1 | 27.6 | 33.4 | 27.2 |
| English Learners | 138 | 70.4 | 35.0 | 42.8 | 29.9 |
| Low Income | 1,006 | 52.8 | 28.8 | 34.1 | 30.3 |
| Students with Disabilities | 343 | 54.0 | 28.5 | 34.4 | 27.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 28.5 |
| Asian | 18 | 30.4 | 13.0 | 33.3 | 11.8 |
| Black or African American | 64 | 53.3 | 22.2 | 31.3 | 22.5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 339 | 65.1 | 37.0 | 45.4 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, Not Hispanic or Latino | 83 | 52.5 | 29.8 | 25.3 | 20.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 24.3 |
| White | 994 | 38.7 | 16.6 | 21.7 | 14.4 |

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

Table D4. Greenfield Public Schools: Expenditures, Fiscal Years, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditures** | **FY 2021** | **FY 2022** | **FY 2023** |
| By school committee | $19,583,308 | $19,583,922 | $21,553,238 |
| By municipality | $10,704,946 | $11,235,844 | $12,238,621 |
| Total from local appropriations | $30,288,254 | $30,819,766 | $33,791,858 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $4,780,031 | $7,680,183 | $5,722,920 |
| Total expenditures | $35,068,285 | $38,499,949 | $39,514,778 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Spending Comparisons - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) last updated October 2024.

Table D5. Greenfield Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chapter 70 aid to education program** | **FY 2021** | **FY 2022** | **FY 2023** |
| Chapter 70 state aida | $13,902,321 | $13,958,091 | $15,704,567 |
| Required local contribution | $10,256,971 | $10,181,012 | $10,621,969 |
| Required net school spendingb | $24,159,292 | $24,139,103 | $26,326,536 |
| Actual net school spending | $28,755,285 | $28,936,710 | $31,641,278 |
| Over/under required ($) | $4,595,993 | $4,797,607 | $5,314,742 |
| Over/under required (%) | 19.0% | 19.9% | 20.2% |

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

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

Table D6. Greenfield Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $840 | $881 | $832 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $955 | $982 | $1,273 |
| Teachers | $5,407 | $5,982 | $6,932 |
| Other teaching services | $1,825 | $2,275 | $2,367 |
| Professional development | $107 | $546 | $52 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $737 | $459 | $628 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $565 | $603 | $495 |
| Pupil services | $1,945 | $1,875 | $2,647 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,323 | $1,618 | $1,639 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $4,337 | $4,234 | $4,905 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $18,041 | $19,455 | $21,769 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Spending Comparisons - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) last updated October 2024.
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Table E1. MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 611 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 39 | 57 | 50 | 48 | 40 | 27 | 32 | 33 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 15 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 24 | 65 | 41 | 53 | 46 | 29 | 53 | 47 | 31 |
| Asian | 7 | 36 | 27 | -- | 62 | 45 | 36 | -- | 29 | 18 | 36 | -- | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 129 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 20 | 53 | 40 | 43 | 44 | 38 | 49 | 48 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 30 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 46 | 72 | 68 | 47 | 37 | 24 | 25 | 43 | 17 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 25 | -- | -- | -- | 43 | -- | -- | -- | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 39 | -- | -- | -- | 39 | -- | -- | -- | 21 |
| White | 429 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 47 | 58 | 52 | 49 | 40 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 13 |
| High needs | 434 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 22 | 58 | 50 | 47 | 45 | 32 | 40 | 41 | 33 |
| Low income | 410 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 21 | 57 | 50 | 47 | 45 | 33 | 39 | 40 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 54 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 42 | 39 | 43 | 48 | 56 | 61 | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 127 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 49 | 32 | 30 | 40 | 47 | 63 | 67 | 50 |

Table E2. MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

| Group | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 76 | 39 | 44 | 45 | 57 | 50 | 36 | 37 | 31 | 11 | 20 | 18 | 12 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 42 | -- | -- | -- | 40 | -- | -- | -- | 18 |
| Asian | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 78 | -- | -- | -- | 16 | -- | -- | -- | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 5 | 20 | 13 | 36 | 75 | 33 | 60 | 38 | 20 | 47 | 27 | 26 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | -- | -- | -- | 61 | -- | -- | -- | 30 | -- | -- | -- | 9 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 48 | -- | -- | -- | 37 | -- | -- | -- | 14 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 58 | -- | -- | -- | 34 | -- | -- | -- | 8 |
| White | 54 | 52 | 50 | 56 | 65 | 38 | 38 | 30 | 28 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 7 |
| High needs | 44 | 25 | 26 | 25 | 37 | 59 | 42 | 45 | 41 | 16 | 32 | 30 | 23 |
| Low income | 40 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 38 | 61 | 41 | 45 | 40 | 14 | 33 | 28 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 14 | -- | -- | -- | 38 | -- | -- | -- | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 14 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 21 | 65 | 29 | 36 | 45 | 35 | 65 | 50 | 34 |

Table E3. MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 609 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 41 | 52 | 49 | 52 | 42 | 34 | 34 | 29 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 16 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 39 | 50 | 63 | 49 | 56 | 44 | 38 | 30 |
| Asian | 8 | 27 | 36 | -- | 71 | 55 | 45 | -- | 23 | 18 | 18 | -- | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 129 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 20 | 46 | 40 | 49 | 48 | 47 | 51 | 42 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 30 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 47 | 67 | 75 | 50 | 37 | 30 | 21 | 37 | 16 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 27 | -- | -- | -- | 46 | -- | -- | -- | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 39 | -- | -- | -- | 41 | -- | -- | -- | 20 |
| White | 425 | 16 | 21 | 22 | 49 | 53 | 50 | 54 | 40 | 30 | 29 | 24 | 11 |
| High needs | 433 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 48 | 42 | 42 | 38 | 28 |
| Low income | 408 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 21 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 49 | 42 | 41 | 37 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 57 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 21 | 47 | 38 | 51 | 46 | 44 | 57 | 40 | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 128 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 38 | 35 | 34 | 43 | 58 | 61 | 65 | 44 |

Table E4. MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

| Group | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 78 | 36 | 33 | 37 | 48 | 43 | 51 | 38 | 39 | 21 | 16 | 24 | 13 |
| African American/Black | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 27 | -- | -- | -- | 52 | -- | -- | -- | 21 |
| Asian | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 79 | -- | -- | -- | 17 | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 25 | 52 | 62 | 36 | 50 | 43 | 31 | 50 | 25 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | -- | -- | -- | 51 | -- | -- | -- | 39 | -- | -- | -- | 10 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 33 | -- | -- | -- | 54 | -- | -- | -- | 13 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 52 | -- | -- | -- | 39 | -- | -- | -- | 10 |
| White | 57 | 47 | 40 | 46 | 58 | 41 | 48 | 35 | 35 | 12 | 12 | 19 | 7 |
| High needs | 46 | 24 | 11 | 24 | 27 | 47 | 65 | 37 | 51 | 29 | 24 | 39 | 23 |
| Low income | 42 | 24 | 11 | 26 | 27 | 47 | 64 | 36 | 50 | 29 | 24 | 38 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 14 | -- | -- | -- | 46 | -- | -- | -- | 40 |
| Students w/disabilities | 15 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 45 | 47 | 27 | 51 | 45 | 47 | 60 | 35 |

Table E5. MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 193 | 17 | 18 | 28 | 42 | 48 | 48 | 45 | 38 | 34 | 34 | 27 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 21 | -- | -- | -- | 46 | -- | -- | -- | 33 |
| Asian | 6 | -- | -- | -- | 64 | -- | -- | -- | 26 | -- | -- | -- | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 36 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 21 | 45 | 44 | 42 | 43 | 45 | 46 | 39 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 49 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 34 | 40 | 30 | 30 | 17 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 26 | -- | -- | -- | 43 | -- | -- | -- | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 43 | -- | -- | -- | 34 | -- | -- | -- | 23 |
| White | 135 | 21 | 22 | 30 | 51 | 49 | 48 | 48 | 36 | 30 | 30 | 21 | 12 |
| High needs | 134 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 24 | 48 | 49 | 47 | 44 | 44 | 38 | 34 | 32 |
| Low income | 129 | 8 | 12 | 19 | 22 | 47 | 50 | 47 | 44 | 44 | 38 | 34 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 13 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 36 | 48 | 38 | 41 | 64 | 52 | 54 | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 38 | 7 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 27 | 44 | 29 | 38 | 66 | 44 | 61 | 46 |

Table E6. MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

| Group | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 69 | 25 | 18 | 25 | 49 | 54 | 64 | 51 | 40 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 28 | -- | -- | -- | 53 | -- | -- | -- | 19 |
| Asian | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 77 | -- | -- | -- | 19 | -- | -- | -- | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 13 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 26 | 54 | 69 | 38 | 52 | 46 | 31 | 54 | 22 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 53 | -- | -- | -- | 37 | -- | -- | -- | 10 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 38 | -- | -- | -- | 53 | -- | -- | -- | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 47 | -- | -- | -- | 45 | -- | -- | -- | 8 |
| White | 50 | 31 | 21 | 30 | 58 | 53 | 65 | 50 | 36 | 16 | 14 | 20 | 6 |
| High needs | 43 | 17 | 4 | 12 | 28 | 53 | 68 | 51 | 52 | 30 | 28 | 37 | 20 |
| Low income | 40 | 16 | 4 | 13 | 28 | 56 | 67 | 50 | 51 | 28 | 28 | 38 | 20 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | 13 | -- | -- | -- | 48 | -- | -- | -- | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 16 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 40 | 47 | 25 | 52 | 53 | 47 | 63 | 31 |

Table E7. MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 116 | 26 | 20 | 20 | 42 | 59 | 45 | 49 | 40 | 14 | 35 | 31 | 18 |
| 4 | 120 | 10 | 26 | 20 | 37 | 66 | 50 | 46 | 45 | 24 | 24 | 34 | 19 |
| 5 | 101 | 9 | 9 | 33 | 38 | 63 | 61 | 52 | 46 | 28 | 30 | 15 | 16 |
| 6 | 95 | 10 | 19 | 8 | 40 | 57 | 42 | 46 | 35 | 33 | 39 | 45 | 25 |
| 7 | 85 | 19 | 21 | 24 | 36 | 50 | 49 | 45 | 42 | 31 | 29 | 32 | 22 |
| 8 | 94 | 17 | 13 | 9 | 43 | 46 | 53 | 51 | 34 | 37 | 35 | 40 | 24 |
| 3-8 | 611 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 39 | 57 | 50 | 48 | 40 | 27 | 32 | 33 | 21 |
| 10 | 76 | 39 | 44 | 45 | 57 | 50 | 36 | 37 | 31 | 11 | 20 | 18 | 12 |

Table E8. MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 117 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 44 | 55 | 39 | 43 | 35 | 22 | 41 | 33 | 20 |
| 4 | 117 | 19 | 32 | 26 | 46 | 55 | 46 | 49 | 38 | 27 | 22 | 25 | 16 |
| 5 | 102 | 4 | 14 | 23 | 40 | 34 | 56 | 51 | 46 | 62 | 30 | 26 | 14 |
| 6 | 95 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 40 | 60 | 47 | 65 | 43 | 29 | 39 | 23 | 17 |
| 7 | 87 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 37 | 56 | 52 | 53 | 44 | 36 | 34 | 25 | 19 |
| 8 | 91 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 38 | 51 | 59 | 56 | 42 | 34 | 36 | 41 | 19 |
| 3-8 | 609 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 41 | 52 | 49 | 52 | 42 | 34 | 34 | 29 | 18 |
| 10 | 78 | 36 | 33 | 37 | 48 | 43 | 51 | 38 | 39 | 21 | 16 | 24 | 13 |

Table E9. MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # Included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 102 | 13 | 17 | 31 | 45 | 46 | 50 | 47 | 36 | 41 | 33 | 22 | 20 |
| 8 | 91 | 21 | 18 | 24 | 39 | 50 | 46 | 43 | 41 | 28 | 35 | 33 | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 193 | 17 | 18 | 28 | 42 | 48 | 48 | 45 | 38 | 34 | 34 | 27 | 20 |
| 10 | 69 | 25 | 18 | 25 | 49 | 54 | 64 | 51 | 40 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 11 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 454 | 39 | 44 | 48 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 13 | -- | -- | -- | 49 |
| Asian | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 87 | 38 | 38 | 50 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 21 | -- | 41 | 38 | 51 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 51 |
| White | 327 | 39 | 48 | 49 | 50 |
| High needs | 312 | 39 | 39 | 48 | 48 |
| Low income | 295 | 39 | 39 | 48 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 34 | 37 | 42 | 47 | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 85 | 40 | 29 | 43 | 45 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 58 | 44 | 39 | 47 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 48 |
| Asian | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | -- | -- | -- | 47 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | -- | -- | -- | 50 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 49 |
| White | 41 | 45 | 42 | 50 | 51 |
| High needs | 31 | 41 | 33 | 42 | 47 |
| Low income | 29 | 41 | 33 | 41 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 9 | -- | -- | -- | 44 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 454 | 41 | 50 | 49 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 14 | -- | -- | -- | 49 |
| Asian | 6 | -- | -- | -- | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 91 | 43 | 43 | 49 | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 20 | -- | 51 | 38 | 50 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 52 |
| White | 322 | 40 | 53 | 51 | 50 |
| High needs | 314 | 38 | 47 | 47 | 48 |
| Low income | 296 | 38 | 48 | 47 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 40 | 45 | 40 | 53 | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 87 | 37 | 42 | 39 | 46 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 61 | 59 | 47 | 56 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 47 |
| Asian | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | -- | -- | -- | 45 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 49 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 50 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 50 |
| White | 45 | 58 | 49 | 61 | 52 |
| High needs | 33 | 56 | 40 | 43 | 47 |
| Low income | 30 | 56 | 39 | 41 | 46 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 46 |
| Students w/disabilities | 13 | -- | -- | -- | 47 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 109 | 43 | 45 | 49 | 50 |
| 5 | 97 | 32 | 31 | 56 | 50 |
| 6 | 85 | 36 | 50 | 48 | 50 |
| 7 | 77 | 48 | 57 | 60 | 50 |
| 8 | 86 | 35 | 42 | 30 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 454 | 39 | 44 | 48 | 50 |
| 10 | 58 | 44 | 39 | 47 | 50 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # Included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 105 | 52 | 46 | 53 | 50 |
| 5 | 96 | 25 | 43 | 40 | 50 |
| 6 | 90 | 40 | 62 | 51 | 50 |
| 7 | 79 | 41 | 61 | 72 | 50 |
| 8 | 84 | 42 | 42 | 32 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 454 | 41 | 50 | 49 | 50 |
| 10 | 61 | 59 | 47 | 56 | 50 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| All | 92 | 84.6 | 86.4 | 73.9 | 89.2 |
| African American/Black | 3 |   | 100.0 | -- | 85.6 |
| Asian | 1 |   | -- | -- | 95.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 19 | 70.6 | 82.6 | 73.7 | 78.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 7 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 71.4 | 89.3 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 82.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 89.9 |
| White | 62 | 85.0 | 87.0 | 75.8 | 93.0 |
| High needs | 68 | 79.7 | 80.2 | 66.2 | 82.8 |
| Low income | 66 | 78.7 | 80.0 | 65.2 | 82.2 |
| English learners | 6 | 50.0 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 67.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 24 | 52.4 | 60.9 | 54.2 | 76.4 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2022) | 2020 (%) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | State 2022 (%) |
| All | 118 |  93.2 | 84.6 | 86.4 | 91.9 |
| African American/Black | 6 | -- |   | 100.0 | 90.1 |
| Asian | 3 | -- |   | -- | 96.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 23 |  94.7 | 70.6 | 82.6 | 84.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 8 | -- | 100.0 | 75.0 | 90.8 |
| Native American | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 87.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 81.3 |
| White | 77 |  90.9 | 85.0 | 87.0 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 81 |  92.7 | 79.7 | 80.2 | 86.8 |
| Low income | 80 |  92.3 | 78.7 | 80.0 | 86.3 |
| English learners | 6 | -- | 50.0 | 83.3 | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 23 |  80.0 | 52.4 | 60.9 | 81.8 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| All | 342 | 1.6 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 66 | 2.7 | 7.6 | 4.5 | 4.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 22 | 3.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| Native American | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.9 |
| White | 235 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 211 | 2.0 | 7.8 | 5.7 | 3.5 |
| Low income | 198 | -- | 8.2 | 5.1 | 3.8 |
| English learners | 21 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 67 | 4.5 | 9.3 | 7.5 | 3.0 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 1,451 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 63 | 11.4 | 3.6 | -- | 2.1 |
| Asian | 18 | -- | -- | -- | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 322 | 6.5 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 78 | 6.2 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | -- | -- | -- | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 1.9 |
| White | 967 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 1,039 | 5.4 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 1.9 |
| Low income | 964 | 5.5 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 2.1 |
| English learners | 133 | 4.9 | -- | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 334 | 7.2 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 2.4 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 1,451 | 9.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 63 | 18.2 | 12.7 | -- | 4.6 |
| Asian | 18 | -- | -- | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 322 | 14.7 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 78 | 14.8 | 7.4 | 6.4 | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | -- | -- | -- | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 2.5 |
| White | 967 | 7.7 | 4.1 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| High needs | 1,039 | 12.3 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 964 | 12.7 | 6.5 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| English learners | 133 | 16.0 | -- | 4.5 | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 334 | 18.8 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 4.5 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # Included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 171 | 51.1 | 46.0 | 46.2 | 67.2 |
| African American/Black | 11 | 50.0 | -- | 9.1 | 58.2 |
| Asian | 6 | -- | -- | 83.3 | 86.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 36 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 22.2 | 53.7 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | 66.7 | 60.0 | 50.0 | 68.4 |
| Native American | -- | -- | -- | -- | 57.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- | 59.8 |
| White | 108 | 53.2 | 53.0 | 55.6 | 71.9 |
| High needs | 108 | 34.3 | 31.0 | 25.0 | 52.0 |
| Low income | 104 | 34.6 | 32.5 | 25.0 | 53.1 |
| English learners | 21 | 44.4 | 11.1 | 4.8 | 31.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 31 | 10.0 | 5.9 | 12.9 | 38.5 |

Table E22. Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative Progress Toward Improvement Targets (%) | Percentile | Overall Classification | Reason for Classification |
| District | 53 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| The Academy of Early Learning at North Parish | — | — | Insufficient data | Insufficient data |
| Discovery School at Four Corners | 44 | 38 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Federal Street School | 43 | 4 | Requiring assistance or intervention | Among the lowest performing 10% of schools |
| Low student group performance: Low income and High Needs |  |  |  |  |
| Newton School | 39 | 14 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Greenfield Middle | 67 | 17 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Greenfield High | 30 | 17 | Requiring assistance or intervention | Low student group performance: Low income and High Needs |

1. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are available at: <https://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.docx>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Site team did not conduct observations at The Academy of Early Learning at North Parish as it provides only PK instruction. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Districts with similar demographics and similar wealth are based on [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) (retrieved February 2024).  [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. 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-6)
6. Column labels for Tables E1-E9: M/E=Percent meeting or exceeding expectations, PME=Partially meeting expectations, NM= Not meeting expectations [↑](#footnote-ref-7)