



**Tri-State  
Consortium**

# **CHAPPAQUA CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

TRI-STATE Consultancy 2025

K-4 LITERACY

OCTOBER 22 – 24, 2025



## Table of Contents

---

<b>District Visit Personnel and Information</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Essential Questions and Quality Indicators</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>The Scope of the Visit</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Response to Essential Questions &amp; Commendations &amp; Recommendations</b>	<b>9</b>
Essential Question #1	9
Commendations	10
Recommendations	11
Essential Question #2	12
Commendations	13
Recommendations	13
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>14</b>
TriState Indicator #7	14
TriState Indicator #4	16
Commendations	18
Recommendations	18
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>20</b>



# Tri-State Consortium

## CHAPPAQUA CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

### TRI-STATE CONSULTANCY 2025

#### K-4 LITERACY

OCTOBER 22 – OCTOBER 24, 2025

#### District Visit Personnel and Information

**Maria-Elena Barbuto**

Instructional Coach  
Eastchester Union Free School District  
Greenvale Elementary  
1 Gabriel Rescigno Dr Scarsdale, NY 10583  
914-793-6130  
mbarbuto@eufsd12.org

**Tashia Brown**

Principal  
Dobbs Ferry  
Springhurst Elementary School  
175 Walgrove Avenue Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522  
914-693-1503  
brownt@dfsd.org

**Amy Cazes**

Principal  
Hastings-on-Hudson  
Hillside Elementary School  
120 Lefurgy Avenue Hastings-on-Hudson, NY  
10706  
914-478-6271  
cazesa@hohschools.org

**Cecile Chirignan**

Instructional Coach  
Clarkstown Central School District  
Chestnut Grove District Office  
62 Old Middletown Rd, New City, NY 10956  
845-639-6300  
cchirignan@ccsd.edu

**Jaimie Crecco**

Middle School Teacher  
Pawling Central School District  
Pawling Central Middle School  
80 Wagner Road Pawling, NY 12564  
845-855-4653855-4653855-4653  
creccoj@pcsdny.org

**Amy Fazio**

Principal  
Wappingers  
Fishkill Plains Elementary School  
17 Lake Walton Rd Wappingers Falls, NY 12590  
845-227-1770  
amy.fazio@wcsdny.org

**Michelle Forzaglia**

Teacher  
Blind Brook-Rye School District  
Bruno M. Ponterio Ridge Street School  
390 North Ridge Street Rye Brook, NY 10573  
914-937-3600 X2301  
mforzaglia@blindbrook.org

**Felix Gil**

Principal  
Scarsdale Public Schools  
Quaker Ridge School  
125 Weaver St Scarsdale, NY 10583  
914-721-2780  
fgil@scarsdaleschools.org

**Lisa Michalak**

Instructional Coach  
Eastchester Union Free School District  
Waverly School  
45 Hall Ave Eastchester, NY 10709  
914-793-6130  
lmichalak@eufsd12.org

**Kelli Dunston**

Supervisor K-5 Literacy  
Scotch Plains Fanwood  
District  
667 Westfield Rd Scotch Plains, NJ 07076  
908-889-8600855-4653855-4653  
kdunston@spfk12.org

**Ashlyn Field**

Principal  
Katonah Lewisboro  
Meadow Pond Elementary School  
185 Smith Ridge Rd South Salem, NY 10590  
914-763-7900  
afield@klschools.org

**Brian Galvin**

Assistant Principal  
South Orangetown  
William O. Schaefer Elementary School  
140 Lester Dr Tappan, NY 10983  
845--680-1300  
bgalvin@socsd.org

**Deborah Mariniello**

Principal  
Clarkstown Central School District  
Lakewood Elementary School  
77 Lakeland Ave Congers, NY 10920  
845-639-6320  
dmariniello@ccsd.edu

**Michelle O'Donnell**

Coordinator of ELA  
Scarsdale Public Schools  
2 Brewster Road Scarsdale, NY 10583  
914-721-2794  
modonnell@scarsdaleschools.org

**Dayna Orlando**

Instructional Coach  
Eastchester Union Free School District  
Anne Hutchinson School  
60 Mill Rd Eastchester, NY 10709  
914-793-6130  
DOrlando@eufsdk12.org

**Joanna Sanese**

Principal  
Eastchester Union Free School District  
Greenvale School  
1 Gabriel Rescigno Dr Scarsdale, NY 10583  
914-793-6130  
jsanese@eufsdk12.org

**TRI-STATE LIAISONS:**

**Lauren Allan**

Assistant Director  
Tri-State Consortium  
Lauren.allan@tristateconsortium.org

**Andrew Selesnick**

Executive Director  
Tri-State Consortium  
andrew.selesnick@tristateconsortium.org

**Raina Kor**

Reporter Writer  
Tri-State Consortium  
Raina.Kor@tristateconsortium.org

## **Introduction**

---

### **The Tri-State Consortium**

The Tri-State Consortium, a professional network of **fifty-four** public school districts in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, advances student performance through a continuous improvement process. Based on a framework of [eight quality indicators](#), the process involves a self-study by member districts and a triennial cycle of review by teams of fellow educators whose districts also belong to the Consortium. Serving as critical friends, these teams provide Tri-State districts with external feedback about current strengths and promising next steps.

### **The Chappaqua Central School District Tri-State Consultancy 2025: K-4 Literacy**

The Chappaqua Central School District is a suburban community located in Westchester County. The total school enrollment is 3,516 students. There are three elementary schools: Douglas Grafflin, Roaring Brook and Westorchard. The secondary schools include two middle schools – Robert E. Bell and Seven Bridges Middle Schools – both serve Grades 5-8. Horace Greeley High School serves Grades 9-12 and ninety-nine percent of high school graduates go on to higher education. Average class size at the elementary level is 19.5, middle level is 21.3, and high school is 17.6. According to district-provided data, grades three through eight performed in the 99% percentile of proficiency in both English Language Arts and Mathematics in the 2024 school year.

In August 2023, the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project transitioned to become the Advancing Literacy Initiative at TC. This marked an evolution in their thinking about literacy instruction. The Chappaqua Central School District developed and implemented a comprehensive approach to understand, evaluate and address this decision as it related to the Districts long standing relationship to and implementation of the TC Program. The well developed approach was reflected in a two-year timeline that included the following key components: communication to all stakeholders, creation of a Literacy Task Force,

implementation of a **Literacy Audit (Science of Reading)**, formation of the Literacy Fellowship, and the review and piloting of potential literacy programs including the revised units of study now published by Heinemann Publishing.

All of the above components were important parts of the District's process, and **The Science of Reading Audit** resulted in six next steps as a guiding framework for moving forward: Establish a Formal Philosophy of Literacy, Provide Professional Learning-Science of Reading, Replace the Units of Study in Reading and Writing, Align Tier 1 Instruction with Tiers 2 and 3, Create a Philosophy of Assessment and establish a team oriented approach to edu.change.

During the introduction to the visiting team, the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent shared the current "quandary" around reconciling highly successful student performance with the Audit recommendation to replace the Units of Study in Reading and Writing. Included in the presentation were quantitative data, processes, and actions developed in response to the Audit, as follows:

- Strong results on New York State Assessments in ELA Grade Levels 3-8, years 2021-2025
- Strong results on Spring 2025 NWEA Map ELA Data by Grade
- Development of Literacy Fellowships
- Analysis of literacy programs implemented by top ranked NYS Districts
- Evaluation of the district's current program
- Evaluation of literacy program options identified through pilot programs

The Tri-State visiting team appreciated this foundational information and the opportunity to partner with the Chappaqua Central School District in the process of reflection and thinking about next steps. The District Administration invited the team to explore and understand the following essential questions and two Tri-State Model Indicators as they relate to literacy instruction and the District's significant efforts and planning.

## **Essential Questions and Quality Indicators**

---

### **Essential Questions:**

- To what extent do our current classroom practices align to our [District Literacy Philosophy](#)?
- To what extent and how consistently and effectively are [High Impact Instructional Practices](#), as outlined in the NYSED Literacy Briefs, being implemented across classrooms to support student learning?

### **Indicator 4: Curriculum and Instruction**

*Teachers and administrators collaborate to develop an articulated and aligned curriculum designed to ensure optimal student results. When making curricular and instructional decisions, teachers and administrators consider current research and evidence of student performance from multiple sources. In their planning, teachers purposefully select and differentiate strategies and resources that advance the learning of all students.*

### **Indicator #7: Shared Vision and Environment for Change**

*Shared vision and goals focused on student performance have been developed with the staff and community, are well articulated, clearly communicated, consistently pursued throughout the district and school community, and include student voice. This vision expects, supports, and recognizes risk taking, creativity, and innovation as components of change toward continuous improvement. There is a process to review student and teacher work and learn from experimentation.*

## **The Scope of the Visit**

---

The visiting team spent three days in the district, October 22 - 24, 2025, reviewing presentations made to the Board of Education and community, examining district and building documents, reviewing student work, interviewing administrators, teachers, and students, and visiting classrooms. On the third day, the Tri-State team facilitated a consultancy conversation between team members and district representatives. The consultancy was attended by administrators

and instructional leaders from all schools, District Office leadership, and members of the Board of Education.

The initial welcome by the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Principals, Assistant Principals and Instructional Leaders included an overview of the Districts Strategic Priorities, instructional approach and philosophy, academic program and assessment practices. Additionally, core literacy documents and practices were reviewed and explained to ensure the visiting team had a deep understanding of the evidence provided to inform its thinking and increase the team’s ability to provide meaningful feedback.

### **Response to Essential Questions & Commendations & Recommendations**

#### **Essential Question #1**

- To what extent do our current classroom practices align to our [District Literacy Philosophy](#)?

Site visits and interviews in all three elementary schools revealed strong evidence of alignment with the District Literacy Philosophy. Classroom environments, teacher practices and student engagement reflected the categories of Beliefs, Research, Goals and Practices. Classroom libraries were organized in meaningful and appropriate ways to support students' learning and access to texts. Some classroom libraries were organized by levels and genres and included diverse titles, for example I Am Love, I Think I Can, A Kids Book About Neurodiversity, Not Norman, Courage and Take a Breath. Other libraries were sorted by non fiction books, chapter books, and other genres. Primary grade libraries featured decodables, leveled texts, and thematic bins.

During visiting team interviews, students were thoughtful and able to describe their engagement with text and oral language. For example, a 4th grade student shared, “We have

discussions around short texts everyday as a class. It means we have to think deeply about a text.” In a kindergarten classroom, students were practicing being storytellers in a large group, then went to their tables to read out of their “star” book bins to practice this skill. The teacher walked around during this time, conferencing and collecting data on a clipboard. Students then transitioned into partner reading. Noteworthy is that these types of examples were consistent across the three elementary schools. Interdisciplinary approaches in science and social studies included explicit instruction focused on essential questions that expected readers to be critical thinkers: What are you wondering? How does this fit with what you expected to learn? Students discussed the text with each other and worked in a “real-life” collaborative learning space as a research team. Students’ abilities to articulate their own strategies were demonstrated by a 1st grader who explained, “When I come across a word I don’t know, I sound it out,” and a third grader who shared, “We read stories about different cultures and had a chance to discuss which culture was just like ours.” Examples of foundational skills were present at the kindergarten level with direct phonics instruction and at the 4th grade level with a vocabulary word wall. Explicit Instruction was demonstrated in a 3rd grade lesson on vowels in a shared text from the My Word Study workbook in Benchmark Phonics. Students highlighted their Accountable Text along with the teacher who modeled on the SMARTBoard. Students were asked to sort long o and u sounds.

Over the course of two days, the team visited over 40 classrooms across the three elementary schools and interviewed many teachers and students. The insights we gained reflected the commitment of the teachers to the District's Philosophy of Literacy. High levels of student engagement were consistent throughout all classrooms regardless of the program and although instructional strategies and style may have differed, all teachers were applying components of the District’s Philosophy of Literacy.

## Commendations

In many of the classrooms visited, the team saw evidence of:

- Foundational skills instruction at a high level in grades K-4
- Exemplary models of differentiation in some classrooms
- Examples of students working collaboratively (but not always around critical thinking)
- Clear structures for collaborative learning with established routines
- Literacy supporting global citizenship
- Text based discussion and writing opportunities
- Diverse literature
- Well developed phonics, grammar, phonemic awareness, and vocabulary lessons
- Student choice and voice in reading and writing
- Integration of science standards into literacy lessons in grades 3, 4 and 5
- Students consistently engaged in their reading and expressed their love of reading

## Recommendations

- Collaboratively engage with teachers to prioritize the non-negotiable parts of the literacy program
- Create a structure for district leaders to reflect on the units of study with teachers (What's working well, what could be strengthened, etc.)
- Consider the development of culminating student projects that reflect the "This we believe" statements and that allow students to demonstrate their growing literacy skills
- Identify other measures (beyond standardized test data) of student success in literacy
- Consider use of growth scores rather than achievement scores when thinking about impact of instructional practices
- Consider including stamina as another valuable measure of literacy

- Consider using the observation process as an entry point for one on one dialogue with teachers to focus on specific areas of need/interest and monitoring implementation of non-negotiables to build consistency

### **Essential Question #2**

- To what extent and how consistently and effectively are [High Impact Instructional Practices](#), as outlined in the NYSED Literacy Briefs, being implemented across classrooms to support student learning?

The framework of High Impact Instructional Practices along with The Big Six Skills and Competencies were evident throughout the classrooms visited in all three elementary schools. Student collaboration was clearly a norm in all literacy settings. Some specific examples of text-based discussion and collaboration include: 4th grade students engaged in *turn and talk* relevant to a story's beginning, middle, and end; and third grade students during a benchmark phonics lesson, working in small groups to complete a word sort. The team also saw students working together in research teams, in which they had the responsibility of learning and teaching new information to peers. In a 4th grade classroom, a teacher engaged students through the following real world scenario - "When essayists are seeking ideas for their writing, they turn to issues that come up in stories they have been reading. These issues are ones that writers in the community know about and care about deeply." The teacher then worked with students to brainstorm issues on a shared chart. Students also created issues charts in their writers' notebooks and then the teacher modeled how to take an issue and expand on it in her writer's notebook.

In addition to the visitors' observations of practices, the relationships between the High Impact Instructional Practices and The Big Six Skills and Competencies were evident through student interviews. One student shared, "In 3rd grade we wrote literary essays which was so much fun. We got to write really long & use different vocabulary. We wrote about Women's History." When asked about feedback, he said, "We get our writing back to see how we can make it better. We have writing celebrations where we put our writing on each other's desks & then we

go around and read each other's writing. We put a post-it note to compliment the writer.” Another student described that “we discussed ‘marking’ words and abbreviations, digraphs, and rule breakers like OLD.” She shared about stop and jot and explained their reading series. She explained how they read from bins from their level, and then move to higher levels when ready. She along with other students shared about word study, mini-lessons, marking, tapping, scooping words, word sounds, when to use “and” in writing, and dialogue tags. Students also described book selections available including books about Diwali, urban, rural, and suburban settings as examples of books about varied cultures and geographic regions.

The examples shared through documents, classroom visits and student voice provided the team with an extensive and deep understanding of strong classroom practices, teacher instruction and student engagement. While much of the evidence does reflect High Impact Instructional Practices in literacy, the extent to which the district’s approach is systematic was unclear. While generally good practices were evident in all classrooms, well defined and consistently implemented expectations were less apparent.

### Commendations

In many of the classrooms visited, the team saw evidence of:

- Classrooms that reflected Science of Reading in the approach to teaching and learning
- The “Big 6” Skills and Competencies in lessons
- Diverse and complex text in the lessons
- Examples of High Impact Instructional Practices
- Welcoming and positive classroom environments
- Well established protocols and routines
- Progress monitoring ESGI (assessment platform)

## Recommendations

- Consider ways to foster deeper and more consistent understanding of the High Impact Instructional Practices among all staff. Consider using High Impact Practices In Action: What Do These Look Like In Elementary Settings? (Brief 5, Page 3) as a text for shared study to determine and define “must do’s.”
- Consider collaborating with teachers to define in writing the district's expectations of what the high impact practices should look like in elementary classrooms.
- Consider prioritizing those practices the district would like to see implemented in the short and long terms.
- Consider ways to support teacher alignment of their practices with the district’s philosophy and the Big 6 Skills and Competencies
- Analyze the feedback data collected from teachers by the instructional coach to target specific areas of need for professional learning.

## Indicators:

The Tri-State Consortium utilizes a series of eight indicators to evaluate school programs and initiatives. The eight indicators are measured using a rubric that examines three targeted components: Approach, Implementation and Results. It is through these three lenses that feedback is structured as a way to offer both current status and next steps of a program/initiative.

- Approach reflects processes and structures that can be evidenced through District planning and documents.
- Implementation reflects the active use of the processes and structures in classrooms.
- Results reflect measured assessment and student growth.

The District asked the visiting team for feedback on the following two indicators:

**Indicator #7: *Shared Vision and Environment for Change*** goals focused on student performance have been developed with the staff and community, are well articulated, clearly communicated, consistently pursued throughout the district and school community, and include student voice.

*This vision expects, supports, and recognizes risk taking, creativity, and innovation as components of change toward continuous improvement. There is a process to review student and teacher work and learn from experimentation.*

The importance of literacy instruction for the District is evident through the thoughtful planning, extensive conversations, research conducted and presentation of findings. The **approach** to the decision making process for next steps in teaching literacy, as described in the New York State Science of Reading Briefs, has been considered along with the recommendations presented in the Science of Reading Literacy Audit conducted in spring of 2024. The District's standardized and reading performance levels are key in considering which current practices are viable and valuable, as well as consideration for planned abandonment of those that may no longer be relevant or would be better replaced by other programs and resources. The district's Literacy Timeline demonstrates a commitment to a process and defined steps to be followed, and to the inclusion of stakeholders. The development of the Literacy Fellows offered inclusion of expert voices and the opportunity to communicate information to other teachers. In addition, the plan to pilot several programs in multiple classrooms presented the opportunity to reflect on current practices and align newly defined expectations. The Districts' well developed Philosophy of Literacy by Grade-Band provided a correlation document to support and guide next steps in determining the decision to proceed with the Revised Reading and Writing Units of Study or shift to another approach/program.

A hallmark of the **implementation** process was the development of the Literacy Fellows, a representative group tasked with evaluating ELA programs and approaches that have been researched and implemented in high performing NYS school districts. The year-long process resulted in a District Philosophy, a deeper understanding of District data, a defined set of programs to pilot and a plan to pilot three programs: Fishtank, Foundations, and the Revised Units of Study 3-5.

The visiting team engaged in interviews with teachers, administrators and instructional coaches who reflected on literacy practices, steps the District has taken in the decision making process,

professional learning provided for teachers, and the implementation of the pilot programs. Feedback from teachers was very positive for Foundations at the primary level. Teachers in the upper grades shared that Benchmark Phonics supported defined goals.

Interviews with teachers who were piloting or part of the Fellows reflected a deeper understanding of the District's process and direction for literacy instruction. These teachers had the opportunity to meet with colleagues across the District and considered their voices an essential part of the decision making process. The visiting team observed examples across the District that were not program based, but rather a reflection of a framework. Almost all classrooms had an approach to literacy that reflected the importance of the tenets of the Science of Reading and a plan for teaching the Big Six Skills and Competencies with an overlay of the District Philosophy of Literacy. The different programs that are currently being used in different classrooms were generally cited with a positive feeling that the program was working for students.

The use of data in this decision making process can be considered the **results**. It is through thorough analysis of data including NY State Assessments, NWEA and informal assessments that the District will be able to make an informed data driven decision.

#### ***Indicator 4: Curriculum and Instruction***

*Teachers and administrators collaborate to develop an articulated and aligned curriculum designed to ensure optimal student results. When making curricular and instructional decisions, teachers and administrators consider current research and evidence of student performance from multiple sources. In their planning, teachers purposefully select and differentiate strategies and resources that advance the learning of all students.*

Evidence of extensive dialogue, planning and support of literacy were provided to the visiting team. The District has an **approach** to developing and defining curriculum, instruction and expectations through ongoing professional development provided to teachers through a district wide coach as well as outside consultants. Some Superintendents Conference Days have been

used to explore alignment across the District. At this critical point in the decision making process, the District embarked on a thorough process to determine next steps. Engagement in the Science of Reading Audit demonstrated an openness to feedback and a genuine interest in assessing the current program and determining where changes and shifts may be warranted. In response to the Audit, the District took action by defining philosophies and beliefs, providing professional development, and creating an approach for exploring options for teaching literacy. The creation of the Literacy Fellows offered an opportunity for teachers across the District to collaborate and consider next steps.

The **implementation** of literacy practices and how the District defines its priorities was evident in teaching and learning across classrooms, grade levels and buildings. While there are currently a variety of programs in use, all classrooms are focused in some way and at varied levels on the key components defined in the Science of Reading and Big Six Skills and Competencies. The visiting team consistently saw and heard high levels of student engagement and the successful layering of phonics and word work in classrooms. Workshop models were in place, classroom libraries were organized (in varied ways) and included diverse texts, students were engaged in collaborative and interdisciplinary projects, and both whole class and small group instruction were used as appropriate and when needed. Teachers used a variety of strategies and resources to support student learning. The implementation of the pilot programs included a variety of teachers and grade levels. These classroom teachers mirrored their colleagues in non-pilot classrooms in that the defined expectations for learning remained consistent. The programs offered different materials and resources, as well as a varied approach in some cases. The reflection process and collaboration of the Literacy Fellows will help to guide the final decision.

The **results** of the approach and implementation at this time cannot be determined. Assessments over time will provide data that can be used as an indicator, although pilot data which can be short term, may not offer accurate measures. The most current data the District

can apply would be the high level of performance on the standardized measures that have been collected to date.

### **Commendations**

In classrooms, through discussions, and District presentations, the team saw evidence of:

- A deep and thoughtful process that has been developed and implemented over several years
- District consideration of current research to make well informed decisions
- Extensive review of programs and approaches to teaching literacy
- Consistent levels of communication to the Board of Education
- A genuine process for examining practice and ensuring high quality instruction
- A high level of professionalism in faculty
- Students sharing their joy of reading
- Meaningful engagement in all classrooms
- Teacher interest in learning about best practices
- Strong results on test scores
- An openness and willingness to examine practices and hear feedback
- An open and honest consideration in response to the Audit and a willingness to “dig deeper” to analyze which recommendations make sense and those that may not
- Collective engagement in thoughtful consideration of “why change” if students performance levels have increased
- Joy in every building for teachers and students

### **Recommendations**

- Consider the extent to which teacher voice/need determines what professional learning is provided
- Consider how information and data regarding pilot programs will be disseminated to everyone

- Consider feedback loops that ensure broad understanding of district literacy priorities
- Assess the importance of the “We believe” statements in the Philosophy of Literacy to measure the need for increased engagement of teachers
- Develop a plan inclusive of teachers for ongoing dialogue and exploration of the interaction and overlap of the three key documents that are creating the foundation for all classroom practices and teaching and learning: Science of Reading, Big Six Skills and Competencies and the District’s Philosophy of Literacy
- To build more consistency in application of the Philosophy and the High Impact Instructional Practices, consider structures and other ways to understand and support teacher needs
  - Assess instructional time allocated for literacy and whether it is aligned with the Units of Study and its many components
  - Use established time for more collaboration and sharing best practices to build greater consistency
  - Look for evidence in student work
- Consider broadening the district’s definition of student success in literacy by including multiple measures that emphasize growth, reflection, and authentic performance, such as culminating experiences that reflect district philosophy and student voice
- Assess and articulate the importance of consistent program selection across grade levels and the three elementary schools
- Consider continuing with the updated/newly published Reading and Writing Units of Study based on successful results, teacher commitment, and the quality of the units
- Consider meeting with teacher representatives, instructional coaches, and building administrators to review and reflect on each Unit after it’s taught to identify what worked, what didn’t, and what teachers are finding challenging - This type of reflection could be used to support the design of differentiated professional learning

## **Conclusion**

The Chappaqua School District, like many districts, has been grappling with next steps following the transition of the Reading and Writing Project to the Advancing Literacy Initiative at Teachers College. The district’s approach to decision-making has been thoughtful and inclusive. It invited a large-scale audit, supported the piloting of several new programs, formed a fellowship for teachers to learn from and with one another, and studied relevant data around student literacy. While the Science of Reading Audit suggested shifting away from the Units of Study, the district’s student data and solid foundational practices are a strong argument for maintaining the revised Units of Study. Based on the thoroughness of evidence presented to our team and the district’s openness to feedback, we are confident the district, ultimately, will reach the decision that makes the most sense for its students. In the meantime, we encourage district leaders to continually focus on prioritizing, articulating, and monitoring the non-negotiables, while also narrating to all stakeholders the “why” behind their decisions and ensuring that collaborating with teachers remains an integral part of their process.

During our three-day visit to the District, our team consistently observed an admirable level of energy and professionalism that the teaching and administrative faculty bring to the District. The team was impressed by the thoughtful faculty, students and staff and their genuine interest in reflection, risk taking and feedback.

The team is extremely grateful for the District's warm welcome and attention to detail during the visit. Thank you to the faculty and staff throughout the district for the hospitality we experienced throughout the three days. Thank you to Adam Pease for creating the complex organization for our visit and all the docents who helped us navigate our locations and meetings.