ALIGNMENT AUDIT

Model Policy Manual

57 domains · 599 references verified · generated 2026-11-03

What a district's policy manual would say if every clause followed the best current evidence on student outcomes. Each clause states the standard, who reports what, and how often. The research behind each clause is footnoted; its strength is labelled; where the evidence is mixed, the manual says so.



audited with the same tool

TIER A	TIER B	TIER C	TIER D
26	**21**	**6**	**4**
meta-analyses or several causal studies	one strong causal study	correlational	professional standard

How to read it. Each section is one policy domain. The **clause** is written to be adopted as board policy. The **standard** is the testable requirement behind it, the **indicator** is what a district would measure, and **red flags** are provisions found in real manuals that undercut the standard. Each domain ends with **how to implement it** (first 90 days, year one, ongoing, with an owner) and **how you know it worked** (measure, baseline, target, benchmark, when it is reported). A tier D clause is a professional standard, not a research finding, and is labelled as such. Run through the Alignment Audit itself, this manual scores 100 out of 100: every clause meets its own standard, commits to something measurable, and is current.

Academics and access

– 1. Access to extracurricular activities, athletics and the arts TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Causal studies find that participation pays: Houston's randomized arts-access initiative (42 schools, more than 10,000 students) reduced disciplinary infractions, raised writing achievement and increased empathy and, for elementary students, school engagement and college aspirations; Title IX's forced expansion of girls' sports raised women's college attendance and employment (Stevenson); German sports-club participation improved grades and health. Longitudinal work (Fredricks and Eccles) links breadth of participation to higher GPA, college enrollment and lower risk behavior. Fees are the main access barrier: average required fees in 2018 to 2019 were $161 for sports, $86 for arts and $46 for clubs, lower-income students are twice as likely not to participate, and only 7% of parents have ever requested a waiver. (arts RCT: discipline referrals down, writing up, empathy up; Title IX sports expansion: +1 pp college attendance per 10 pp participation; lower-income nonparticipation about 2x; waiver uptake 7%) [1,2,3,4,5,6,7]

Where the evidence is mixed. Most of the participation literature is correlational and selection runs strongly (motivated, better-resourced students join), so effect sizes from longitudinal studies overstate causal returns. The Houston RCT found no effect on attendance, math, reading or science scores, and only elementary students showed engagement gains. Zdroik and Veliz found Michigan schools with pay-to-play fees had similar participation rates to schools without fees, but the schools able to charge fees were larger, whiter and lower-poverty, which is the selection problem itself rather than evidence that fees are harmless. Fee elimination has a real budget cost and the research does not show which activities yield the most per dollar. Sports carry injury and concussion costs that the achievement studies do not count.

Standard. The district shall guarantee that no student is excluded from any school-sponsored activity for inability to pay, shall grant automatic fee waivers to students eligible for free or reduced-price meals without a separate application, shall provide weekly arts instruction in every elementary grade, and shall report participation by subgroup to the board annually.

1. The policy guarantees that no student is excluded from any school-sponsored activity for inability to pay. CORE
2. The policy grants automatic fee waivers to students eligible for free or reduced-price meals.
3. The policy requires no separate application for the fee waiver.
4. The policy provides weekly arts instruction in every elementary grade.
5. The policy requires participation to be reported by subgroup to the board annually.

> **Policy.** No student shall be denied participation in any school-sponsored athletic, arts, club or other extracurricular activity because of inability to pay a fee, purchase equipment or uniforms, or pay for travel. Any participation fee shall be waived automatically for every student eligible for free or reduced-price meals, for students in foster care or experiencing homelessness, and for any other student whose parent or guardian signs a statement of hardship; no separate application shall be required and waiver status shall not be visible to other students. Each school shall offer at least one no-fee activity option in each of athletics, arts and academic clubs. Every elementary

> school shall provide at least 60 minutes per week of instruction in visual art and 60 minutes per week in music taught by a certified arts teacher. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by November 1 each year the share of students in each school participating in at least one activity, disaggregated by free-and-reduced-lunch status, race and grade, the number and value of waivers granted, the fee schedule for every activity, and any activity discontinued in the prior year with the enrollment it had. The Board shall review the fee schedule annually and shall not raise any fee without a public hearing.

Indicator. Participation rate in at least one school-sponsored activity by free-and-reduced-lunch status, race and grade (student information system activity rosters); number and dollar value of fee waivers granted versus eligible students; share of elementary students receiving weekly arts instruction; list of activities cut or added each year with enrollment.

Red flags in real manuals. participation fees are required and non-refundable; fee waivers are available upon application with documentation of hardship; students with outstanding fees or fines may not participate; activities may be cancelled when enrollment or funding is insufficient, with no notice standard; arts instruction is offered as resources permit; no participation reporting by subgroup; transportation to activities is the responsibility of the family

Law. Title IX, 20 U.S.C. 1681 and 34 CFR 106.41, requires equal athletic opportunity by sex. California prohibits fees for any educational activity including extracurriculars (Hartzell v. Connell, 35 Cal.3d 899 (1984); Education Code 49010 to 49013, with a required complaint process), while most states permit fees subject to waiver rules; several, including Massachusetts and Ohio, require waivers or caps. The McKinney-Vento Act (42 U.S.C. 11431 et seq.) requires that homeless students not be excluded from activities by fees or documentation. State athletic association eligibility rules govern academic eligibility and may conflict with no-pay-no-play provisions.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through the Director of Student Activities, with the Director of Fine Arts responsible for the elementary arts requirement

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent directs the Director of Student Activities to publish a complete fee schedule for every school-sponsored athletic, arts, club and other activity, including equipment, uniform and travel costs, within 30 days.
2. The Director of Student Activities and the Director of Nutrition Services build an automatic waiver flag in the student information system so every student eligible for free or reduced-price meals, in foster care or experiencing homelessness is waived without an application and without the status being visible to other students.
3. The Director of Fine Arts surveys every elementary school and reports to the Superintendent within 60 days which schools provide 60 minutes per week of visual art and 60 minutes per week of music from a certified arts teacher, and which do not.
4. Each principal confirms to the Superintendent within 90 days that the school offers at least one no-fee option in each of athletics, arts and academic clubs, and names them.

5. General counsel reviews the district's fee practices against state law and the state athletic association's eligibility rules, including any Title IX or McKinney-Vento exposure, and reports conflicts to the board within 90 days.

Year one

1. The Director of Fine Arts and the Chief Financial Officer bring the board a staffing and schedule plan so every elementary school meets the 60-minute visual art and 60-minute music requirement by the start of the next school year.
2. The Director of Student Activities pulls activity rosters from the student information system and produces the first November 1 report showing participation by free-and-reduced-lunch status, race and grade, waivers granted by number and dollar value against eligible students, the fee schedule, and any activity discontinued with its prior enrollment.
3. The Director of Communications sends every family a plain-language notice, in the home languages the district serves, that no student can be excluded for inability to pay and that a parent hardship statement is enough to waive any fee.
4. The board holds its first annual fee schedule review in public session and adopts the rule that no fee rises without a public hearing.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent delivers the disaggregated participation, waiver and fee report to the board by November 1 every year.
2. The board reviews the fee schedule annually and holds a public hearing before any increase.
3. The Director of Student Activities audits a sample of activity rosters each semester to confirm that no eligible student was charged or turned away and that waiver status was not disclosed.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students in each school participating in at least one school-sponsored activity, disaggregated by free-and-reduced-lunch status, race and grade, drawn from student information system activity rosters; share of waiver-eligible students who actually received a waiver; share of elementary students receiving weekly arts instruction.
BASELINE	The first November 1 report, covering the school year in which the policy is adopted, establishes the baseline participation rate by subgroup, the waiver count against eligible students, and the number of elementary schools meeting the 60-minute art and 60-minute music requirement.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, 100% of free-and-reduced-lunch, foster and homeless students carry an active waiver flag and 100% of elementary schools provide 60 minutes per week each of visual art and music; within 3 years, the gap in participation rates between free-and-reduced-lunch and non-free-and-reduced-lunch students narrows each year from the baseline, with no subgroup's rate falling.**

BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric participation benchmark. National reference points: lower-income students are about 2x as likely not to participate, only 7% of parents have ever requested a waiver, and average required fees in 2018 to 2019 were $161 for sports, $86 for arts and $46 for clubs. The 2x nonparticipation gap is the disparity the policy aims to close.
REPORTED	Superintendent reports to the board by November 1 each year, in public session, with the data posted on the district website; the board's annual fee schedule review follows the report.

– 2. Access to rigorous coursework (automatic enrollment, AP, IB, dual credit) TIER B

STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. When districts automatically place every student who meets an objective readiness threshold into the next advanced course, with parent opt-out instead of opt-in, advanced course enrollment rises and gaps by race and income narrow without lowering grades or graduation; Washington's Academic Acceleration policies raised the chance of taking any advanced course by about 5 percent district-wide and more among proficient students who had been passed over. Effects on later college enrollment and persistence from the high school version of the policy are null so far. (WA Academic Acceleration: advanced course enrollment up, gaps narrowed, GPA and graduation unchanged; college enrollment and persistence unchanged. Wake County objective math placement: income and race no longer predicted placement; on-track-for-algebra share up. Earning AP credit raises degree completion (regression discontinuity).) [8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15]

Where the evidence is mixed. The best-studied high school automatic enrollment policy (Washington, grades 11 and 12) did not change college enrollment, first-year coursetaking, or persistence to a second year (Austin et al. 2026). Wake County's objective placement improved access but accelerated students earned lower course grades in middle school and the acceleration did not raise test scores or college readiness measures (Dougherty et al. 2017). Expanding AP and dual enrollment seats without supports is associated with wider, not narrower, racial participation gaps across districts (Xu, Solanki and Fink 2021). Access is necessary but not sufficient; the courses must be taught well and students supported to pass them.

Standard. The policy shall name an objective readiness threshold, require automatic enrollment of every student who meets it in the next most rigorous course offered, allow only written parent opt-out, and require annual public reporting of participation and success by student group.

1. The policy names an objective readiness threshold for placement in advanced coursework.
2. The policy requires automatic enrollment of every student who meets the readiness threshold in the next most rigorous course offered. CORE
3. The policy allows only written parent opt-out as the way a qualifying student is not enrolled.
4. The policy requires annual public reporting of advanced course participation and success.
5. The policy requires that the reported participation and success data be broken out by student group.

> **Policy.** Each student who meets or exceeds the state standard on the most recent state assessment in English language arts, mathematics, or science, or who earns a grade of B or higher in the prerequisite course, shall be enrolled in the next most rigorous level of coursework offered in that subject, including honors, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual-credit courses, for the following term. Enrollment shall not depend on a teacher recommendation, application, or test fee. A student may be placed in an alternative course only when a parent or guardian submits a written opt-out after receiving written notice of the student's eligibility. Principals shall provide the notice by June 1 for the following year. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 each year the number of eligible students, the number enrolled, the number opted out, and advanced course completion and exam pass rates, each disaggregated by

> school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and shall publish the report on the district website.

Indicator. Share of students meeting the readiness threshold who are enrolled in the corresponding advanced course the next term, by race, ethnicity, income, English learner and disability status; AP, IB and dual-credit participation and pass rates by group (state report card, College Board and IB data); opt-out counts by school.

Red flags in real manuals. teacher recommendation required for honors, AP, or IB placement; application, essay, or interview required for advanced courses; students must opt in to advanced courses; prerequisite grade thresholds above B or above the state standard; AP exam fees or dual-credit tuition charged to students without a waiver; no reporting of advanced course participation by student group

Law. Washington RCW 28A.320.195 required every district board to adopt an academic acceleration policy by 2021-22 that automatically enrolls students who meet the state standard on the grade 8 or high school ELA or math assessment in the next most rigorous course, with parent opt-out. Illinois Accelerated Placement Act (105 ILCS 5/14A-32), amended by Public Act 103-0743 in 2024, requires automatic enrollment of high school students who exceed state standards in the next most rigorous course and an option to enroll for students who meet them, with district policies amended by 2027-28. North Carolina G.S. 115C-81.36 requires placement of students who score at the highest level on the math end-of-grade or end-of-course test in the advanced course for their next math course. Texas SB 2124 (2023) requires automatic enrollment in advanced sixth grade math of students in the top 40 percent on the fifth grade STAAR math test, with parent opt-out.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning as day-to-day lead

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent designates the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning to lead implementation and names a data lead in the assessment office within 30 days.
2. The data lead builds the eligibility list by matching the most recent state assessment results in English language arts, mathematics, and science and prerequisite course grades of B or higher to each student, and sends each principal a school roster within 60 days.
3. The Superintendent issues an administrative procedure within 60 days that bars teacher recommendations, applications, and test fees as enrollment conditions and defines the written opt-out form.
4. Principals brief counselors and department chairs on the automatic enrollment rule and the June 1 parent notice deadline within 90 days.
5. The Superintendent reviews the current master schedule with each principal within 90 days to identify where honors, AP, IB, and dual-credit seat counts must grow to hold every eligible student.

Year one

1. Principals send written eligibility notices to every eligible student's parent or guardian by June 1 and log each written opt-out received.

2. Counselors enroll every eligible student who has not opted out in the next most rigorous course for the following term and the data lead confirms the enrollment match before the term begins.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first report to the Board by October 15 covering eligible, enrolled, and opted-out counts and completion and exam pass rates, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and publishes it on the district website.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning arranges AP, IB, and dual-credit teacher training and exam fee support so that added sections are staffed and students can sit the exams.

Ongoing

1. The data lead refreshes the eligibility roster each term and principals repeat the June 1 notice and opt-out process every year.
2. The Superintendent presents the October 15 report to the Board annually and flags any school where opt-out counts or group gaps stand out.
3. The Board reviews the policy every 1 to 3 years against state law changes and the district's own enrollment and pass-rate trends.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students meeting the readiness threshold who are enrolled in the corresponding advanced course the next term, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus AP, IB, and dual-credit participation and pass rates by group and opt-out counts by school.
BASELINE	The eligible-to-enrolled match rate, opt-out counts, and advanced course participation and pass rates by group as calculated by the data lead from the first eligibility roster before the first June 1 notices go out.
TARGET	**By the first October 15 report, every eligible student not covered by a written opt-out is enrolled in the corresponding advanced course, and by the third annual report the enrollment rate among eligible students no longer differs by race, ethnicity, or income, with advanced course completion and exam pass rates by group holding steady or rising rather than falling.**
BENCHMARK	Washington's Academic Acceleration policies raised the chance of taking any advanced course by about 5 percent district-wide, with larger gains among proficient students who had been passed over, and GPA and graduation unchanged; Wake County's objective math placement ended the link between income or race and placement. The entry gives no numeric pass-rate or college enrollment benchmark, and college enrollment and persistence effects are null so far.
REPORTED	The Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 15, published on the district website, with the eligible, enrolled, and opted-out counts and completion and exam pass rates disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner

status, and disability status, cross-checked against the state report card and College Board and IB data.

– 3. Career and technical education pathways TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Structured CTE pathways, meaning multi-year sequences with employer partners, work-based learning, and a credential, raise graduation and earnings in causal studies: the MDRC career academies RCT found earnings 11 percent higher eight years after high school (17 percent for young men), Massachusetts and Connecticut regression-discontinuity studies find 7 to 10 point gains in on-time graduation and, in Connecticut, 32 percent higher quarterly earnings for men, and New York City's lottery-based P-TECH evaluation found associate degree completion up 5 percentage points with dual enrollment more than doubled. Effects come from depth in one field, not scattered introductory courses, and are concentrated among young men. (Career academies: earnings +11 percent per year over 8 years (+17 percent men), attainment unchanged. Massachusetts regional vocational schools: on-time graduation +7 to +10 points. Connecticut technical high schools: graduation +10 points and quarterly earnings +32 percent for men, no effect for women. P-TECH: associate degree +5 points, internships +38 points. Upper-level CTE courses: about +2 percent wages per additional year; introductory courses 0.) [16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23]

Where the evidence is mixed. Gains are uneven. Career academies did not raise educational attainment, and the Connecticut technical schools had no measurable effect on women. P-TECH's degree effects were concentrated among young men, and its interim credits were mostly in CTE and non-academic subjects. Earnings returns vary widely by field, with health care and IT far above others and some fields near zero (Ecton and Dougherty 2023), and returns accrue only to upper-level coursework in a single field (Kreisman and Stange 2020). The strongest effects come from whole-school or regional CTE models with oversubscribed admissions; a single elective or a program without employer partners should not expect these results. Kemple warned that partial implementation of the academy model may not reproduce the impacts.

Standard. Every high school shall offer at least one multi-year CTE pathway aligned to a regional high-wage field with an employer partner, work-based learning, dual credit, and an industry credential; admission to oversubscribed pathways shall be by lottery or objective criteria, and completion and post-graduation outcomes shall be reported by student group.

1. The policy requires every high school to offer at least one multi-year CTE pathway aligned to a regional high-wage field. CORE
2. The policy requires each pathway to include an employer partner and work-based learning.
3. The policy requires each pathway to include dual credit and an industry credential.
4. The policy requires admission to oversubscribed pathways to be by lottery or objective criteria.
5. The policy requires completion and post-graduation outcomes to be reported by student group.

> **Policy.** Each high school shall offer no fewer than two career and technical education programs of study, each consisting of a sequence of at least three courses in one field identified as high-wage and in demand in the most recent regional labor market analysis, each with a named employer or industry partner, an aligned dual-credit agreement with a public college, a paid or credit-bearing work-based learning placement available to every concentrator by grade 12, and preparation for an industry-recognized credential whose exam fee the district shall pay. When a program is oversubscribed, seats shall be assigned by lottery or by published objective criteria, not by staff recommendation. Students shall not be placed in a CTE program of study as a

> substitute for the college-preparatory course sequence. The Director of Career and Technical Education shall report to the Board by December 1 each year, using Perkins V accountability data: the number of concentrators and completers by program, credentials earned, work-based learning placements, dual credits earned, the graduation rate of concentrators, and employment or postsecondary enrollment of the prior cohort, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, disability status, and sex, and shall recommend closing or redesigning any program whose completers show no employment or enrollment advantage for two consecutive years.

Indicator. Share of graduates who completed a CTE program of study (concentrators: two or more courses in one pathway) and who earned an industry-recognized credential or 12 or more aligned college credits, by race, ethnicity, income, English learner, disability and sex (Perkins V accountability data); share of concentrators with a paid work-based learning placement; concentrator graduation rate and post-graduation employment or enrollment from state wage and Clearinghouse matches.

Red flags in real manuals. CTE offered only as single-semester electives with no sequence; no employer partner or work-based learning requirement; CTE used as a lower track or as an alternative to college-preparatory courses; placement in CTE by counselor or staff recommendation without objective criteria; credential exam fees charged to students; no reporting of concentrator outcomes by student group or sex

Law. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V, 2018) requires each recipient to conduct a comprehensive local needs assessment every two years, align programs of study to labor market demand, and report concentrator outcomes (graduation, academic proficiency, postsecondary placement, credentials, and participation in nontraditional fields) by subgroup. State graduation requirements increasingly allow CTE sequences or credentials to count toward a diploma endorsement or as a college-and-career-readiness indicator under ESSA.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Career and Technical Education, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Career and Technical Education inventories every high school's current CTE course sequences against the model clause and the most recent regional labor market analysis and reports to the Superintendent which schools have fewer than two qualifying programs of study.
2. The Director pulls the district's current Perkins V accountability data on concentrators, completers, credentials, dual credits, and work-based learning placements, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, disability status, and sex, and files it as the baseline.
3. The Superintendent names the employer or industry partner for each existing or planned program of study and the Director opens dual-credit agreement talks with the nearest public college.

4. The Director publishes the lottery or objective admission criteria for any oversubscribed program within 90 days and the Superintendent ends admission by staff recommendation at the same time.
5. The Director confirms with each principal that no student is enrolled in a CTE program of study in place of the college-preparatory course sequence and corrects any such schedule.

Year one

1. The Director brings to the Board, for a vote, a plan under which each high school offers at least two programs of study with three or more sequenced courses, a named partner, a dual-credit agreement, a paid or credit-bearing placement for every grade 12 concentrator, and credential preparation.
2. The Chief Financial Officer budgets payment of industry credential exam fees for every concentrator and the Director reports the fees paid in the December 1 report.
3. The Director signs the dual-credit agreements and work-based learning placement agreements for each program and reports how many grade 12 concentrators have a placement by school and student group.
4. The Director delivers the first December 1 report to the Board using Perkins V data, including the prior cohort's employment or postsecondary enrollment from state wage and Clearinghouse matches.

Ongoing

1. The Director delivers the December 1 report each year and recommends closing or redesigning any program whose completers show no employment or enrollment advantage for two consecutive years, and the Board votes on each recommendation.
2. The Director completes the Perkins V comprehensive local needs assessment every two years and realigns programs of study to the regional labor market analysis.
3. The Board reviews the disaggregated concentrator data each year for gaps by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, disability status, and sex and directs the Superintendent to address any program whose completers are drawn disproportionately from one group.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of graduates who completed a CTE program of study (two or more courses in one pathway) and earned an industry-recognized credential or 12 or more aligned college credits; share of concentrators with a paid work-based learning placement; concentrator graduation rate; and employment or postsecondary enrollment of the prior cohort, each by school and student group
BASELINE	The district's current Perkins V accountability data for concentrators, completers, credentials, dual credits, and work-based learning placements, by school and student group, pulled in the first 90 days, plus the current count of high schools with fewer than two qualifying programs of study
TARGET	**Within 1 year every high school offers at least two qualifying programs of study and the structural elements (partner, dual-credit agreement, placement,**

	credential preparation, fee payment) are in place; within 3 years the share of graduates who are concentrators with a credential or 12 aligned credits, the share of concentrators with a paid placement, and the concentrator graduation rate rise above baseline in each student group, and completers of every retained program show an employment or enrollment advantage over non-completers in the prior cohort
BENCHMARK	The research supports direction but not a district-level target for the indicator: causal studies find on-time graduation gains of 7 to 10 points, earnings gains of 11 percent per year over 8 years (17 percent for young men) and 32 percent higher quarterly earnings for men, associate degree completion up 5 points, and internships up 38 points, with effects coming from depth in one field rather than introductory courses; no numeric benchmark exists for the share of graduates who are concentrators with a credential, so the target is directional
REPORTED	Annual report to the Board by December 1 from the Director of Career and Technical Education, using Perkins V accountability data and state wage and Clearinghouse matches, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, disability status, and sex, with a close-or-redesign recommendation for any program showing no completer advantage for two consecutive years

– 4. Chronic absence response TIER A STAKES 5/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Missing 10 percent or more of school days lowers achievement and engagement from kindergarten on, and the share of students chronically absent nearly doubled after the pandemic. Controlled studies show that early, supportive, family-facing responses (mailed and texted attendance information, caseworkers who remove material barriers, structured adult mentoring) cut chronic absence by roughly 8 to 23 percent at modest cost, while no rigorous US study shows that fines, prosecution or court referral improve attendance. (Family mailings and texts: chronic absence -10% to -15% (2 to 7 points); school-based material-needs caseworkers: -8%; Check & Connect mentoring: -4.2 days (-23%) in grades 5-7, nothing in grades 1-4; pooled attendance interventions small (g = 0.09 to 0.25)) [24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39]

Where the evidence is mixed. Average effects are small and uneven. Eklund et al. (2022) pooled g = 0.25 across 22 controlled studies and the family-school partnership category's confidence interval included zero; Li et al. (2026) pooled g = 0.09 across 13 post-2020 studies, with weaker effects in majority students-of-color samples. Check & Connect had no detectable effect in grades 1 to 4 and none on test scores or GPA; texting cut chronic absence but not achievement (Heppen et al. 2020). On punishment: Maynard et al. (2012) found court-based truancy programs did not differ from school- or community-based ones on short-term attendance, and an Australian RCT of a police-school partnership raised attendance, so 'punitive responses never work' overstates the record. What the evidence does support is narrower: no rigorous US study shows fines or prosecution improve attendance; Texas truancy filings fell about 90 percent after 2015 decriminalization with no drop in statewide attendance (descriptive only); and in a 131,312-student RCT the standard legalistic, punitively worded truancy notice was outperformed by a plain, supportive one.

Standard. Policy requires monthly identification of every student at or trending toward 10 percent absence, a documented supportive family contact and barrier assessment before any penalty, a written plan at Tier 2 and case management at Tier 3, and quarterly public reporting by building and subgroup; court or truancy referral is permitted only after the supportive steps are documented.

1. The policy requires a documented supportive family contact and barrier assessment before any penalty for absence. CORE
2. The policy requires monthly identification of every student at or trending toward 10 percent absence.
3. The policy requires a written plan for students at Tier 2.
4. The policy requires case management for students at Tier 3.
5. The policy requires quarterly public reporting of attendance by building and subgroup.
6. The policy permits court or truancy referral only after the supportive steps are documented.

> **Policy.** Chronic absence shall be defined as missing 10 percent or more of enrolled school days for any reason, excused or unexcused. Each principal shall review attendance data at least monthly and shall identify every student who has missed 10 percent or more of enrolled days, or who has missed three or more days in any 20-day period. Within 10 school days of identification the school shall make a documented two-way contact with the student's family, in the family's preferred language, that states the number of days missed, asks what is making attendance hard, and offers help; this contact shall be supportive and shall not threaten penalties. A student who remains at or

> above 10 percent after that contact shall receive a written attendance plan developed with the family within 20 school days, naming a staff member responsible for weekly follow-up. A student who misses 20 percent or more, or whose attendance does not improve under a plan, shall be assigned to a case manager who shall assess transportation, health, housing, food, safety and school-climate barriers and connect the family with services. No student shall be referred to truancy court, cited, fined, suspended, excluded from activities or denied credit for absence until the contact, plan and barrier assessment above are documented in the student information system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board each quarter, by school, grade and subgroup: the chronic absence rate, the share of identified students who received a documented contact within 10 school days, the number of attendance plans opened, and the number of truancy referrals filed. The Superintendent shall also publish these figures on the district website within 30 days of each report.

Indicator. Percent of enrolled students missing 10 percent or more of enrolled days (the state chronic absence measure in the EDFacts or state report card file), reported by school, grade and subgroup; the share of chronically absent students who received a documented Tier 2 contact within 10 school days of crossing the threshold; and the number of truancy referrals filed, each tracked monthly.

Red flags in real manuals. truancy referral, citation or fine triggered automatically at a fixed number of unexcused absences with no supportive contact first; loss of credit, grade reduction or denial of course credit for absences; out-of-school suspension or exclusion from activities as a consequence for absence; attendance tracked only as average daily attendance or only unexcused absences, with no chronic absence (10 percent, all absences) measure; no named role responsible for outreach and no reporting frequency; attendance letters written in legal or threatening language with no offer of help

Law. ESSA requires states to report chronic absenteeism on report cards and most states use it as a school-quality indicator. Every state has a compulsory attendance statute, and many still define truancy as a status offense with court jurisdiction over students or parents; Texas HB 2398 (2015) decriminalized failure to attend school and requires districts to apply truancy prevention measures before court referral. Several states require supportive interventions before court referral (for example Connecticut General Statutes 10-198a); California Education Code 60901 defines a chronic absentee as a pupil absent 10 percent or more of enrolled days.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with each building principal responsible for monthly identification and the required family contacts

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent directs the student information system administrator to build a monthly report flagging every student at or above 10 percent of enrolled days missed, or with three or more absences in any 20-day period, broken out by school, grade and subgroup.
2. The Superintendent adds fields to the student information system so each school can document the two-way family contact, the attendance plan, the barrier assessment and the case manager

assignment for each identified student.
3. Each principal names a staff member responsible for monthly attendance review and weekly follow-up on open attendance plans, and the Superintendent trains those staff on the supportive, non-threatening contact script and on contact in the family's preferred language.
4. The Superintendent suspends any existing truancy referral, citation, fine, suspension or credit-denial practice for absence until the contact, plan and barrier-assessment documentation is in place at every school.
5. The Superintendent pulls the prior year's chronic absence rate from the state report card file, by school, grade and subgroup, as the baseline for the first quarterly report.

Year one

1. Each principal runs the identification report monthly and makes the documented two-way family contact within 10 school days of identification, then opens a written plan within 20 school days for any student still at or above 10 percent.
2. The Superintendent assigns a case manager to every student at 20 percent or above, or whose attendance does not improve under a plan, and the case manager documents the transportation, health, housing, food, safety and school-climate assessment and the referrals made.
3. The Superintendent delivers the quarterly report to the Board with the chronic absence rate, the share of identified students contacted within 10 school days, the number of plans opened and the number of truancy referrals filed, by school, grade and subgroup, and publishes it on the district website within 30 days.
4. The Superintendent audits a sample of every truancy referral filed in year one to confirm the contact, plan and barrier assessment were documented before the referral.

Ongoing

1. Each principal continues the monthly review, and the Superintendent continues quarterly reporting to the Board and website publication within 30 days of each report.
2. The Board reviews the quarterly report each quarter and asks the Superintendent to explain any school where fewer identified students received a documented contact within 10 school days than in the prior quarter.
3. The Superintendent reviews the policy and the referral audit annually and reports to the Board whether any truancy referral was filed without the required documented supportive steps.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Percent of enrolled students missing 10 percent or more of enrolled days (the state chronic absence measure in the EDFacts or state report card file), by school, grade and subgroup; the share of identified students who received a documented two-way family contact within 10 school days; and the number of truancy referrals filed, each tracked monthly and reported quarterly.

BASELINE	The prior school year's chronic absence rate from the state report card file, by school, grade and subgroup, plus the number of truancy referrals filed in that year; the contact-within-10-school-days share starts at zero because it was not previously tracked.
TARGET	**Within 1 year every school reports the share of identified students contacted within 10 school days rising each quarter, with zero truancy referrals filed without a documented contact, plan and barrier assessment; within 1 to 3 years the chronic absence rate falls below the baseline in every school and subgroup, with a reduction in the range of 8 to 15 percent of the baseline rate consistent with the family-contact and caseworker studies.**
BENCHMARK	Controlled studies cited in the entry: family mailings and texts cut chronic absence 10 to 15 percent (2 to 7 points); school-based material-needs caseworkers cut it 8 percent; Check & Connect mentoring cut absences 4.2 days (23 percent) in grades 5 to 7 and had no effect in grades 1 to 4; pooled attendance interventions show small effects (g = 0.09 to 0.25). The entry gives no benchmark for the contact-within-10-days share or for referral counts, so those targets are directional.
REPORTED	The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes the figures on the district website within 30 days of each report; the Board reviews the annual chronic absence rate against the baseline at the end of each school year.

– 5. District pre-kindergarten TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Every rigorous evaluation finds public pre-K raises school readiness at kindergarten entry (Boston 0.4 to 0.6 SD in language and math, Tulsa large gains, Tennessee gains at end of pre-K), but what happens next depends on the program and the schools that follow: Boston's lottery cohorts showed no later test-score gains yet higher high school graduation, SAT taking and college enrollment and less juvenile incarceration, Tulsa's cohorts kept middle school math and course-taking advantages, and Tennessee's statewide program, a randomized trial, left participants worse off than controls on achievement, discipline and special education by sixth grade. A meta-analysis of 22 causal studies finds average long-run reductions in special education placement (8 points) and grade retention (8 points) and higher graduation (11 points). (Kindergarten entry: +0.4 to +0.6 SD (Boston); long run: special education -8.1 points, grade retention -8.3 points, high school graduation +11.4 points (meta-analysis); Boston lottery: college enrollment up, juvenile incarceration down, test scores null; Tennessee RCT: sixth-grade achievement, discipline and special education all worse than controls)
40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50

Where the evidence is mixed. The only large randomized trial of a scaled state program (Tennessee Voluntary Pre-K, n 2,990) found that children offered pre-K had lower state test scores in grades 3 through 6, more disciplinary infractions, worse attendance and more special education designations than wait-listed controls. Test-score fadeout by grade 3 is the norm even in positive studies (Bailey et al. 2017), and the Boston long-run gains came from a program with coached teachers, a shared curriculum and small classes that most districts do not replicate. The Tulsa evidence relies on propensity-score weighting, not randomization. Pre-K is among the most expensive grades to add, and poor-quality programs can be worse than the child-care arrangements they replace.

Standard. District pre-K uses an adopted evidence-based curriculum, certified lead teachers with ongoing coaching, class sizes of 20 or fewer with two adults, and a full instructional day, and the district tracks each pre-K cohort through third grade and reports readiness and later outcomes by subgroup.

1. The policy requires district pre-K to use an adopted evidence-based curriculum.
2. The policy requires certified lead teachers in district pre-K with ongoing coaching.
3. The policy caps district pre-K class sizes at 20 or fewer children with two adults in each class. CORE
4. The policy requires district pre-K to run a full instructional day.
5. The policy requires the district to track each pre-K cohort through third grade.
6. The policy requires the district to report pre-K readiness and later outcomes by subgroup.

> **Policy.** Any pre-kindergarten program the district operates shall use a Board-adopted curriculum with published evidence of effectiveness, employ a lead teacher holding early childhood certification in every classroom, provide at least two adults for every classroom of no more than twenty (20) children, offer a full instructional day of the same length as kindergarten, and provide each teacher at least monthly instructional coaching. Enrollment priority shall go to children eligible for free or reduced-price meals, English learners and children with identified disabilities. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by November 1 of each year the number of age-eligible children enrolled and wait-listed by attendance area and subgroup, class sizes, teacher

> certification, and fall kindergarten entry assessment results for former pre-K attendees compared with non-attendees, and shall report by August 1 of each year the third-grade reading proficiency, grade retention and special education referral rates of the cohort that attended district pre-K four years earlier compared with the district average.

Indicator. Share of age-eligible four-year-olds enrolled in district pre-K, by income and attendance area (enrollment file); kindergarten entry assessment results for pre-K attendees versus non-attendees by subgroup; pre-K class size, teacher certification and curriculum adoption; third-grade reading proficiency, grade retention and special education referral rates for the pre-K cohort tracked longitudinally.

Red flags in real manuals. pre-K classes above 20 children or with a single adult; lead teachers without early childhood certification; no adopted curriculum or coaching provision; half-day pre-K only; enrollment by first-come first-served with no priority for low-income or English learner children; no longitudinal reporting on pre-K cohorts

Law. Federal Head Start (42 USC 9831 et seq.) serves children below the poverty line with its own performance standards (class size 20 or fewer, two staff). State pre-K programs set eligibility, class size and teacher credential rules; 44 states and the District of Columbia fund some pre-K, and universal programs exist in Oklahoma, Florida, Georgia, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin and the District of Columbia. IDEA Part B section 619 requires preschool special education for eligible three- to five-year-olds in every district.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through the Director of Early Childhood Education

First 90 days

1. The Director of Early Childhood Education inventories every district pre-K classroom against the clause within 60 days, recording curriculum in use, lead teacher certification, class size, adult-to-child ratio, instructional day length and coaching frequency, and reports the gaps to the Superintendent.
2. The Superintendent brings the Board a list of candidate curricula with published evidence of effectiveness within 90 days, and the Board adopts one by vote.
3. The Director of Enrollment builds an enrollment priority process that ranks applicants by free or reduced-price meal eligibility, English learner status and identified disability, and publishes it for the next application window.
4. The Director of Assessment designates the fall kindergarten entry assessment and the data fields needed to flag each kindergartner as a former district pre-K attendee or non-attendee by subgroup.

Year one

1. The Director of Human Resources fills every lead teacher position with an early childhood certified teacher or places uncertified incumbents on a dated certification plan before the first day of the next school year.
2. The Director of Early Childhood Education assigns an instructional coach to each pre-K teacher and schedules at least monthly coaching visits, logging each visit by classroom.
3. The Superintendent reschedules any classroom not yet on a full instructional day equal to kindergarten and caps enrollment at 20 children with two adults before the next school year

opens.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first November 1 report on enrollment, wait lists, class sizes, certification and kindergarten entry results by attendance area and subgroup.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Assessment maintains a longitudinal cohort file linking each pre-K cohort to its third-grade reading proficiency, grade retention and special education referral records.
2. The Superintendent reports to the Board each November 1 on enrollment and kindergarten readiness and each August 1 on the third-grade outcomes of the cohort that attended pre-K four years earlier compared with the district average.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Kindergarten entry assessment results for former district pre-K attendees versus non-attendees by subgroup, and third-grade reading proficiency, grade retention and special education referral rates for each tracked pre-K cohort compared with the district average.
BASELINE	The first November 1 report establishes the kindergarten entry gap between attendees and non-attendees by subgroup, and the first August 1 report establishes the third-grade reading, retention and special education referral rates for the earliest cohort that can be linked.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, every pre-K classroom meets all five program conditions in the clause (adopted curriculum, certified lead teacher, 20 or fewer children with two adults, full day, monthly coaching). Within 1 to 3 years, former pre-K attendees score higher on the fall kindergarten entry assessment than non-attendees in every reported subgroup, and the tracked cohort shows grade retention and special education referral rates below the district average with third-grade reading proficiency at or above it, with no cohort trending worse than the district average on any of the three measures.**
BENCHMARK	Rigorous evaluations show kindergarten entry gains of 0.4 to 0.6 SD (Boston), and a meta-analysis of 22 causal studies finds special education placement down 8.1 points, grade retention down 8.3 points and high school graduation up 11.4 points; the Tennessee randomized trial, where participants were worse off by sixth grade on achievement, discipline and special education, is the warning case the cohort tracking is designed to catch early.

REPORTED	Superintendent reports to the Board each November 1 (enrollment, wait lists, class size, certification, kindergarten entry results by subgroup) and each August 1 (third-grade reading, retention and special education referral for the cohort that attended four years earlier versus the district average), with results published on the district website.

– 6. Dual enrollment and early college TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Two independent lottery-based randomized studies of early college high schools (North Carolina, followed 17 years, and the AIR national study, followed six years past graduation) find higher high school graduation, college enrollment, and degree completion, with very large effects on associate degrees and bachelor's gains for low-income and first-generation students. A Tennessee RCT of a dual-credit math course shifted students from remedial to precalculus and AP math and from two-year to four-year colleges, though it did not raise overall college enrollment. The What Works Clearinghouse rates dual enrollment as having positive effects on degree attainment, credit accumulation, and completing school. (Early college: college enrollment +7 percentage points (84 vs 77 percent at year 10 in NC), bachelor's +5 points (30 vs 25 percent), associate degree effects very large; AIR study: enrollment and degree completion up within six years. Dual-credit math RCT: no change in overall enrollment, shift toward four-year colleges for mid-achievers. Observational dual enrollment: degree attainment gains largest for low-income students.) [51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59]

Where the evidence is mixed. Early college effects come from a whole-school model with college-going culture, supports, and a community college partner on site; a la carte dual enrollment courses are not the same intervention. The Tennessee RCT of a single dual-credit course found no effect on overall college enrollment and only limited evidence of better college math performance. Dual enrollment and AP participation gaps by race exist in most districts, and gaps widen where seats expand without equity supports (Xu, Solanki and Fink 2021). Credits earned may not transfer to the student's eventual college, and some AIR early college impacts were stronger for students with higher prior achievement. Early college GPA at completion and double-majoring did not differ from controls.

Standard. Every high school shall offer dual enrollment with a public college partner at no cost to students, with automatic eligibility for students meeting an objective threshold, transportation and textbooks provided, and participation and credit outcomes reported annually by student group; districts of sufficient size shall operate or partner with an early college pathway.

1. The policy requires every high school to offer dual enrollment with a public college partner at no cost to students. CORE
2. The policy makes students automatically eligible for dual enrollment when they meet an objective threshold.
3. The policy provides transportation and textbooks for dual enrollment students.
4. The policy requires annual reporting of dual enrollment participation and credit outcomes by student group.
5. The policy requires districts of sufficient size to operate or partner with an early college pathway.

> **Policy.** The district shall maintain a written agreement with at least one accredited public college under which every high school offers dual-credit courses, on the high school campus or online, in general education subjects that transfer to the state's public universities. Tuition, fees, textbooks, and transportation for dual-credit courses shall be paid by the district or the partner college, and no student shall be charged. Any student who meets the partner college's placement standard or the state standard on the high school assessment shall be eligible, and principals shall notify eligible students and their parents or guardians in writing by March 1 for the following year. The district shall

> operate, or partner with, at least one early college pathway in which students can earn an associate degree or 60 transferable credits by the end of grade 12 or 13, with enrollment by lottery when oversubscribed. The Director of College and Career Readiness shall report to the Board by November 1 each year: dual-credit participation, courses passed, credits earned and credits transferred, and early college enrollment and completion, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, together with postsecondary enrollment of the prior graduating class from the National Student Clearinghouse.

Indicator. Share of graduates who earned at least one transferable college credit in high school and share who earned 12 or more, by race, ethnicity, income, English learner and disability status (state report card and National Student Clearinghouse); dual enrollment course pass rates; share of credits that transferred; postsecondary enrollment and completion of dual enrollment participants versus non-participants.

Red flags in real manuals. students pay tuition, fees, or textbook costs for dual enrollment; dual enrollment limited to students with a minimum GPA above the college's own placement standard; counselor or principal approval required with no objective criteria; dual enrollment offered only off campus with no transportation; no articulation agreement or no record of credit transfer; no reporting of participation by student group

Law. Nearly every state has a dual enrollment statute; eligibility rules, funding, and who pays tuition vary by state (for example Washington's Running Start under RCW 28A.600.300 and Texas Education Code 28.009). Title IV of ESSA permits Title I and Title IV-A funds for dual enrollment and early college, and Perkins V allows CTE funds for dual credit in CTE programs of study. Several states require that dual-credit general education courses transfer to public universities.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of College and Career Readiness

First 90 days

1. The Director of College and Career Readiness inventories every high school's current dual-credit offerings, partner agreements, student charges, and eligibility rules within 30 days.
2. The Superintendent opens negotiations with at least one accredited public college on a written agreement covering courses, tuition and fee payment, textbooks, transportation, and transferability within 60 days.
3. The Chief Financial Officer identifies Title I, Title IV-A, Perkins V, and state dual enrollment funds that can pay tuition, textbooks, and transportation and presents a cost estimate to the Board within 90 days.
4. The Director of Research and Assessment builds the disaggregated dual-credit participation, pass, credit, and transfer report template and confirms National Student Clearinghouse access within 90 days.

Year one

1. The Superintendent brings the signed college partnership agreement to the Board for approval so that every high school offers transferable general education dual-credit courses, on campus or

online, in the next school year.
2. Each principal identifies every student who meets the partner college's placement standard or the state assessment standard and mails written eligibility notices to those students and their parents or guardians by March 1.
3. The Director of College and Career Readiness designs an early college pathway leading to an associate degree or 60 transferable credits by the end of grade 12 or 13, with a lottery admission process for oversubscription, and presents it for Board approval before the first application window opens.
4. The Director of College and Career Readiness delivers the first annual report to the Board by November 1 covering participation, courses passed, credits earned and transferred, early college enrollment, and prior-class postsecondary enrollment, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.

Ongoing

1. The Director of College and Career Readiness reports to the Board by November 1 each year with the full disaggregated dual-credit, early college, and postsecondary enrollment data.
2. Principals send written eligibility notices by March 1 each year and the Director audits each school to confirm that no student was charged for tuition, fees, textbooks, or transportation.
3. The Superintendent reviews the college partnership agreement at least every 3 years and renegotiates course offerings and transferability guarantees as state transfer rules change.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of graduates who earned at least one transferable college credit in high school and share who earned 12 or more, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus dual-credit pass rates, share of credits that transferred, early college enrollment and completion, and postsecondary enrollment of participants versus non-participants from the National Student Clearinghouse.
BASELINE	The first November 1 report sets the baseline for each measure and each student group, using the most recent graduating class and the inventory of current student charges and offerings.
TARGET	**Within 1 year every high school offers no-cost dual-credit courses and all eligible students receive written notice by March 1; within 3 years the share of graduates earning at least one transferable credit and the share earning 12 or more rise each year in every student group, gaps for low-income, first-generation, English learner, and disability-status students narrow, and postsecondary enrollment of dual enrollment participants exceeds that of non-participants.**

BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric participation benchmark; the research reference points are the North Carolina early college results of college enrollment at 84 versus 77 percent at year 10 and bachelor's completion at 30 versus 25 percent, and the What Works Clearinghouse positive rating for dual enrollment on degree attainment, credit accumulation, and completing school.
REPORTED	Director of College and Career Readiness to the Board by November 1 each year, posted publicly with the state report card and National Student Clearinghouse data, with the Board reviewing progress against the baseline at that meeting.

– 7. Early literacy instruction and K-3 reading screening TIER A STAKES 5/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Systematic, explicit phonics instruction in K-1 raises word reading, spelling and comprehension by a moderate amount (about 0.4 SD) and is the only reading-disability treatment whose efficacy is confirmed in randomized trials; curriculum-based screening in K-2 predicts later reading well enough to find at-risk readers early. State 'science of reading' laws raise high-stakes elementary reading scores by a small amount so far, mainly where the policy is comprehensive, and the gains on low-stakes NAEP are not yet statistically clear. (Phonics d = 0.41 overall, 0.55 when begun in K-1; intensive K-3 interventions about 0.3 to 0.4 SD; state literacy laws +0.025 to +0.10 SD on state tests, NAEP effect not significant) 60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69

Where the evidence is mixed. Suggate (2016) found phonics-only gains fade more at follow-up than phonemic awareness and comprehension gains, so phonics is necessary but not sufficient. Bowers (2020) reviewed 12 meta-analyses and argues the advantage of systematic phonics over alternative methods is smaller and less consistent than usually claimed; Torgerson et al. (2018) rate the effect moderate and the evidence base thinner than policy rhetoric implies. Westall and Cummings (2023) find that state early literacy laws move high-stakes scores by only 0.025 to 0.05 SD on average, that effects fade by middle school unless the policy is comprehensive, and that NAEP gains are not statistically significant; Mississippi's rise from 49th to the national average on fourth-grade NAEP reading (2013 to 2019) coincided with a package of screening, LETRS teacher training, coaching and third-grade retention, so no single component can claim the credit. Screening accuracy varies by tool and by how it is administered.

Standard. The policy shall require that core K-3 reading instruction be explicit and systematic in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, shall prohibit three-cueing as the primary word-reading strategy, and shall require a valid universal screener three times a year in K-3 with intervention for every student flagged at risk.

1. The policy requires core K-3 reading instruction to be explicit and systematic in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. CORE
2. The policy prohibits three-cueing as the primary word-reading strategy.
3. The policy requires a valid universal screener administered three times a year in grades K-3.
4. The policy requires intervention for every student the screener flags as at risk.

> **Policy.** Core reading instruction in kindergarten through grade 3 shall be explicit and systematic in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Instructional materials that direct students to identify words primarily from pictures, context or syntax (three-cueing) shall not be adopted as core or intervention materials. The Superintendent shall administer a universal reading screener with published classification accuracy to every student in kindergarten through grade 3 within the first 30 school days of the year and again in the winter and spring windows. Any student identified as at risk shall begin a documented, evidence-based intervention within 15 school days of the screening, and the student's parent or guardian shall be notified in writing within the same period. All K-3 teachers of reading and all elementary principals shall complete a Board-approved structured-literacy training within two years of hire. The Director of Curriculum shall report to the Board each November and

> each June the screening participation rate, the share of students at risk by school and subgroup, the share of at-risk students receiving intervention within 15 days, and third-grade state ELA results.

Indicator. Share of K-3 students screened within the first 30 school days of each year and share flagged at risk (district screener data, e.g. DIBELS 8 or Acadience); share of flagged students receiving a documented intervention within 15 school days; third-grade state ELA proficiency rate and the subgroup gaps; percent of K-3 teachers with completed structured-literacy training.

Red flags in real manuals. balanced literacy or guided reading named as the core K-3 program; three-cueing, MSV, or 'use the picture' strategies in the reading policy or adopted materials; screening only for students referred by a teacher rather than universal; no timeline between screening and the start of intervention; parent notification of reading risk only at report card time; phonics limited to kindergarten or treated as an intervention rather than core instruction

Law. By 2021, 41 states and DC had early literacy laws (Westall and Cummings). Mississippi's Literacy-Based Promotion Act (2013) requires K-3 screening, intervention, LETRS-trained teachers and third-grade retention. Ohio HB 33 (2023) requires science-of-reading core curricula and bans three-cueing. Texas HB 3 (2019) requires K-3 teachers to complete reading academies. Most states now mandate K-3 dyslexia or reading-risk screening; check the state's screener approval list before scoring a district's choice of tool.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Curriculum, under the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Curriculum inventories every K-3 core and intervention reading program against the state's approved list and flags any material that teaches three-cueing as the primary word-reading strategy.
2. The Superintendent selects a universal screener with published classification accuracy from the state's approved screener list and adopts a 30-school-day fall screening window for every K-3 student.
3. The Director of Curriculum builds a tracking sheet that records, for each flagged student, the screening date, the intervention start date, and the date of the written parent notice, so the 15-school-day deadlines can be checked.
4. Each elementary principal counts the K-3 reading teachers and principals who have not completed a structured-literacy training and reports the number to the Director of Curriculum.
5. The Superintendent sets the two-year training deadline for each K-3 reading teacher and principal from their hire date and informs them in writing.

Year one

1. The Director of Curriculum completes the first fall, winter and spring screening windows for every K-3 student and delivers the November and June reports to the Board with participation, at-risk share by school and subgroup, and 15-day intervention rate.
2. The Superintendent replaces any core or intervention material that relies on three-cueing with explicit, systematic materials covering phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, and brings the adoption to the Board.

3. Each elementary principal enrolls every untrained K-3 reading teacher in the Board-approved structured-literacy training and confirms that interventions for flagged students are documented and evidence-based.
4. The Director of Curriculum reviews the first year's screening and intervention data with each principal and corrects any school where flagged students waited more than 15 school days.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Curriculum reports to the Board each November and June the screening participation rate, the at-risk share by school and subgroup, the 15-day intervention rate, the training completion percentage, and third-grade state ELA results.
2. The Superintendent confirms each year that the screener remains on the state's approved list and that no newly adopted material uses three-cueing.
3. Each elementary principal audits a sample of intervention records each semester for documentation and timely parent notice.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of K-3 students screened within the first 30 school days; share of flagged students beginning a documented intervention within 15 school days; percent of K-3 reading teachers and principals with completed structured-literacy training; third-grade state ELA proficiency rate and subgroup gaps.
BASELINE	First fall screening window after adoption: participation rate, at-risk share by school and subgroup, and 15-day intervention rate as reported to the Board in November of year one; prior-year third-grade state ELA proficiency and subgroup gaps.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, every K-3 student is screened within the first 30 school days and every flagged student begins a documented intervention with written parent notice within 15 school days; within 2 years of hire, every K-3 reading teacher and elementary principal completes the structured-literacy training; third-grade state ELA proficiency rises and subgroup gaps narrow over 1 to 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	Explicit systematic phonics shows d = 0.41 overall and 0.55 when begun in K-1; intensive K-3 interventions show about 0.3 to 0.4 SD; state literacy laws show +0.025 to +0.10 SD on state tests with no significant NAEP effect yet, so a district should expect small gains on state ELA scores in the first years rather than a step change. The entry gives no numeric proficiency or gap target.
REPORTED	Director of Curriculum reports to the Board each November and each June, by school and subgroup, with the third-grade state ELA results included in the June report.

– 8. English learner programs and reclassification TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Lottery studies show dual-language immersion raises English reading achievement (Portland: +13 percentile points by grade 5 and +22 by grade 8, with no loss in math or science; Charlotte: +0.04 to 0.05 SD per year in math and reading for English learners and non-learners alike) and raises the share of English learners reclassified by grade 6. Regression-discontinuity studies of reclassification show that the rule matters more than the label: reclassifying students on a single lenient test score harmed later outcomes, while multi-measure criteria that keep supports in place removed the harm, and timely reclassification before the grade 5 and grade 8 transitions improved on-time graduation. (Dual-language immersion: English reading +13 to +22 percentile points by grade 5 to 8 (Portland lottery); +0.04 to 0.05 SD per year (Charlotte lottery). Reclassification effects: +0.25 SD English test scores for marginal grade 2 to 4 reclassifiers in Los Angeles; harmful under single-test lenient criteria, null under multi-measure criteria.) [70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80]

Where the evidence is mixed. Dual-language immersion effects are concentrated in English reading; the Portland lottery found no effect on math or science and the Charlotte study found no effect on EL status. Reclassification effects vary by district: Cimpian, Thompson and Makowski (2017) found that where reclassification cuts off services abruptly, marginal reclassified students lost ground, and Pope (2016) found no benefit for students reclassified in later grades. Johnson (2019) found no effect of initial EL classification on graduation or college entry, so the classification itself is not the lever; program quality and exit rules are. Dual immersion students in San Francisco scored lower in English language arts in early grades before catching up and passing peers by middle school (Valentino and Reardon 2015), which can look like failure on short-horizon accountability measures. Program seats are limited by the supply of bilingual teachers.

Standard. The district shall offer a dual-language or bilingual program where enrollment supports it, use multiple measures (state proficiency test plus academic performance and teacher input) for reclassification, continue academic monitoring and supports for at least four years after exit, and place English learners in grade-level core content with language support rather than in separate lower-track courses.

1. The policy requires reclassification to use multiple measures: the state proficiency test plus academic performance and teacher input. CORE
2. The policy requires the district to offer a dual-language or bilingual program where enrollment supports it.
3. The policy requires academic monitoring and supports to continue for at least four years after a student exits English learner status.
4. The policy requires English learners to be placed in grade-level core content with language support rather than separate lower-track courses.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall ensure that every English learner receives a language instruction program meeting the standards of Castaneda v. Pickard and that English learners are enrolled in grade-level core academic courses with integrated language support; placement in a course below grade level solely on the basis of English learner status is prohibited. Where at least 20 English learners who share a home language are enrolled at a grade level, the Superintendent shall offer a dual-language or bilingual program at that grade level or report to the Board the reason it cannot. Reclassification

> shall require the state English language proficiency assessment plus at least two additional measures, including classroom academic performance and teacher recommendation, and shall not rest on a single test score. The Director of Multilingual Programs shall monitor every reclassified student for four academic years and shall re-enter supports when a reclassified student falls below grade level. By October 15 of each year the Director of Multilingual Programs shall report to the Board, disaggregated by school, program model, home language and years in program: reclassification rates, the number and share of long-term English learners, achievement and growth of current and former English learners, and English learner enrollment in advanced and core courses. Program models, exit criteria and this report shall be posted on the district website.

Indicator. Annual EL reclassification rate by years in program and by program model; share of long-term English learners (6 or more years); state English language proficiency assessment growth; ELA and math achievement of current and former ELs tracked for four years after reclassification; EL enrollment in grade-level core courses and advanced courses (student information system course rosters); dual-language seats offered versus applicants.

Red flags in real manuals. reclassification based solely on the state English proficiency test; no monitoring period for reclassified students; English learners scheduled into ELD in place of a core subject; program described only as 'English immersion' with no bilingual option; no named administrator responsible for English learner services; parent waiver required to receive bilingual instruction; no annual report of EL outcomes to the board

Law. Lau v. Nichols (1974) and Castaneda v. Pickard (5th Cir. 1981) require programs based on sound theory, adequately resourced and evaluated; the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 codifies the duty. ESSA Title III requires standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures and four years of monitoring of former ELs for accountability. The 2015 joint Department of Justice and Department of Education Dear Colleague letter sets expectations for identification, program access, reclassification and monitoring. California Proposition 58 (2016) repealed English-only mandates; Arizona Proposition 203 and its four-hour ELD block were loosened by SB 1014 (2019); Texas requires bilingual education where 20 or more ELs share a language at a grade level (Texas Education Code 29.053).

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Multilingual Programs, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Multilingual Programs pulls student information system course rosters within 30 days to identify every English learner placed in a course below grade level and documents whether English learner status was the basis for placement.
2. The Superintendent directs principals to move any English learner placed below grade level solely on the basis of English learner status into grade-level core courses with integrated language support within 60 days.
3. The Director of Multilingual Programs produces a count, by school and grade level, of English learners who share a home language and flags every grade level with at least 20 such students for

a dual-language or bilingual program decision.
4. The Director of Multilingual Programs drafts written reclassification criteria that require the state English language proficiency assessment plus at least two additional measures, including classroom academic performance and teacher recommendation, and submits them to the Superintendent within 90 days.
5. The Director of Multilingual Programs builds a roster of every student reclassified in the past four academic years so that monitoring can begin on the current cohort.

Year one

1. The Superintendent presents to the Board, for each grade level with at least 20 English learners sharing a home language, either a dual-language or bilingual program plan with a start date or a written reason the program cannot be offered.
2. The Director of Multilingual Programs runs the first full reclassification cycle under the multi-measure criteria and confirms that no student exits on a single test score.
3. The Director of Multilingual Programs establishes a quarterly review of every reclassified student's grades and assessment results and re-enters supports for any student who falls below grade level.
4. By October 15 the Director of Multilingual Programs delivers the first annual report to the Board, disaggregated by school, program model, home language and years in program, and posts program models, exit criteria and the report on the district website.

Ongoing

1. Each year by October 15 the Director of Multilingual Programs reports to the Board on reclassification rates, long-term English learners, achievement and growth of current and former English learners, and English learner enrollment in advanced and core courses.
2. The Director of Multilingual Programs monitors every reclassified student for four academic years and documents each re-entry of supports.
3. The Superintendent reviews dual-language seats offered versus applicants each spring and repeats the 20-student threshold check for every grade level.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Annual reclassification rate by years in program and program model; number and share of long-term English learners (6 or more years); ELA and math achievement of former English learners tracked for four years after reclassification; share of English learners enrolled in grade-level core courses and advanced courses; dual-language seats offered versus applicants.
BASELINE	The first October 15 report establishes the baseline for each measure using the prior school year's data, including the current count of English learners placed below grade level and the current number of grade levels where 20 or more English learners share a home language but no dual-language or bilingual program exists.
TARGET	**Within 180 days, zero English learners placed in a course below grade level solely on the basis of English learner status and zero reclassifications resting on a single**

	test score; within 1 to 3 years, the share of long-term English learners (6 or more years) declines each year from baseline, the reclassification rate rises from baseline, former English learners show no decline in ELA and math achievement across the four monitored years, and every grade level with 20 or more English learners sharing a home language has a dual-language or bilingual program or a Board-reviewed reason it does not.
BENCHMARK	Lottery studies found dual-language immersion raised English reading by 13 percentile points by grade 5 and 22 by grade 8 in Portland and by 0.04 to 0.05 SD per year in Charlotte, and raised the share of English learners reclassified by grade 6; multi-measure reclassification with continued supports produced null rather than harmful effects. These are research effects, not district targets, so the district target is directional. ESSA Title III sets the four-year monitoring period and Texas Education Code 29.053 sets the 20-student threshold.
REPORTED	The Director of Multilingual Programs reports to the Board by October 15 each year, disaggregated by school, program model, home language and years in program, and posts the report with program models and exit criteria on the district website; the Board compares each measure against the baseline year and the prior year.

– 9. Full-day kindergarten TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Full-day kindergarten raises achievement at the end of the kindergarten year by about 0.25 to 0.35 SD compared with half-day programs (meta-analysis of 40 studies; Community Guide systematic review; an Indiana lottery experiment found 0.31 SD in literacy, larger for Hispanic children and low-entering-skill children), but in most US studies the test-score advantage fades by third grade. (End of kindergarten: +0.25 SD (meta-analysis) to +0.35 SD (Community Guide; verbal +0.46, math +0.24); lottery experiment: literacy +0.31 SD, Hispanic children +0.70 SD; advantage largely gone by grade 3 in ECLS-K studies) [81,82,83,84,85,86,87]

Where the evidence is mixed. Fadeout is the consistent finding: Cannon, Jacknowitz and Painter (2006) and Cooper et al. (2010) both find the achievement difference disappears by third grade, and the 2006 study found no extra benefit for children below the poverty line. Cooper's meta-analysis also found suggestive evidence of less positive attitudes toward school and more behavior problems in full-day programs. Ontario's play-based full-day program showed lasting gains through grade 2 and grade 3 reading, so persistence may depend on program design and the quality of the grades that follow. Full-day kindergarten roughly doubles the staffing and space cost of the grade.

Standard. The district offers tuition-free full-day kindergarten, with the same daily instructional minutes as grade 1, to every eligible child in every attendance area, and reports enrollment and end-of-year readiness results by subgroup.

1. The policy provides tuition-free full-day kindergarten to every eligible child in every attendance area. CORE
2. The policy gives kindergarten the same daily instructional minutes as grade 1.
3. The policy does not offer full-day kindergarten only as a tuition or fee program.
4. The policy does not limit full-day seats to certain buildings or a lottery without a plan to expand.
5. The policy requires reporting of kindergarten enrollment and end-of-year readiness results by subgroup.

> **Policy.** The district shall offer a tuition-free full-day kindergarten program in every elementary attendance area, with daily instructional minutes equal to those of grade 1, and shall enroll every age-eligible child whose family requests it. Half-day enrollment shall be available only at a family's written request. The kindergarten program shall include daily recess and a play-based component, and shall not reduce time for physical education, art or music below the grade 1 allocation. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 of each year the number and percentage of kindergarten students enrolled full-day by building and subgroup, any waiting list, and the results of the fall kindergarten entry assessment, and by July 15 of each year the end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening results by subgroup and the kindergarten chronic absence rate.

Indicator. Share of kindergarten students enrolled in a free full-day program (enrollment file); daily kindergarten instructional minutes compared with grade 1; kindergarten entry assessment and end-of-

year literacy and numeracy screening results by subgroup; kindergarten attendance and chronic absence rate.

Red flags in real manuals. full-day kindergarten offered only as a tuition or fee program; full-day seats limited to certain buildings or by lottery with no plan to expand; kindergarten day shorter than grade 1 by more than 30 minutes; no kindergarten readiness or end-of-year reporting; kindergarten listed as optional with no full-day provision

Law. State law sets whether districts must offer kindergarten and whether full-day is funded. Education Commission of the States counted 15 states plus the District of Columbia requiring districts to offer full-day kindergarten as of 2018; Washington and Rhode Island have since added requirements. Most states fund full-day kindergarten at the full per-pupil rate but do not require it, and six states do not require districts to offer any kindergarten. Check the state code for the required daily minutes and attendance age.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education as day-to-day lead

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent checks the state code for required kindergarten daily minutes, attendance age, and full-day funding, and reports the findings to the Board within 30 days.
2. The Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education inventories every elementary attendance area for current kindergarten format, daily instructional minutes compared with grade 1, tuition charged, classroom space, and staffing.
3. The Chief Financial Officer prepares a cost model for tuition-free full-day kindergarten in every attendance area, showing state per-pupil funding, added staff, and any space needs, for Board review within 90 days.
4. The Director of Curriculum drafts a kindergarten daily schedule that matches grade 1 instructional minutes and includes daily recess, a play-based component, and physical education, art and music at no less than the grade 1 allocation.
5. The Superintendent designates the fall kindergarten entry assessment and the end-of-year literacy and numeracy screeners that will be reported by subgroup.

Year one

1. The Board adopts the budget and staffing plan so that every attendance area offers tuition-free full-day kindergarten at the start of the next school year, with half-day only on a family's written request.
2. The Director of Student Services builds the registration form and the enrollment file fields that record full-day or half-day status by building and subgroup and any waiting list.
3. The Superintendent delivers the October 15 report on full-day enrollment by building and subgroup, any waiting list, and fall entry assessment results, and the July 15 report on end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening by subgroup and the kindergarten chronic absence rate.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education audits each building's kindergarten schedule once during the year to confirm minutes, recess, play-based time, and specials match the adopted schedule.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent presents the October 15 and July 15 reports every year and flags any building where full-day enrollment, a waiting list, or subgroup screening results have moved in the wrong direction.
2. The Chief Financial Officer confirms each spring that the next year's budget keeps full-day kindergarten tuition-free in every attendance area.
3. The Director of Curriculum reviews grade 3 reading results for recent kindergarten cohorts each year, since the entry gives notice that the early advantage can fade by grade 3 without follow-through.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of kindergarten students enrolled in a tuition-free full-day program, by building and subgroup, from the enrollment file; kindergarten daily instructional minutes compared with grade 1; end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening results by subgroup; kindergarten chronic absence rate.
BASELINE	The current year's enrollment file: percentage of kindergarten students in full-day, tuition-free seats by building and subgroup, any tuition charged, daily kindergarten minutes relative to grade 1, and the most recent end-of-year screening results by subgroup and chronic absence rate.
TARGET	**Within 1 year of adoption, every elementary attendance area offers tuition-free full-day kindergarten with daily instructional minutes equal to grade 1, every age-eligible child whose family requests it is enrolled with no waiting list, and the only half-day enrollments are those with a written family request; within 1 to 3 years, end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening results rise for every reported subgroup, with the largest gains expected among Hispanic children and children with low entering skills, and kindergarten chronic absence does not rise.**
BENCHMARK	The research gives an effect size, not an enrollment or screening threshold: full-day kindergarten raised end-of-kindergarten achievement by about 0.25 SD (meta-analysis of 40 studies) to 0.35 SD (Community Guide review; verbal +0.46, math +0.24), and an Indiana lottery experiment found +0.31 SD in literacy, with +0.70 SD for Hispanic children. The entry gives no numeric benchmark for enrollment share or screener pass rates, so the enrollment target is universal access and the achievement target is directional. The entry also notes the advantage largely fades by grade 3 in ECLS-K studies, so the Board should treat end-of-kindergarten gains as the primary check and grade 3 results as a watch item.

REPORTED	Superintendent to the Board by October 15 each year (full-day enrollment by building and subgroup, waiting list, fall entry assessment) and by July 15 each year (end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening by subgroup, kindergarten chronic absence rate), each with the prior year's figures alongside for comparison.

– 10. Gifted and advanced learner identification TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Replacing teacher or parent referral with universal screening of every student, with no change in the eligibility cutoff, raised gifted identification in Broward County from 3.3 to 5.5 percent of second graders, with the largest gains for low-income, Black, Hispanic and English learner students who had been systematically under-referred. Black students with the same test scores are referred less often than White students, especially by non-Black teachers, which is why referral-based systems miss them. (Broward universal screening: identification rate +67 percent overall; Hispanic identification roughly +130 percent, Black +80 percent, with eligibility cutoffs unchanged. Local (school) norms would further raise Black and Latinx representation. Gifted services themselves: achievement effects for marginal students near zero in RD studies, though high-achiever classrooms raised Black and Hispanic scores by 0.5 SD in one district.) [88,89,90,91,92,93,94]

Where the evidence is mixed. Universal screening fixes who is found, not what they get: regression-discontinuity and lottery studies find little or no short-run achievement gain for students at the margin of gifted eligibility (Bui, Craig and Imberman 2014), and nationally representative data show Black and low-income students do not see the small gains their peers get from gifted services (Redding and Grissom 2021). Broward suspended universal screening during budget cuts and identification fell back, showing the policy needs a funded test every year. Screening with a single nonverbal test can still under-identify English learners unless local norms or multiple measures are used.

Standard. Every student shall be screened for advanced learning services with a validated instrument at least once in the primary grades and once in middle school, without a prior referral, using multiple measures and local norms, and identification rates by student group shall be published annually.

1. The policy requires every student to be screened for advanced learning services without a prior teacher or parent referral. CORE
2. The policy requires the screening to use a validated instrument.
3. The policy requires screening at least once in the primary grades and once in middle school.
4. The policy requires identification to use multiple measures and local norms.
5. The policy requires identification rates by student group to be published annually.

> **Policy.** The district shall administer a validated ability or achievement screener to every student in grade 2 and again in grade 6, and to every student new to the district within one semester of enrollment, at no cost to families and without any requirement of teacher, parent, or self nomination. Eligibility shall be determined from multiple measures and shall use school-level or district-level local norms in addition to national norms, with nonverbal measures and native-language accommodations available for English learners. A student who meets the criteria shall be placed in services within one semester unless a parent or guardian declines in writing. The Director of Advanced Academics shall report to the Board by November 1 each year the percentage of each cohort screened, the number and percentage of students identified and served by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and the representation index for each group, and the Superintendent shall present a corrective plan for any group whose representation index is below 0.8.

Indicator. Share of each grade cohort screened (target 100 percent at the screening grade); identification rate by race, ethnicity, income, and English learner status compared with each group's share of enrollment (representation index); share of identified students receiving services; state gifted data collection and the federal Civil Rights Data Collection gifted enrollment counts.

Red flags in real manuals. identification requires a teacher or parent referral or nomination; testing only for students recommended by staff; a single national-norm cutoff (for example 130 IQ or 97th percentile) as the only criterion; screening or testing fees charged to families; no reporting of identification by student group; services limited to pull-out enrichment with no advanced curriculum

Law. No federal mandate to identify or serve gifted students; the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act funds research and demonstration only. State mandates vary widely: some states require identification and services and set identification rules (for example Texas Education Code chapter 29 subchapter D and Florida Rule 6A-6.03019 Plan B for underrepresented groups), others require neither. Gifted enrollment by race, sex, disability and English learner status is reported to the federal Civil Rights Data Collection.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Advanced Academics, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Advanced Academics selects a validated ability or achievement screener with nonverbal forms and native-language accommodations and brings the contract to the Board for approval within 60 days.
2. The Director of Advanced Academics and the Director of Assessment set the screening calendar for every grade 2 and grade 6 student and for students new to the district within one semester of enrollment, and publish it to schools by day 90.
3. The Superintendent revises the eligibility rules to use multiple measures and school-level or district-level local norms alongside national norms, and removes any teacher, parent, or self nomination requirement from the identification procedure.
4. The Director of Advanced Academics pulls the current gifted roster by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status and computes the baseline representation index for each group within 90 days.
5. The Director of Communications sends families a plain-language notice in home languages explaining that every child in the screening grades will be screened at no cost and how a parent or guardian may decline services in writing.

Year one

1. School principals administer the screener to every grade 2 and grade 6 student during the scheduled window, and the Director of Assessment reconciles rosters so that students absent on screening day are tested within 30 days.
2. The Director of Advanced Academics convenes eligibility reviews using multiple measures and local norms and places every student who meets the criteria in services within one semester unless a parent or guardian declines in writing.
3. The Director of Advanced Academics reports to the Board by November 1 the percentage of each cohort screened, the number and percentage of students identified and served by school and

student group, and the representation index for each group.
4. The Superintendent presents a corrective plan to the Board for any group whose representation index is below 0.8, naming the schools and the changes to norms, measures, or accommodations that will be made.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Advanced Academics repeats universal screening every year for grade 2, grade 6, and newly enrolled students and files the November 1 report to the Board.
2. The Director of Data and Accountability reconciles the district's gifted counts with the state gifted data collection and the federal Civil Rights Data Collection submission each reporting cycle.
3. The Board reviews the representation index by group at a public meeting each year and renews or revises the corrective plan for any group still below 0.8.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Percentage of each grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened, and the representation index (share of identified students in a group divided by that group's share of enrollment) for students by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status
BASELINE	Current year's share of the grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened under the referral-based system, and the current gifted representation index for each student group computed from the district roster in the first 90 days
TARGET	**100 percent of each grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened in year one, and the representation index for every student group reaches at least 0.8 within 3 years, with the identification rate for low-income, Black, Hispanic, and English learner students rising each year until that threshold is met**
BENCHMARK	Broward County raised overall identification from 3.3 to 5.5 percent of second graders (+67 percent) after universal screening with unchanged cutoffs, with Hispanic identification up roughly 130 percent and Black identification up roughly 80 percent; the clause sets 0.8 as the representation index floor that triggers a corrective plan
REPORTED	Annual report by the Director of Advanced Academics to the Board by November 1, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, with the same counts filed to the state gifted data collection and the federal Civil Rights Data Collection

– 11. Grade retention and promotion TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Regression discontinuity studies of test-based third-grade retention paired with intensive reading intervention (Florida, Indiana, Mississippi) show large short-run reading gains, with Indiana and Mississippi gains persisting into middle school. Long-run evidence is split: Florida retainees reached high school with higher GPAs and less remediation and no graduation penalty, while a 2026 Texas study finds retained third graders were 9 points less likely to graduate and earned 19 percent less at 26, and retention in later grades (Chicago grade 8, Louisiana grade 8) raises dropout and juvenile crime. (Short-run reading gains of roughly 0.2 to 0.6 SD that fade or persist by state; Texas: graduation -9 pp, earnings at 26 -19%; older grades: dropout up; disciplinary incidents up short-run (Florida)) [95,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103,104,105]

Where the evidence is mixed. Zhong (2026, Texas) is the longest follow-up of a modern test-based policy and finds net harm: higher absenteeism, violent behavior and juvenile crime, lower graduation and earnings despite temporary score gains. Ozek (2015) finds Florida retention raised disciplinary incidents and suspensions in the short run, concentrated among poor and male students. Jacob and Lefgren (2009) find grade 8 retention in Chicago raises dropout. Eren, Depew and Barnes (2017) find grade 8 retention in Louisiana raises juvenile crime. The pre-2000 literature summarized by Jimerson (2001) associated retention with worse achievement and adjustment, though Allen et al. (2009) show the negative estimates shrink toward zero in better-designed studies. The positive results all come from retention bundled with summer reading camps, high-quality teachers and intervention plans; nothing in the evidence supports retention alone. Retention costs taxpayers about one additional year of schooling per retained student, less than previously estimated (Winters 2022) but still substantial.

Standard. The policy shall prohibit retention as a stand-alone response, shall require that any retention in grades K-3 be preceded by documented intervention and followed by a written individual reading plan with a different and more intensive program, shall provide good-cause exemptions, and shall prohibit retention in grades 6 through 8 as a consequence of test scores alone.

1. The policy prohibits retention as a stand-alone response to a student's academic performance. CORE
2. The policy requires that any retention in grades K-3 be preceded by documented intervention.
3. The policy requires that any retention in grades K-3 be followed by a written individual reading plan.
4. The policy requires that the individual reading plan for a retained K-3 student use a different and more intensive program.
5. The policy provides good-cause exemptions from retention.
6. The policy prohibits retention in grades 6 through 8 as a consequence of test scores alone.

> **Policy.** No student shall be retained in grade solely on the basis of a single test score, and no student shall be retained more than once in grades K-3. Before any student in grades K-3 is retained, the principal shall document that the student received at least one semester of evidence-based intervention beyond core instruction, that the parent or guardian was notified in writing of the risk of retention at least 90 school days before the end of the year, and that a good-cause exemption review was completed for students with disabilities, English learners with fewer than two years of instruction, and students

> already retained. Every retained student shall receive a written individual reading plan, prepared by the principal and the reading specialist before the first day of the repeated year, that assigns a different core program or a highly rated teacher, at least 90 minutes of daily reading instruction, and progress monitoring every two weeks. Students in grades 6 through 8 shall not be retained on the basis of test scores. The Superintendent shall report to the Board each September the number of students retained in the prior year by grade, school, race, disability and English learner status, the share with a completed intervention record, and the reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier.

Indicator. Number and share of students retained by grade, school, race, disability and EL status each year (student information system); share of retained students who had a documented intervention plan before the retention decision; reading proficiency of retained students one and three years later compared with barely promoted peers; attendance and discipline of retained students.

Red flags in real manuals. retention at the discretion of the principal or teacher with no documented intervention first; promotion requirements based on a single cut score with no good-cause exemptions; retention permitted in middle school grades as a consequence of test scores or behavior; no individual plan or change of program for the repeated year; parent notification only after the retention decision; no limit on the number of times a student may be retained

Law. Florida (2002), Mississippi (2013), Indiana (2024 SEA 1), Alabama (effective 2023-24), Tennessee (effective 2023) and roughly a dozen other states require or strongly presume third-grade retention for students below a reading cut score, nearly all with good-cause exemptions. Michigan repealed its retention mandate effective 2024 and Ohio made retention optional in 2023 (HB 33). District policy must at least match state exemption and notification rules; where state law is silent, the district standard above governs.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, with the Director of Student Information Systems maintaining the retention data and the Director of Special Education and the EL Coordinator conducting good-cause exemption reviews.

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent directs legal counsel to compare the model clause against the state's retention statute, exemption list and parent notification rules and to report to the Board which of the two is stricter on each point so the district policy at least matches state law.
2. The Director of Student Information Systems adds fields to the student information system that record, for every retention decision, the grade, the intervention record, the date of written parent notice, the good-cause exemption review and the individual reading plan.
3. The Director of Curriculum and Instruction writes the template for the written individual reading plan, including the different core program or highly rated teacher assignment, the 90 minutes of daily reading instruction and the two-week progress monitoring schedule.
4. Each principal, with the reading specialist, lists every current K-3 student at risk of retention and confirms that each has at least one semester of documented evidence-based intervention beyond

core instruction under way.
5. The Superintendent sends every principal and middle school counselor written notice that students in grades 6 through 8 may not be retained on the basis of test scores.

Year one

1. Each K-3 principal sends written notice of retention risk to parents or guardians at least 90 school days before the end of the year and logs the date in the student information system.
2. The Director of Special Education and the EL Coordinator complete and sign a good-cause exemption review for every student with a disability, every English learner with fewer than two years of instruction and every student already retained before any retention decision is final.
3. The principal and reading specialist complete a written individual reading plan for every retained student before the first day of the repeated year, and the Director of Curriculum and Instruction audits a sample of plans for the required program change, minutes and monitoring schedule.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first September report to the Board with retentions by grade, school, race, disability and English learner status and the share with a completed intervention record.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board each September on prior-year retentions and on the reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier, compared with barely promoted peers.
2. The Director of Curriculum and Instruction reviews the two-week progress monitoring data for all retained students each quarter and reassigns program or teacher where a student is not gaining.
3. The Director of Student Information Systems reviews retention counts by race, disability and EL status each spring and flags any school whose retention share for a subgroup exceeds its share of enrollment for Board review.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of retained K-3 students whose retention record shows a completed intervention plan, written parent notice at least 90 school days before year end, a good-cause exemption review where required and an individual reading plan dated before the first day of the repeated year; number of students retained in grades 6 through 8 on the basis of test scores; reading proficiency and attendance of retained students one and three years after retention compared with barely promoted peers; discipline incidents of retained students.
BASELINE	The Superintendent establishes the baseline from the first September report: the number and share of students retained in the prior year by grade, school, race, disability and EL status, the share with a documented intervention plan before the decision, and the current reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier.

TARGET	**By the end of year one, every retained K-3 student has a complete intervention record, parent notice, exemption review and individual reading plan, zero students in grades 6 through 8 are retained on test scores alone, and no student is retained more than once in K-3; within 1 to 3 years, retained students' reading proficiency rises relative to barely promoted peers and their attendance and discipline do not worsen relative to those peers.**
BENCHMARK	The research gives no district-level numeric benchmark for compliance or outcomes. Regression discontinuity studies of test-based third-grade retention with intensive reading intervention report short-run reading gains of roughly 0.2 to 0.6 SD, persisting into middle school in Indiana and Mississippi but fading elsewhere; a 2026 Texas study finds retained third graders 9 points less likely to graduate and earning 19 percent less at 26, and Florida reports higher short-run disciplinary incidents, so the Board should expect reading gains only when the intervention is real and should watch attendance and discipline as warning signs.
REPORTED	The Superintendent presents the retention report to the Board each September, with the compliance measures for the prior year's retentions and the reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier, disaggregated by grade, school, race, disability and EL status, and the Board reviews any school with incomplete records or a subgroup retention share above its enrollment share at that meeting.

– 12. Grading practices (zeros, late work, minimum grades, standards-based grading) TIER C

STAKES 2/5

Tier C: consistent correlational evidence

Finding. Grades measure a mix of academic mastery and behavior and vary widely from teacher to teacher. The causal evidence favors two things: higher grading standards raise learning (Algebra I students of tougher graders learn more and keep the gain in later courses), and a standards-based system with formative feedback and reassessment for full credit raised ninth-grade math test scores by 0.33 SD in a cluster RCT. The specific rules districts fight over, no zeros, 50-percent floors and late-work penalties, have almost no outcome research; the one study of a minimum-grade policy is from a single school. (Higher teacher grading standards: positive effect on test scores and later math courses; PARLO standards-based grading RCT: +0.33 SD; minimum-grade and no-zero policies: no causal outcome evidence)
106,107,108,109,110,111,112,113,114,115,116,117

Where the evidence is mixed. Carey and Carifio (2012) found no grade inflation or social promotion under a 50-point floor at one urban high school over seven years, but it is a single site with no comparison group. Reeves (2004) argues against zeros on arithmetic grounds (a zero on a 100-point scale is a six-point penalty on a 4-point scale), which is a measurement argument, not outcome evidence. Welsh, D'Agostino and Kaniskan (2013) find standards-based report-card grades only moderately converge with state test scores and vary more within schools than between them. Hjorth-Trolle, Rosenqvist and Hed (2021) show that changing grading practice (Sweden's move from relative to absolute grades) widened the gap between students of low- and high-educated parents, so grading reforms can move equity in either direction. Gershenson, Holt and Tyner (2024), Betts and Grogger (2003) and Figlio and Lucas (2004) all point the other way from lenient grading: students learn more under higher standards. Equity-grading programs such as Feldman's have practitioner and pilot data but no peer-reviewed causal evaluation.

Standard. The policy shall require every course to publish, before the first grading period, how grades are computed, shall separate academic achievement from behavior and compliance in the reported grade, shall allow at least one reassessment of a summative standard for credit, and shall not mandate or forbid numeric floors without the district's own grade-to-test data.

1. The policy requires every course to publish how grades are computed before the first grading period.
2. The policy separates academic achievement from behavior and compliance in the reported grade. CORE
3. The policy allows at least one reassessment of a summative standard for credit.
4. The policy does not mandate or forbid numeric grade floors without the district's own grade-to-test data.

> **Policy.** Each teacher shall publish to students and parents, within the first ten school days of each course, the standards the course assesses, the categories and weights used to compute the grade, the reassessment procedure, and the late-work procedure. The reported academic grade shall reflect achievement on course standards; attendance, participation, effort and conduct shall be reported separately and shall not reduce the academic grade. A student who does not meet a standard on a summative assessment

> shall be permitted at least one reassessment of that standard within the grading period, and the higher score shall count. Late work submitted within the grading period shall be scored on the same standard as on-time work; any penalty for lateness shall be reported in the separate conduct or work-habits mark. Teachers of the same course in the same school shall use a common grading scale and weights. The Director of Assessment shall report to the Board each August, by school and course, the correlation between final grades and end-of-course or state test scores, the failure rate by teacher for courses with three or more sections, and the number of grading appeals, and shall recommend revisions to this policy where grades and test results diverge.

Indicator. Correlation between course grades and state or end-of-course test scores by school and course (gradebook export joined to assessment file); spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course; share of students with a D or F who passed the end-of-course exam and vice versa; count of grading appeals.

Red flags in real manuals. grading left entirely to individual teacher discretion with no published criteria; attendance, participation or behavior deductions built into the academic grade; no reassessment permitted or reassessment capped at a failing score; a zero required for any missing work with no window to submit; a mandated numeric floor adopted without any district grade-to-test review; different weighting across sections of the same course

Law. Few states regulate K-12 grading beyond GPA calculation for scholarships and transcripts. South Carolina enacted a 2026 law prohibiting districts from requiring a minimum grade above a student's actual performance (reported by Education Week, August 2026; verify the statute before citing). A 2024 RAND survey found about 27 percent of teachers reported a 'no zeros' policy at their school or district.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Assessment, with the Chief Academic Officer responsible for building-level compliance

First 90 days

1. The Director of Assessment drafts a one-page course grading plan template covering standards assessed, categories and weights, the reassessment procedure, and the late-work procedure, and the Chief Academic Officer approves it within 30 days of adoption.
2. Each principal collects a completed grading plan from every teacher and confirms that teachers of the same course in the same school share a common scale and weights before the first ten school days of the next course start.
3. The Director of Technology configures the student information system so attendance, participation, effort and conduct are entered in a separate work-habits mark that cannot alter the academic grade.
4. The Director of Assessment requests a gradebook export and the end-of-course and state assessment file from the prior year and joins them by student and course to produce the first grade-to-test correlation by school and course within 90 days.
5. The Superintendent designates a grading appeals contact in each school and instructs principals to log every appeal with its outcome.

Year one

1. The Director of Assessment delivers the first August report to the Board showing grade-to-test correlation by school and course, failure rate by teacher for courses with three or more sections, and the count of grading appeals.
2. The Chief Academic Officer runs professional learning on standards-based grading with formative feedback and reassessment for all secondary math teachers first, because the entry's strongest evidence (a 0.33 SD gain in ninth-grade math) comes from that subject.
3. Principals audit a sample of gradebooks each grading period to confirm reassessment was offered and the higher score was counted, and report findings to the Chief Academic Officer.
4. The Director of Assessment presents the district's own grade-to-test data to the Board before any proposal to mandate or forbid a numeric floor, and the Board takes no action on floors without it.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Assessment repeats the August report to the Board every year and recommends policy revisions where grades and test results diverge.
2. Principals verify the published grading plans at the start of every course and confirm common scales and weights across sections of the same course each semester.
3. The Superintendent reviews the grading appeals log each year and refers any teacher or course with repeated appeals to the Chief Academic Officer for support.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Correlation between final course grades and end-of-course or state test scores by school and course; spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course; share of students with a D or F who passed the end-of-course exam and vice versa; count of grading appeals; share of courses with a published grading plan within ten school days.
BASELINE	The first joined gradebook and assessment file produced within 90 days of adoption sets the baseline for correlation, failure-rate spread, grade-test mismatch and appeals; publication compliance has no baseline until the first principal collection.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of courses have a published grading plan within the first ten school days and all same-course sections in a school use a common scale and weights; within 1 to 3 years, the grade-to-test correlation rises and the spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course narrows in every school and course relative to the baseline, and the share of students with a D or F who passed the exam, and with an A or B who failed it, falls each year.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric benchmark for grade-to-test correlation, failure-rate spread, or appeal counts, so the target is directional. The 0.33 SD effect from the PARLO standards-based grading RCT is the only outcome figure in the entry and applies to ninth-grade math test scores, not to the indicators above; the entry reports no causal outcome evidence for no-zero or minimum-grade rules, and a 2024 RAND

	survey finding that about 27 percent of teachers report a no-zeros policy is prevalence, not a benchmark.
REPORTED	The Director of Assessment reports to the Board each August, by school and course, with the first report due in the August following adoption and the baseline comparison carried forward in every later report.

– 13. High-dosage tutoring TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Across 96 randomized trials, tutoring raises achievement by about 0.29 SD, with the largest effects when teachers or paraprofessionals tutor, sessions run at least three days a week, and tutoring happens during the school day. Post-pandemic programs run at district scale have produced much smaller gains (0.04 to 0.09 SD in reading and no math effect in Nashville), and a 263-trial reanalysis puts the realistic effect of large, test-targeted programs at 0.16 to 0.22 SD. (+0.29 SD pooled in RCTs; +0.18 to +0.40 SD math in Chicago Saga RCTs; +0.16 to +0.22 SD expected at scale; Nashville district program +0.04 to +0.09 SD reading, 0 in math) [118,119,120,121,122,123,124]

Where the evidence is mixed. Effects shrink sharply with program scale: Kraft, Schueler and Falken (2026) find pooled effects fall from 0.40 SD in the full sample to 0.16 to 0.22 SD in studies that resemble large, standardized-test-targeted programs. Metro Nashville's district-run program, delivered partly before and after school by a mix of teachers and volunteers, produced only small reading gains and no math or grade effects (Kraft, Edwards and Cannata 2024). Opt-in and on-demand online tutoring is rarely used (under 1 percent of eligible students in New Mexico) and reaches higher-performing students. Pre-pandemic RCT effects came from programs costing several thousand dollars per student; thinner programs should expect thinner results.

Standard. Every student below benchmark on the district assessment shall be scheduled for tutoring in groups of four or fewer, at least three sessions a week of 30 minutes or more, during the school day, with a consistent trained tutor, and the district shall track delivered dosage and report it by school and student group.

1. The policy schedules every student below benchmark on the district assessment for tutoring at least three sessions a week of 30 minutes or more. CORE
2. The policy limits tutoring groups to four or fewer students.
3. The policy requires that tutoring happen during the school day.
4. The policy requires each student to have a consistent trained tutor.
5. The policy requires the district to track the tutoring dosage actually delivered.
6. The policy requires the district to report delivered dosage by school and student group.

> **Policy.** Students who score below the district benchmark on the fall or winter interim assessment in reading or mathematics shall be enrolled in tutoring in groups of no more than four students, for no fewer than three sessions per week of at least thirty minutes each, delivered during the regular school day by a consistent tutor who has completed district training and uses district-approved materials aligned to the core curriculum. Tutoring shall not be offered solely on an opt-in, on-demand, or outside-school-hours basis. The principal of each school shall record sessions scheduled and sessions delivered for each tutored student. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by December 15 and by June 15 each year: the number and share of eligible students tutored, average sessions delivered per week, tutor consistency, and the assessment growth of tutored students compared with similar non-tutored students, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.

Indicator. Share of students below benchmark on the district's interim assessment who received tutoring at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day, by school and student group; sessions delivered versus scheduled; tutor consistency (share of sessions with the student's assigned tutor); growth of tutored versus matched non-tutored students on the interim assessment.

Red flags in real manuals. tutoring offered only after school, before school, or online on demand; tutoring available on request or by referral only; no dosage, frequency, or group-size requirement; tutoring assigned to unpaid volunteers without training; no reporting of who received tutoring or how much

Law. No federal mandate; ESSER funds that paid for most pandemic tutoring had to be obligated by September 30, 2024, so programs now depend on local, Title I, and state funds. Texas HB 4545 (2021), as amended by HB 1416 (2023), requires accelerated instruction, including supplemental instruction in groups of no more than four, for students who do not pass STAAR. Several states (for example Tennessee's TN ALL Corps) fund tutoring with dosage conditions.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Chief Academic Officer managing the program and each principal accountable for delivery in their school

First 90 days

1. The Chief Academic Officer identifies every student below benchmark on the most recent fall or winter interim assessment in reading or mathematics and sends each principal a roster within 30 days.
2. Each principal builds a master schedule that places tutoring during the regular school day in groups of four or fewer at least three sessions a week of 30 minutes or more, and submits it to the Superintendent within 60 days.
3. The Chief Academic Officer selects district-approved tutoring materials aligned to the core curriculum and delivers tutor training to teachers and paraprofessionals assigned as tutors before the first session.
4. The Chief Financial Officer identifies local, Title I, and state funds to replace expired ESSER money and presents a funded staffing plan to the Board within 90 days.
5. The data office builds a tracking system that records sessions scheduled, sessions delivered, and assigned tutor for each tutored student by the end of the first 90 days.

Year one

1. Each principal records sessions scheduled and sessions delivered for every tutored student each week and reviews dosage with the Chief Academic Officer monthly.
2. The Chief Academic Officer matches tutored students to similar non-tutored students and computes interim assessment growth for both groups after the winter and spring administrations.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first reports to the Board by December 15 and June 15 showing share of eligible students tutored, average sessions per week, tutor consistency, and growth, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.
4. The Superintendent directs any school where delivered dosage falls short of three sessions a week to submit a corrective schedule within 30 days.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by December 15 and June 15 every year on eligibility, dosage, tutor consistency, and comparative growth.
2. The Chief Academic Officer re-runs eligibility after each fall and winter interim assessment and enrolls newly eligible students within 30 days.
3. The Board reviews the June report each year and renews or adjusts the program funding and staffing for the following year.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students below benchmark on the interim assessment who received tutoring at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day, by school and student group; sessions delivered versus scheduled; share of sessions with the student's assigned tutor; interim assessment growth of tutored students compared with matched non-tutored students.
BASELINE	Share of below-benchmark students currently receiving tutoring that meets the dosage standard, sessions delivered versus scheduled, and tutor consistency as recorded in the first report after adoption; most districts will have no prior dosage record, so the first December 15 report sets the baseline.
TARGET	**Within one year, every student identified below benchmark is enrolled and the share receiving at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day rises each reporting period, with no student group lagging the district rate; within 1 to 3 years, tutored students show growth on the interim assessment greater than matched non-tutored students in both reading and mathematics.**
BENCHMARK	Randomized trials show about 0.29 SD pooled, 0.18 to 0.40 SD in math in the Chicago Saga trials, and a realistic 0.16 to 0.22 SD for large test-targeted programs at scale; the Nashville district program produced only 0.04 to 0.09 SD in reading and no math effect, which marks the floor the district should aim to exceed.
REPORTED	Superintendent reports to the Board by December 15 and June 15 each year, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, with any school below the dosage standard named and its corrective schedule attached.

– 14. High-quality instructional materials and adoption TIER B STAKES 4/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Which textbook a district adopts can move achievement as much as many costlier reforms: in California the best-performing elementary math series outscored its rivals by 0.05 to 0.08 SD at near-zero marginal cost, a randomized IES trial found differences of 4 to 7 percentile points between first and second grade math curricula, and a field experiment giving teachers high-quality off-the-shelf lessons raised math achievement by 0.06 SD at about 6 dollars per student. Effects depend on the specific materials and their use with aligned professional development; districts' formal adoption processes rarely examine evidence of effectiveness. (Textbook choice: 0.05 to 0.08 SD (California), roughly 0.1 to 0.17 SD between best and worst in the IES RCT. Online lessons plus supports: +0.06 SD math (RCT). Curriculum plus curriculum-based PD: positive effects on science achievement (RCT). Six-state Common Core era study: no detectable differences among textbooks.) 125,126,127,128,129,130,131,132,133,134

Where the evidence is mixed. Blazar et al. (2020) examined elementary math textbooks across six states after the Common Core transition and found no meaningful differences in achievement among the most widely used books, a null that contrasts with the earlier California and Indiana findings; one explanation is that textbook use had become fragmented and teachers supplemented heavily. Effects in the IES trial and in California varied by grade and did not always persist. Standards alignment on the cover is unreliable: Polikoff (2015) found textbooks labeled Common Core aligned were poorly aligned. Materials without aligned professional development and without time to implement show weak effects, and Jackson and Makarin's gains were concentrated among teachers who actually used the lessons. Evidence for English language arts and secondary materials is thinner than for elementary math.

Standard. The district shall adopt core instructional materials for each subject and grade through a published process that requires an independent quality review, consideration of effectiveness evidence, a classroom pilot, and a curriculum-specific professional development plan, and shall maintain a public inventory of materials in use with achievement tracked after each adoption.

1. The policy requires the district to adopt core instructional materials for each subject and grade through a published adoption process. CORE
2. The policy requires an independent quality review of candidate materials before adoption.
3. The policy requires consideration of evidence of effectiveness before materials are adopted.
4. The policy requires a classroom pilot of candidate materials before adoption.
5. The policy requires a curriculum-specific professional development plan as part of each adoption.
6. The policy requires a public inventory of materials in use with achievement tracked after each adoption.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall maintain and post on the district website an inventory of the core instructional materials in use in every subject and grade, with the adoption year and the independent quality rating of each program. Core materials shall be adopted only through a process that includes an independent standards-alignment and quality review (such as EdReports or the state review), a written summary of available effectiveness evidence for each finalist, a pilot of at least one semester in at least two schools with teacher and student feedback, and a curriculum-specific professional development plan providing at least 20 hours of training to every teacher using the

> materials in the first year. Core materials shall be reviewed at least every six years. Teachers shall use the adopted core program as the primary instructional resource and may supplement it; supplemental materials used for more than 20 percent of instructional time in a course shall be reported to the principal. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum shall report to the Board by August 31 of each year: the inventory, the share of classrooms using the adopted core program as primary (from the annual teacher survey and walkthroughs), curriculum professional development hours delivered, and achievement and growth in each subject for three years following each adoption.

Indicator. Inventory of core materials in use by subject and grade with the adoption year (curriculum office records); independent quality rating of each adopted core program (EdReports or state review) at the time of adoption; share of classrooms using the adopted core program as the primary resource (teacher survey or walkthrough); hours of curriculum-specific professional development per teacher in the adoption year; student achievement and growth before and after each adoption, tracked by the district for at least three years.

Red flags in real manuals. adoption process based on teacher preference or publisher presentation alone; no independent quality review required; no pilot or evidence summary before adoption; materials adopted without a professional development plan; no inventory of materials in use; adoption cycle longer than seven years or unspecified; policy addresses only objectionable content review, not quality

Law. About 20 states run state textbook adoption lists that districts must choose from or justify departing from (for example Texas Education Code Chapter 31, California Education Code 60200 et seq. for K-8, Florida Statute 1006.28 to 1006.42). Several states now require or fund high-quality instructional materials: Louisiana's tiered review, Tennessee's 2019 to 2021 ELA adoption and the Tennessee Literacy Success Act, Nebraska and Rhode Island HQIM laws, and Texas House Bill 1605 (2023) funding state-approved materials. Many state laws since 2021 add parent review and objection procedures for materials; these address content, not quality.

How to implement it. Owner: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum compiles the inventory of core instructional materials in use in every subject and grade, with the adoption year and the EdReports or state review rating of each program, and the Superintendent posts it on the district website.
2. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum drafts the published adoption process covering the independent quality review, the written effectiveness-evidence summary for each finalist, the one-semester pilot in at least two schools, and the 20-hour curriculum-specific professional development plan, and the Superintendent brings it to the Board for approval.
3. The curriculum office flags every core program on the inventory that lacks an independent quality rating or is more than six years past adoption and schedules each for review.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum confirms with district counsel whether the state runs an adoption list the district must choose from or justify departing from, and adds that step to

the process.
5. The curriculum office adds items to the annual teacher survey asking which program teachers use as the primary resource and whether supplemental materials exceed 20 percent of instructional time in any course.

Year one

1. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum runs the first adoption under the new process for the subject and grade band with the oldest or lowest-rated core program, including the pilot in at least two schools with teacher and student feedback.
2. Principals and the curriculum office deliver at least 20 hours of curriculum-specific professional development to every teacher using newly adopted materials in the first year and log hours per teacher.
3. Principals conduct classroom walkthroughs and the curriculum office administers the teacher survey to measure the share of classrooms using the adopted core program as the primary resource.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum delivers the first annual report to the Board by August 31 with the inventory, primary-use share, professional development hours, and baseline achievement in each subject.

Ongoing

1. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum reports to the Board by August 31 each year and tracks achievement and growth for three years after every adoption.
2. The curriculum office reviews every core program at least every six years through the published adoption process.
3. Principals collect reports from teachers whose supplemental materials exceed 20 percent of instructional time in a course and share a summary with the curriculum office.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of core programs on the public inventory that have an independent quality rating and were adopted through the published process, share of classrooms using the adopted core program as primary, curriculum-specific professional development hours per teacher in adoption year, and achievement and growth in each subject for three years after each adoption.
BASELINE	Current inventory of core materials by subject and grade with adoption year and quality rating, current share of classrooms using the adopted program as primary from the first teacher survey and walkthroughs, and achievement in each subject in the year before the first adoption under the new process.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, the full inventory is posted and every new adoption follows the published process with a semester pilot in at least two schools and at least 20 hours of professional development per teacher in the first year; within 3 years of each adoption, the share of classrooms using the core program as primary rises**

	from baseline and achievement and growth in that subject improve relative to the pre-adoption year.
BENCHMARK	Research gives effect sizes, not district targets: 0.05 to 0.08 SD between elementary math series in California, 0.1 to 0.17 SD between best and worst in the IES RCT, and +0.06 SD from high-quality off-the-shelf lessons; a six-state study found no detectable differences, so the entry supports a directional target, not a numeric district benchmark.
REPORTED	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum reports to the Board by August 31 each year, with the inventory posted on the district website.

– 15. Homework TIER C STAKES 2/5

Tier C: consistent correlational evidence

Finding. Homework has a small to moderate positive association with achievement in secondary grades and little or none in elementary grades; the relation runs through how often and how well homework is assigned, not how many hours students spend on it. Beyond roughly ten minutes per grade level per night the returns flatten, stress rises, and the benefit accrues more to higher-income students. (Cooper 2006: d about 0.6 in the few experimental comparisons, secondary correlations r about 0.25, elementary near zero; Fan 2017: small positive effect in math and science; high-performing high schools average 3 hours per night with higher stress) [135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,144]

Where the evidence is mixed. The meta-analyses pool mostly correlational studies, and time on homework may reflect struggling as much as learning (Trautwein 2007 finds frequency, not time, predicts achievement). Daw (2012) and Ronning (2011) find that homework widens socioeconomic gaps because higher-income students gain more from each hour, and Ronning finds low-SES students may be harmed. Galloway, Conner and Pope (2013) report that high-performing high school students averaging more than three hours a night show more academic stress, physical complaints and less balance. Pressman et al. (2015) find primary school children receive about three times the ten-minute guideline and that family stress rises with load. Eren and Henderson (2008) find positive effects that are concentrated among high and low achievers, with a share of students responding negatively to more homework. No randomized trial of district homework policy exists.

Standard. The policy shall state maximum nightly homework time by grade band (none required in K-2, no more than ten minutes per grade level through grade 8, no more than two hours total in high school), shall cap homework at a minor share of the academic grade, and shall require that assigned homework be practice of taught material that a student can complete without adult help or paid resources.

1. The policy states maximum nightly homework time by grade band: none required in K-2, no more than ten minutes per grade level through grade 8, no more than two hours total in high school. CORE
2. The policy caps homework at a minor share of the academic grade.
3. The policy requires that assigned homework be practice of material already taught in class.
4. The policy requires that assigned homework be completable by a student without adult help or paid resources.

> **Policy.** Homework shall be assigned only to practice or extend material already taught in class and shall be designed so that a student can complete it without adult assistance, internet access beyond district-provided devices, or purchased materials. No homework shall be required in kindergarten through grade 2 other than nightly reading. Expected homework time in grades 3 through 8 shall not exceed ten minutes per grade level per school night across all subjects, and in grades 9 through 12 shall not exceed two hours per school night across all subjects; department chairs at each secondary school shall coordinate assignment calendars so that the total stays within the limit. No homework shall be assigned over scheduled school breaks. Homework shall count for no more than ten percent of the academic grade in any course, and missing homework shall not be the

> sole basis for a failing grade. The Superintendent shall survey students and parents each March on reported nightly homework time by grade and shall report the results to the Board by May 31, together with the homework grade weight by course, and shall direct principals to correct any school where reported time exceeds the limit.

Indicator. Expected and reported nightly minutes by grade band (annual student and family survey); share of final grade weight assigned to homework by course (gradebook categories); share of students reporting more than two hours per night in high school; homework completion rate by free-lunch status.

Red flags in real manuals. no stated time limit by grade band; homework required in kindergarten or grade 1 beyond reading; homework weighted at 20 percent or more of the grade; zeros for missing homework with no make-up window; homework assigned over breaks or holidays; assignments that require printing, purchased supplies or parent participation; homework used as a disciplinary consequence

Law. No federal law. California AB 2999 (Healthy Homework Act, Chapter 751, Statutes of 2024, signed September 27, 2024) directs the state to post homework guidelines and encourages, but does not require, districts to adopt a homework policy by the 2027-28 school year that weighs student health, time and equity. Elsewhere homework is a district matter; the National PTA and NEA ten-minutes-per-grade guideline is the common reference.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction as day-to-day lead

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent issues the grade-band time limits (none in K-2 beyond nightly reading, ten minutes per grade level in grades 3 through 8, two hours in grades 9 through 12) and the ten percent grade-weight cap to all principals in writing within 30 days of adoption.
2. Principals direct every teacher to set the homework category in the gradebook to no more than ten percent of the course grade within 60 days and confirm compliance to the Assistant Superintendent.
3. Department chairs at each secondary school build a shared assignment calendar within 90 days so that total expected homework across all subjects stays within the two-hour limit.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction drafts the March student and family homework survey, covering reported nightly minutes by grade and whether assignments required adult help, internet beyond district devices, or purchased materials, and the Board reviews the draft within 90 days.

Year one

1. The Superintendent administers the homework survey to students and parents in March and reports results by grade band and by free-lunch status to the Board by May 31, together with the homework grade weight by course from the gradebook.
2. Principals, with department chairs, review homework assignments each semester against the practice-only and no-adult-help standard and remove or redesign assignments that fail it.

3. The Superintendent directs principals at any school where reported time exceeds the limit to submit a correction plan within 30 days of the May report.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent repeats the March survey and May 31 Board report each year, including the share of high school students reporting more than two hours per night and the homework completion rate by free-lunch status.
2. Principals audit gradebook categories each semester to confirm homework stays at or below ten percent of the course grade and that no student has failed solely for missing homework.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students in each grade band whose reported nightly homework time exceeds the policy limit (ten minutes per grade level in grades 3 through 8, two hours in grades 9 through 12), from the annual March student and family survey; share of courses with homework weighted above ten percent of the grade; homework completion rate gap by free-lunch status.
BASELINE	First March survey and gradebook pull after adoption; the entry reports that high-performing high schools average about three hours per night, so a district baseline above the two-hour limit is plausible.
TARGET	**By the second May 31 report, no school reports average nightly time above the grade-band limit, no course weights homework above ten percent of the grade, and the share of high school students reporting more than two hours per night falls each year compared with the prior survey; the completion gap by free-lunch status narrows year over year within 1 to 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	The National PTA and NEA ten-minutes-per-grade guideline and the policy's two-hour high school cap are the only numeric reference points; the entry gives no benchmark for completion rate or stress, so those targets are directional.
REPORTED	Superintendent reports to the Board by May 31 each year with survey results by grade band and free-lunch status, homework grade weight by course, the list of schools exceeding the limit, and the correction directed at each.

– 16. Math acceleration, eighth grade algebra, and tracking TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. The evidence favors objective, transparent placement into accelerated math with instructional support, and cuts against both extremes. Placing moderately prepared students into Algebra I in eighth grade without extra support lowered their pass rates and later math course completion in North Carolina and reduced tenth grade math scores in California's push for algebra for all; placing students by an objective prior-achievement rule in Wake County removed race and income from placement decisions, and a randomized Dee and Huffaker study found that putting below-grade-level ninth graders into Algebra I with teacher training raised grade 11 math achievement by up to 0.2 SD. Delaying algebra for everyone, as San Francisco did, cut AP math participation 15 percent at first and left ethnoracial gaps unchanged. (Universal early algebra without support: negative on test scores and later course passing. Objective placement rule: equity of placement improved, test scores unchanged, grades lower. Detracking plus teacher training (Algebra I for below-grade-level ninth graders): +0.2 SD grade 11 math, attendance up. SFUSD delay of Algebra I: AP math participation initially down 6 percentage points, gaps unchanged. Double-dose algebra for low scorers: college enrollment up.) [145,146,147,148,149,150,151,152,153]

Where the evidence is mixed. Results depend on who is accelerated and what support comes with it. Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2015) found that Charlotte-Mecklenburg students accelerated into eighth grade algebra scored lower on the Algebra I exam and were less likely to pass geometry and Algebra II later. Domina et al. (2015) found that raising eighth grade algebra enrollment lowered tenth grade math achievement in large California districts. Chicago's curriculum-for-all policy raised algebra credits but also failure rates with no test score gains (Allensworth et al. 2009). Wake County's objective rule improved access but accelerated students did not gain on test scores or college readiness and earned lower grades (Dougherty et al. 2017). On the other side, removing eighth grade algebra for all students in San Francisco did not close gaps and initially reduced AP calculus participation (Huffaker, Novicoff and Dee 2025). High-achiever classrooms raised Black and Hispanic scores by 0.5 SD in one district (Card and Giuliano 2016), so grouping by readiness can help the students it is meant to help when seats are allocated by objective criteria.

Standard. Math placement shall use published objective criteria from multiple measures, place every student who meets them in the accelerated course with parent opt-out, provide a supported path (double period, tutoring, or summer bridge) for students near the cutoff, and never bar a readiness-qualified student from Algebra I in eighth grade.

1. The policy requires math placement to use published objective criteria drawn from multiple measures.
2. The policy places every student who meets the placement criteria in the accelerated math course. CORE
3. The policy allows parents to opt their student out of accelerated math placement.
4. The policy provides a supported path, such as a double period, tutoring, or summer bridge, for students near the cutoff.
5. The policy never bars a readiness-qualified student from taking Algebra I in eighth grade.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall publish, by March 1 each year, the objective criteria used to place students in accelerated mathematics in grades 6 through 9, which shall rely on at least two measures of prior achievement, including the most recent state assessment, and shall not rely on teacher recommendation alone. Every student who meets the criteria shall be placed in the accelerated course for the following year unless

> a parent or guardian opts out in writing after written notice of eligibility. The district shall offer Algebra I in grade 8 at every middle school and shall provide a supported placement, such as a double period, scheduled tutoring, or summer bridge, for students within one standard error of the cutoff and for any student placed in Algebra I below grade level. Students shall be reassessed for placement at least once each school year, and no placement decision made in grade 6 shall be used to limit course access in later grades. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 each year: placement rates by school and student group, the share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score, Algebra I repeat rates, and the share of graduates completing calculus or statistics, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.

Indicator. Share of eighth graders completing Algebra I or higher with a passing end-of-course score, by race, ethnicity, income, English learner and disability status; share of students meeting the placement criterion who are placed; Algebra I repeat rate; share of graduates completing a course beyond Algebra II and calculus or statistics; placement appeals and overrides by school.

Red flags in real manuals. Algebra I not offered before grade 9; placement based on teacher recommendation alone; placement criteria not published or not applied uniformly across schools; tracks or ability groups assigned in elementary grades with no annual reassessment; acceleration of all students into Algebra I with no support course; no reporting of math course completion by student group

Law. California Math Placement Act of 2015 (SB 359) requires districts to adopt a fair, objective and transparent math placement policy for students entering grade 9 with multiple objective measures and annual reporting. Texas SB 2124 (2023) requires automatic enrollment in advanced sixth grade math of students in the top 40 percent on fifth grade STAAR math, with parent opt-out, to prepare them for Algebra I in grade 8. North Carolina G.S. 115C-81.36 requires that students scoring at the highest level on the math end-of-grade test be placed in the advanced course, and that such seventh graders be placed in a high school math course in grade 8; removal requires written parent consent. Illinois Accelerated Placement Act requires accelerated placement policies and automatic enrollment of high school students who exceed state standards.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through the chief academic officer and the director of secondary mathematics

First 90 days

1. The chief academic officer drafts the objective placement criteria for grades 6 through 9, using at least two prior-achievement measures including the most recent state assessment and no teacher recommendation alone, and submits them to the Superintendent within 60 days.
2. The director of secondary mathematics audits every middle school's current math course offerings and reports to the Superintendent within 30 days which schools do not yet offer Algebra I in grade 8.
3. The director of research and assessment pulls the prior year's placement, Algebra I completion, end-of-course passing, and repeat data by school and student group to establish the baseline for

the October 15 report.
4. The Superintendent sends each middle school principal a written directive within 90 days to identify, from current data, every student who meets the draft criteria and every student within one standard error of the cutoff.

Year one

1. The Superintendent publishes the final objective placement criteria by March 1 and the communications office issues written eligibility notices with a written opt-out form to every parent or guardian of a student who meets them.
2. Each middle school principal schedules Algebra I in grade 8 and a supported placement, such as a double period, scheduled tutoring, or summer bridge, for every student within one standard error of the cutoff and every student placed in Algebra I below grade level.
3. The director of secondary mathematics delivers training to every teacher assigned to a supported Algebra I section before the course begins.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first report to the Board by October 15 with placement rates, Algebra I completion and passing rates, repeat rates, and calculus or statistics completion disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.

Ongoing

1. Each school reassesses every student for placement at least once each school year, and the director of research and assessment verifies that no grade 6 placement decision limits course access in later grades.
2. The Superintendent reports placement appeals and overrides by school each year alongside the October 15 report, and the Board reviews any school where the share of criterion-meeting students who are placed falls below the district average.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students meeting the published placement criterion who are placed in the accelerated course, and share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score, each disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus the Algebra I repeat rate.
BASELINE	The prior year's placement rates, eighth grade Algebra I completion and passing rates, and Algebra I repeat rate by school and student group, as pulled by the director of research and assessment in the first 90 days and reported in the first October 15 report.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, every student who meets the published criterion is placed unless a parent opts out in writing, and Algebra I is offered in grade 8 at every middle school; within 3 years, the share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score rises for every student group with no increase in the Algebra I repeat rate for any group, and the gap in criterion-meeting placement rates between student groups closes to zero.**

BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric placement or pass-rate target. It supports the direction: an objective placement rule removed race and income from placement decisions in Wake County, and Algebra I with teacher training for below-grade-level ninth graders raised grade 11 math achievement by up to 0.2 SD, while early algebra without support lowered pass rates and later course completion.
REPORTED	The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year, with every measure disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and with placement appeals and overrides listed by school.

– 17. Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS / RtI) TIER B STAKES 4/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. The components of a tiered system work when they are done well: K-3 supplemental reading interventions average about 0.4 SD across dozens of rigorous studies, early K-2 screeners predict later reading, and a randomized trial shows that starting intervention immediately after screening beats waiting a semester (d = 0.36). The one large evaluation of RtI as schools actually ran it (Balu et al. 2015, 146 schools in 13 states) found that first graders just below the cutoff who were pulled into Tier 2 or 3 scored lower in spring than peers just above it, with no effect in grades 2 and 3. (Tier 2 and intensive K-3 reading interventions ES about 0.3 to 0.5; immediate versus delayed intervention d = 0.36; national RtI evaluation: grade 1 negative (about -0.1 SD), grades 2-3 null) [154,155,156,157,158,159,160,161,162,163,164]

Where the evidence is mixed. Balu et al. (2015) is the only large-scale evaluation of RtI practice and its result was null to negative; Gersten, Jayanthi and Dimino (2017) and Fuchs and Fuchs (2017) argue the design captured students near the cutoff who were often pulled from core instruction into undifferentiated groups, so it tests weak implementation rather than the model, but the finding stands as a warning that labels and tiers do not help by themselves. Burns et al. (2005) reported very large effects for RtI models, but from a small set of mostly non-experimental field studies. Most district MTSS policies describe structures (teams, tiers, forms) and not instructional content, intensity or dosage, which is where the measurable effects live. Universal screening generates false positives at the K-1 level and its accuracy depends on the measure and administration quality.

Standard. The policy shall name the screener, the screening windows, the timeline from flag to intervention, the minimum dosage of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction delivered in addition to core instruction, the progress-monitoring interval and the decision rule for moving students between tiers.

1. The policy states the minimum dosage of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction delivered in addition to core instruction. CORE
2. The policy names the screener used to identify students for intervention.
3. The policy states the screening windows during the school year.
4. The policy states the timeline from a student being flagged by screening to the start of intervention.
5. The policy states the interval at which progress monitoring occurs for students in intervention.
6. The policy states the decision rule for moving students between tiers.

> **Policy.** The District shall operate a multi-tiered system of support in reading, mathematics and behavior in every school, using [name of screener], with published classification accuracy, as the universal screener for each area. The Superintendent shall screen every student in kindergarten through grade 8 within the first 30 school days and in winter and spring windows published before each year. An at-risk student shall begin Tier 2 intervention, logged by the school, within 15 school days of screening. Tier 2 shall provide at least three 30-minute small-group sessions per week, and Tier 3 at least five 30-minute sessions per week in groups of three or fewer, each added to, never replacing, core instruction. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students shall be progress-monitored at least every two weeks. The student support team shall review each student's data at least every six weeks and record its decision: a student meeting the screener's grade-level benchmark

> exits to the lower tier; one on track to meet it by the next window continues; one below it intensifies. A student not responding after two cycles shall be referred for special education evaluation; no school shall require tiered intervention before a parent-requested evaluation proceeds. The Director of Student Services shall report to the Board each December and June screening participation each window, share identified at risk, share of at-risk students with intervention logged within 15 school days, progress-monitoring frequency per Tier 2 and 3 student, share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester, and special education referral and identification rates by school and race.

Indicator. Share of K-3 students screened each window and share identified at risk (screener vendor reports); share of at-risk students with intervention logged within 15 school days; progress-monitoring frequency per Tier 2 and Tier 3 student (every two weeks or better); share of Tier 2 students who exit to Tier 1 within a semester; special education referral and identification rates by race and school.

Red flags in real manuals. MTSS described only as a team or meeting structure with no dosage, frequency or timeline; intervention delivered during core reading or mathematics instruction; progress monitoring 'as needed' or quarterly; a required number of weeks in RtI before a special education referral may be made; screening only for students referred by teachers; no decision rule or exit criterion for tiers

Law. IDEA 2004 and 34 CFR 300.307 permit states to allow a response-to-intervention process for identifying specific learning disabilities and forbid using it to delay or deny an evaluation (OSEP memo 11-07, 2011). ESSA references MTSS as an allowable use of Title funds. Most states require K-3 reading screening by statute; several (e.g. Texas, Mississippi, Ohio) specify screening windows and parent notification timelines that a district policy must meet.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Student Services, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent selects and names the universal screener for reading, mathematics and behavior with published classification accuracy and publishes the fall, winter and spring screening windows before the school year opens.
2. The Director of Student Services issues a written procedure to every principal setting the 15 school day flag-to-intervention timeline, the Tier 2 minimum of three 30-minute sessions per week, the Tier 3 minimum of five 30-minute sessions per week in groups of three or fewer, and the rule that both tiers add to rather than replace core instruction.
3. Each principal completes screening of every student in kindergarten through grade 8 within the first 30 school days and submits the participation count and the share identified at risk to the Director of Student Services.
4. The Director of Student Services configures the student information system to log the intervention start date for each at-risk student so the 15 school day interval can be computed, and the special education director confirms in writing that no school requires tiered intervention before a parent-requested evaluation proceeds, consistent with OSEP memo 11-07.

5. Each principal forms a student support team, names its chair, and schedules data review meetings at least every six weeks for the full year.

Year one

1. The Director of Student Services delivers the first December report to the Board covering fall screening participation, share identified at risk, share of at-risk students with intervention logged within 15 school days, and progress-monitoring frequency per Tier 2 and Tier 3 student.
2. Each student support team applies the written decision rule at every six-week review, records exit, continue or intensify for each Tier 2 and Tier 3 student, and refers any student not responding after two cycles for special education evaluation.
3. The Director of Student Services delivers the June report to the Board adding share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester and special education referral and identification rates by school and race, and flags any school where first graders placed in Tier 2 or Tier 3 are not outpacing comparable students who stayed in Tier 1.
4. The Superintendent verifies that the district's screening windows and parent notification timelines meet the state statute where the state specifies them.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Student Services reports to the Board each December and June on all indicators in the clause, broken out by school and race.
2. The Superintendent audits a sample of Tier 2 and Tier 3 schedules each year to confirm dosage and that intervention time is added to, not substituted for, core instruction.
3. The student support team at each school reviews its decision records each semester and corrects any school where progress monitoring lapses below every two weeks.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of at-risk students with Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention logged within 15 school days of screening, share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester, screening participation each window, progress-monitoring frequency, and special education referral and identification rates by school and race.
BASELINE	Fall of the first year of operation: screening participation, share identified at risk, share with intervention logged within 15 school days, and current special education referral and identification rates by school and race, as submitted by each principal and compiled by the Director of Student Services.
TARGET	**By the June report of year one, every school screens all K-8 students within the first 30 school days of each window, every at-risk student has intervention logged within 15 school days, every Tier 2 and Tier 3 student is progress-monitored at least every two weeks, and the share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester rises each year over the first 3 years with no school showing referral or identification rates by race that diverge from its share of enrollment without a documented review.**

BENCHMARK	The entry gives effect sizes for well-run components (Tier 2 and intensive K-3 reading interventions about 0.3 to 0.5 SD; immediate versus delayed intervention d = 0.36) and a cautionary national result (grade 1 about -0.1 SD, grades 2-3 null in Balu et al. 2015), but no numeric benchmark for the exit rate, the timeliness rate or the referral rates, so the target is directional on those indicators and absolute on the clause's own timelines and dosage.
REPORTED	Director of Student Services reports to the Board each December and June, by school and race, with the June report comparing spring outcomes of students placed in Tier 2 or Tier 3 against students just above the cutoff to check for the negative grade 1 pattern found in the national evaluation.

– 18. Special education placement and inclusion TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Receiving special education services causally raises achievement and attainment for students with disabilities (Texas: removing services lowered high school completion and college enrollment; NYC and Texas: entering special education raised test scores by roughly 0.1 SD), and large correlational and meta-analytic literatures find that students with disabilities who spend most of the day in general education classrooms do better academically with no detectable cost to their peers (d = 0.35 for students with general learning difficulties; peers d = 0.12 to null). Co-teaching shows a medium positive effect in a 2021 meta-analysis. The causal evidence on placement itself, as opposed to services, is thin and contested, so the best-supported policy is a documented, data-driven least restrictive environment decision for each student rather than a placement quota in either direction. (Special education services: about +0.1 SD achievement; service removal lowered high school completion and college entry. Inclusive placement: d = 0.35 cognitive outcomes for students with learning difficulties (meta-analysis of mostly non-randomized studies); peers d = 0.12 (small positive) to null. Co-teaching: medium positive effect on achievement for students with disabilities.) [165,166,167,168,169,170,171,172,173,174,175,176,177,178]

Where the evidence is mixed. Gilmour (2018) and Gilmour, Fuchs and Wehby (2018) show that the inclusion-achievement correlation is confounded by selection: students with stronger skills and fewer behavior challenges are placed in general education, and the reading gap for students with disabilities is about 1.2 SD regardless of setting. Hanushek, Kain and Rivkin (2002) found special education raised math for students with learning and emotional disabilities but found no difference between general and special classroom settings. Krämer, Möller and Zimmermann (2021) report no psychosocial benefit of inclusion (d = 0.00) and note selection effects in the underlying studies. Correlational work finds higher teacher turnover and more management time in classes with larger shares of students with emotional and behavioral disabilities. Co-teaching effects depend on implementation; much co-teaching in practice is one-teach, one-assist with little specialized instruction. Inclusion done by moving students without moving services or training is not supported by any of this evidence.

Standard. Every placement decision shall start from the general education classroom with supplementary aids and services, document in the IEP the specific reasons a more restrictive setting is required, and be reviewed against the student's academic and behavioral data at least annually; the district shall report placement and outcome data for students with disabilities by school each year.

1. The policy requires every placement decision to start from the general education classroom with supplementary aids and services. CORE
2. The policy requires the IEP to document the specific reasons a more restrictive setting is required.
3. The policy requires each placement to be reviewed against the student's academic and behavioral data at least annually.
4. The policy requires the district to report placement and outcome data for students with disabilities by school each year.

> **Policy.** Each IEP team shall first consider placement in the general education classroom with supplementary aids, services and specially designed instruction, and shall document in the IEP the specific supports tried or considered and the data showing why a student cannot be educated satisfactorily in that setting before recommending any more restrictive placement. No student shall be placed in a separate class or school on the basis of disability category, the availability of staff, or administrative convenience.

> Each co-taught section shall be staffed by a general educator and a certified special educator for the full instructional period, with weekly common planning time scheduled by the principal. The Director of Special Education shall review every placement in a setting of less than 40 percent general education at least annually against the student's progress data and shall report to the Board by November 1 of each year, by school, disability category, race and English learner status: educational environment percentages, state test achievement and growth, graduation and dropout rates, suspension rates, and the number of placement reviews that resulted in a less restrictive placement. The Superintendent shall provide at least 12 hours of training per year in specially designed instruction and co-teaching to every teacher assigned to a co-taught section.

Indicator. Share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day, 40 to 79 percent, and under 40 percent (IDEA Section 618 educational environment data), disaggregated by disability category, race and school; achievement and growth of students with disabilities on state tests versus peers; graduation rate and dropout rate of students with disabilities; suspension rates of students with disabilities; share of IEPs documenting consideration of supplementary aids and services before a more restrictive placement; co-taught sections staffed by a certified special educator for the full period.

Red flags in real manuals. placement determined by program or disability label rather than individual IEP; separate 'resource' or 'self-contained' track described as the default for a category; no mention of supplementary aids and services or least restrictive environment; co-teaching defined as paraprofessional support; inclusion stated as a target percentage without a data review process; placement contingent on 'space available' or staffing; no annual report of special education outcomes to the board

Law. IDEA, 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(5), requires education in the least restrictive environment to the maximum extent appropriate, with removal from general education only when education there cannot be achieved satisfactorily with supplementary aids and services; 34 CFR 300.114 to 300.120 govern placement and a continuum of alternative placements. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the ADA bar exclusion on the basis of disability. States report educational environment data under IDEA Section 618 and set targets in State Performance Plan Indicator 5. Texas's former 8.5 percent special education enrollment benchmark was found to violate IDEA by the U.S. Department of Education in 2018.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Special Education, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Special Education pulls the district's current IDEA Section 618 educational environment data and lists every student placed in general education less than 40 percent of the day, by school, disability category, race and English learner status, within 30 days.
2. The Director of Special Education revises the IEP placement template so that every IEP records the supplementary aids and services tried or considered and the data supporting any setting more restrictive than general education, and issues it to all IEP teams within 60 days.
3. Each principal submits a roster of co-taught sections showing the assigned general educator and certified special educator and the scheduled weekly common planning block within 60 days.

4. The Superintendent sets the annual 12-hour training calendar in specially designed instruction and co-teaching for every teacher assigned to a co-taught section and schedules the first session within 90 days.
5. The Director of Special Education audits a sample of current IEPs at each school for documented consideration of supplementary aids and services before a more restrictive placement and reports the share compliant to the Superintendent within 90 days.

Year one

1. The Director of Special Education completes an annual review of every placement under 40 percent general education against the student's progress data and records how many reviews resulted in a less restrictive placement.
2. Each principal confirms that every co-taught section is staffed by a certified special educator for the full instructional period and reports any section that is not to the Director of Special Education each semester.
3. The Superintendent verifies that every teacher assigned to a co-taught section completed at least 12 hours of specially designed instruction and co-teaching training during the year.
4. The Director of Special Education delivers the first report to the Board by November 1 with educational environment percentages, state test achievement and growth, graduation and dropout rates, suspension rates and the count of placement reviews that led to a less restrictive placement, by school, disability category, race and English learner status.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Special Education reviews every under-40-percent placement at least annually and reports to the Board by November 1 each year.
2. The Director of Special Education audits a sample of new and amended IEPs each year for documented consideration of supplementary aids and services and refers any school below full compliance for corrective action.
3. The Superintendent continues the 12-hour annual training requirement and the principals' weekly common planning schedule for every co-taught section.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day, 40 to 79 percent, and under 40 percent, disaggregated by school, disability category, race and English learner status; achievement and growth of students with disabilities on state tests versus peers; graduation, dropout and suspension rates of students with disabilities; share of IEPs documenting consideration of supplementary aids and services before a more restrictive placement; share of co-taught sections staffed by a certified special educator for the full period.
BASELINE	The most recent IDEA Section 618 educational environment data, state test results, graduation, dropout and suspension rates for students with disabilities, and the first-90-day IEP documentation audit and co-teaching staffing roster.

TARGET	**Within 1 year, every reviewed IEP recommending a setting below 80 percent general education documents the supplementary aids and services considered and the supporting data, every co-taught section is staffed by a certified special educator for the full period, and every assigned teacher completes 12 hours of training; within 3 years, the share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day rises and the achievement gap, dropout rate and suspension rate for students with disabilities fall from baseline, with no decline in peer achievement.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no district-level numeric target for placement shares; the state's State Performance Plan Indicator 5 targets for educational environment are the external reference, and the research effect sizes (about 0.1 SD for services, d = 0.35 for inclusive placement, peers d = 0.12 to null) describe expected direction, not a quota. The entry notes that placement quotas in either direction, such as Texas's former 8.5 percent enrollment benchmark, violate IDEA.
REPORTED	Director of Special Education reports to the Board by November 1 each year, by school, disability category, race and English learner status, with the Board comparing each year's figures to baseline and to the state's Indicator 5 targets.

– 19. Summer learning and extended learning time TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Voluntary summer programs with at least five weeks and three hours of daily academic instruction produce modest gains for students who attend regularly: a meta-analysis of 37 studies finds +0.10 SD in math, a meta-analysis of 41 summer reading interventions finds significant reading gains concentrated among low-income children, and the RAND five-district randomized study found a near-term math benefit after one summer with persistent math and language arts advantages for high attenders after two. Extending the regular school day for literacy in low-performing Florida schools raised reading 0.05 SD in a regression-discontinuity design. (Summer math programs +0.10 SD (meta-analysis); summer reading interventions significant, larger for low-income children; RAND RCT: math gain after one summer that faded by fall, high attenders ahead in math and language arts through spring of the following year; Florida extra literacy hour +0.05 SD reading) [179,180,181,182,183,184,185,186,187,188]

Where the evidence is mixed. Intent-to-treat effects are small and fade: in the RAND study the causal benefit of being offered the program dissipated by the next fall, offering a second summer showed no significant causal effect, and three years later high-attender advantages were no longer statistically significant. Attendance is the binding constraint, and the students who attend 20 or more days differ from those who do not, so the high-attender estimates are correlational. Von Hippel and Hamrock (2019) show that much of the canonical summer-learning-loss literature was distorted by test scaling artifacts, and gaps form mainly before school entry, which weakens the rationale for summer programs as a gap-closing tool. Extended-day and extended-year studies are mostly weak in design (Patall et al. 2010), and added time costs staff pay and transportation.

Standard. The district offers a free summer program of at least five weeks with at least three hours of daily academic instruction by certified teachers, prioritized for students below grade level, and reports attendance and achievement growth for attenders each year.

1. The policy provides a free summer program of at least five weeks with at least three hours of daily academic instruction. CORE
2. The policy requires that summer academic instruction be delivered by certified teachers.
3. The policy prioritizes summer program enrollment for students performing below grade level.
4. The policy requires annual reporting of summer program attendance.
5. The policy requires annual reporting of achievement growth for students who attended the summer program.

> **Policy.** The district shall offer each summer, at no charge, an academic summer program of at least five (5) weeks with at least three (3) hours per day of reading and mathematics instruction taught by certified teachers, together with enrichment, meals and transportation. Enrollment priority shall go to students scoring below grade level on the spring interim assessment, students eligible for free or reduced-price meals, English learners and students with disabilities. The program shall set an attendance goal of at least twenty (20) days per enrolled student and shall contact the family of any student absent two consecutive days. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 of each year the number enrolled and the percentage attending twenty or more days by building and subgroup, and the spring-to-fall assessment change for students who

> attended twenty or more days compared with eligible students who did not enroll. Any extended-day or extended-year program the district adopts shall state its added instructional minutes, the content taught in them and the staff assigned, and shall be included in the same report with its fall-to-spring growth comparison.

Indicator. Summer program offered (yes or no), its weeks and daily academic hours (program plan); enrollment and share of enrollees attending 20 or more days, by subgroup (attendance file); fall-to-spring and spring-to-fall growth on interim assessments for attenders versus matched non-attenders; for extended-day programs, the added minutes and how they are used, with the same growth comparison.

Red flags in real manuals. summer school limited to credit recovery or retention remediation with fees; summer program under four weeks or under two hours of daily academics; no attendance target or outreach provision; extended day used for homework or supervision with no instructional plan; no reporting of attendance or outcomes

Law. No federal mandate. Title I, Part A and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program (ESEA Title IV-B) fund summer and extended learning. The ESSER III requirement that districts spend at least 20 percent of funds on learning recovery, including summer programs, expired with the September 30, 2024 obligation deadline. Some states require summer reading intervention for students not proficient by grade 3 under third-grade reading laws (for example Florida, Michigan, Mississippi and Tennessee); check the state code.

How to implement it. Owner: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction (or the Chief Academic Officer), with the Director of Federal Programs as co-owner for Title I and 21st CCLC funding.

First 90 days

1. The Assistant Superintendent drafts the summer program plan showing at least five weeks, at least three daily hours of reading and mathematics instruction by certified teachers, and the enrichment, meals and transportation to be provided, and brings it to the Board within 60 days.
2. The Director of Federal Programs identifies Title I, Part A and 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds for the program and confirms the budget with the Chief Financial Officer within 90 days.
3. The Director of Assessment writes the eligibility rule and builds the priority list from the spring interim assessment, free or reduced-price meal status, English learner status and disability status, and sends each building principal its list within 90 days.
4. The Human Resources Director posts certified teacher positions for the summer program and the Director of Student Services sets up the attendance file and the two-consecutive-day absence call procedure within 90 days.
5. The General Counsel checks the state code for any third-grade reading law that requires summer intervention and reports to the Superintendent within 30 days.

Year one

1. Building principals run enrollment from the priority list, and the Assistant Superintendent confirms before the program opens that each site meets the five-week and three-hour

requirements and has certified teachers assigned.
2. Site coordinators record daily attendance, call the family of any student absent two consecutive days, and track each student against the twenty-day attendance goal.
3. The Director of Assessment matches attenders of twenty or more days to eligible students who did not enroll and computes the spring-to-fall assessment change for both groups.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first report to the Board by October 15 with enrollment, the percentage attending twenty or more days by building and subgroup, and the growth comparison, plus the added minutes, content and staff for any extended-day program with its fall-to-spring comparison.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year and the Assistant Superintendent adjusts recruitment, transportation and family contact in buildings where the twenty-day attendance share lags.
2. The Director of Federal Programs reviews funding sources each year and the Director of Assessment keeps the matched comparison method the same so year-to-year results can be compared.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of enrolled students attending 20 or more days, by building and subgroup, and the spring-to-fall interim assessment change in reading and mathematics for students attending 20 or more days compared with eligible students who did not enroll.
BASELINE	The first summer's attendance file and spring-to-fall growth comparison, reported to the Board by October 15 of year one; if the district had no summer program, baseline is zero students served.
TARGET	**Within 1 to 3 years, the share of enrolled students attending 20 or more days rises each year in every building and subgroup, and students attending 20 or more days show a higher spring-to-fall assessment change in reading and mathematics than eligible non-enrollees in each annual October 15 report.**
BENCHMARK	Research gives effect sizes, not an attendance rate: summer math programs show about +0.10 SD and an extra literacy hour showed +0.05 SD in reading, with gains concentrated among regular attenders and low-income children. The entry sets no numeric attendance benchmark beyond the 20-day goal, so the attendance target is directional.

REPORTED	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 15, covering enrollment, the percentage attending 20 or more days by building and subgroup, the spring-to-fall growth comparison for attenders versus eligible non-enrollees, and for any extended-day or extended-year program its added minutes, content, staff and fall-to-spring growth comparison.

Time and schedule

– 20. Four-day school week TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Difference-in-differences studies across Oregon, a multi-state NWEA sample and a RAND study of Idaho, New Mexico and Oklahoma agree that moving to a four-day week lowers achievement growth modestly (spring reading about -0.07 SD and fall-to-spring growth about -0.06 SD in math and reading), with the loss concentrated in non-rural districts and in schedules that cut total instructional time; the saving is small, about 1 to 3 percent of operating spending, and there is no evidence of better attendance. (Oregon: -0.042 SD math after switching; multi-state: spring reading -0.07 SD, fall-to-spring growth -0.06 SD; RAND: slower achievement growth than matched five-day districts; expenditures -1 to -3 percent; juvenile crime +20 percent in Colorado counties; no attendance gain) [189,190,191,192,193,194,195,196,197]

Where the evidence is mixed. Anderson and Walker (2015) found positive effects on Colorado elementary math and reading, and Morton (2022) found no detectable effect on Oklahoma high school ACT scores or attendance and 31 to 39 percent fewer fighting and bullying incidents (partly mechanical, since students are in school less). Thompson and Ward (2022) show the harm is near zero in four-day districts that keep total hours at five-day levels, so the schedule itself is less the problem than lost time. Families, students and teachers report high satisfaction, and RAND found qualitative support for teacher recruitment in rural districts. Districts under severe revenue loss may use the small savings to protect instructional spending.

Standard. A district adopts or retains a four-day week only after showing that total instructional hours will equal or exceed its prior five-day calendar, with a published pre-adoption analysis, fifth-day meal and supervision provisions, and a dated outcome review that triggers reconsideration if achievement growth falls.

1. The policy allows a four-day week only if total instructional hours equal or exceed the district's prior five-day calendar. CORE
2. The policy requires a published analysis before a four-day week is adopted.
3. The policy requires provisions for meals and supervision on the fifth day.
4. The policy requires an outcome review on a stated date after adoption.
5. The policy requires reconsideration of the four-day week if achievement growth falls.

> **Policy.** The Board shall not adopt a four-day instructional week unless the Superintendent has first presented, at a public meeting at least sixty (60) days before the vote, a written analysis showing the total annual instructional hours by grade span under the proposed calendar compared with the current calendar and the state minimum, the projected savings as a percentage of operating expenditure, the plan for meals, supervision and academic support on the non-instructional weekday for students eligible for free or reduced-price meals, and the achievement and attendance measures that will be used to evaluate the change. Any four-day calendar the Board adopts shall provide total instructional hours not less than the district's most recent five-day calendar. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 1 of each of the three school years following adoption the district's achievement growth in reading and mathematics on state and interim assessments compared with the prior three years and

> with comparable five-day districts, the chronic absence rate, disciplinary incidents, and actual savings. If achievement growth is below the prior three-year average for two consecutive years, the Board shall vote on whether to return to a five-day calendar before adopting the next year's calendar.

Indicator. Total annual instructional hours per grade span compared with the district's prior five-day calendar and the state minimum (board-adopted calendar); student achievement growth on state tests and interim assessments in the three years after adoption compared with matched five-day districts; chronic absence rate; documented savings as a share of operating expenditure; fifth-day childcare and meal access for low-income students.

Red flags in real manuals. four-day calendar adopted for cost savings with no instructional-hours comparison; total annual hours set at the state minimum rather than the prior calendar; no provision for meals or supervision on the fifth day; no scheduled outcome review after adoption; calendar policy silent on instructional hours

Law. State calendar law governs. Missouri SB 727 (2024) requires districts in charter counties or cities over 30,000 to win majority voter approval to start or keep a four-day week, with approval lasting ten years, effective 2026-27. Oklahoma SB 441 (2019) limits four-day weeks to districts meeting state performance benchmarks and documenting cost savings, with 1,080 instructional hours required; the State Board granted waivers through 2022. Most four-day states set minimum annual hours rather than days (for example, Texas 75,600 minutes), which is what makes shortened calendars legal.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Chief Financial Officer and Director of Curriculum and Assessment

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent directs the Chief Financial Officer and Director of Curriculum to compute total annual instructional hours by grade span under the current five-day calendar, the proposed four-day calendar and the state minimum, and to project savings as a percentage of operating expenditure.
2. The Director of Student Services drafts the fifth-day plan for meals, supervision and academic support for students eligible for free or reduced-price meals, with named providers, sites and costs.
3. The Director of Curriculum and Assessment selects the state and interim assessments, the comparable five-day districts, and the prior three-year baseline that will be used to judge the change.
4. The Superintendent presents the written analysis at a public Board meeting at least 60 days before any vote and posts it on the district website.
5. The Board Attorney confirms whether state law requires voter approval, a performance benchmark or minimum annual hours (for example, 1,080 hours in Oklahoma or 75,600 minutes in Texas) before the Board schedules a vote.

Year one

1. The Board votes on the calendar only after confirming on the record that total instructional hours are not less than the most recent five-day calendar.
2. The Director of Student Services opens the fifth-day meal and supervision program on the first non-instructional weekday and the Business Office tracks participation by meal-eligibility status.
3. The Director of Curriculum and Assessment collects fall and spring interim assessment results and chronic absence counts so the first October 1 report can compare growth with the prior three years and with matched five-day districts.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first October 1 report to the Board covering achievement growth, chronic absence, disciplinary incidents and actual savings.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 1 in each of the three school years after adoption on achievement growth, chronic absence, disciplinary incidents and actual savings.
2. If achievement growth falls below the prior three-year average for two consecutive years, the Board Clerk places a vote on returning to a five-day calendar on the agenda before the next year's calendar is adopted.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Achievement growth in reading and mathematics on state and interim assessments compared with the district's prior three-year average and with comparable five-day districts; total annual instructional hours per grade span; chronic absence rate; actual savings as a share of operating expenditure; fifth-day meal and supervision access for low-income students
BASELINE	The district's achievement growth, chronic absence rate, instructional hours by grade span and operating expenditure for the three school years before adoption, as documented in the pre-adoption analysis
TARGET	**Total instructional hours in every grade span equal to or greater than the most recent five-day calendar in the adopted calendar; achievement growth in reading and mathematics at or above the prior three-year average in each of the three years after adoption, with no two consecutive years below it; chronic absence rate no higher than the prior three-year average**
BENCHMARK	The research gives effect sizes, not a performance target: four-day weeks lowered spring reading by about -0.07 SD and fall-to-spring growth by about -0.06 SD in math and reading (Oregon math -0.042 SD), saved about 1 to 3 percent of operating spending, and produced no attendance gain, so the policy sets no numeric achievement threshold beyond the district's own prior three-year average

REPORTED	Superintendent's written report to the Board by October 1 in each of the three school years after adoption, presented at a public meeting and posted with the original pre-adoption analysis

– 21. Remote instruction days (virtual snow days and planned remote learning) TIER A

STAKES 2/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Remote instruction delivers less learning than in-person instruction and widens gaps. In 2020 to 2021, districts that stayed in person lost 13 percentage points less in math pass rates than remote districts (Jack et al.), remote instruction was the primary driver of widened gaps by race and poverty (Goldhaber et al.), and the national decline reached 0.20 to 0.27 SD in math (Kuhfeld et al.). Randomized trials of online delivery at West Point (-0.215 SD in grades) and in Chicago algebra credit recovery (lower pass rates) confirm the direction outside the pandemic. A few weather closures do not measurably hurt achievement, so a remote day mainly needs to beat a day off, which it fails to do when attendance collapses. (remote vs in-person: about -0.2 SD (RCTs and pandemic natural experiments), largest for low-income and Black students; a handful of closure days: about 0) [198,199,200,201,202,203,204]

Where the evidence is mixed. No study isolates occasional virtual snow days specifically; the pandemic evidence covers months of remote schooling under crisis conditions and likely overstates the cost of a single day. Goodman (2014) found that a few snow days did not reduce Massachusetts test scores because schools made the time up, while Marcotte and Hemelt (2008) found that about five unscheduled closures before Maryland's spring tests lowered third-grade proficiency rates by nearly 3 percent, so the cost of lost days is real when they are not recovered before assessment. Blended programs that keep in-person contact perform about as well as in-person classes (Escueta et al.). Remote days do protect calendar end dates and staff pay, and for a multi-day emergency closure a well-run remote day beats nothing.

Standard. The district shall use remote instruction days only for weather or emergency closures, shall cap them at five per year counted toward instructional time, shall require live synchronous instruction and attendance taking on every remote day, shall confirm device and internet access for every student in advance, and shall make up any closure beyond the cap with in-person days.

1. The policy caps remote instruction days counted toward instructional time at five per year. CORE
2. The policy limits remote instruction days to weather or emergency closures.
3. The policy requires live synchronous instruction on every remote instruction day.
4. The policy requires attendance to be taken on every remote instruction day.
5. The policy requires the district to confirm device and internet access for every student before a remote instruction day.
6. The policy requires any closure beyond the cap to be made up with in-person days.

> **Policy.** Remote instruction days shall be used only when the Superintendent closes school buildings for weather or emergency and shall not be scheduled for staff development, conferences or other planned purposes. No more than five remote instruction days per school year shall count toward the state minimum of instructional days or hours; closures beyond five shall be made up with in-person days added to the calendar. On each remote instruction day every teacher shall deliver at least two hours of live synchronous instruction for secondary students and at least one hour for elementary students, shall take attendance in the student information system, and shall contact the family of any student absent from the synchronous session that day. By

> October 1 each year the Director of Technology shall certify to the Board that every enrolled student has a district device and a working internet connection at home, or has been issued a hotspot, and shall report the number of students for whom this could not be confirmed. Students with IEPs shall receive their services on remote days or receive compensatory services within 10 school days. The Superintendent shall report to the Board within 30 days of each remote instruction day the attendance rate for that day by school and by free-and-reduced-lunch status, compared with the prior month's in-person rate, and shall present an annual summary by June 30.

Indicator. Number of remote instruction days used per year and the reason for each; student attendance on remote days (share logging into synchronous instruction) by school and by free-and-reduced-lunch status, compared with the in-person attendance rate; share of households confirmed to have a device and connectivity; minutes of live instruction delivered per remote day.

Red flags in real manuals. remote learning days may be used at the superintendent's discretion for any purpose; no cap on the number of remote days; asynchronous assignments posted online constitute a remote instruction day; attendance is not taken or is counted as present if the student submits work within a week; no device or connectivity confirmation; no make-up provision when the cap is exceeded; special education services are suspended on remote days

Law. State law controls whether remote days count toward minimum instructional time: as of 2025 to 2026, Arkansas, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey and DC do not count them (with narrow emergency exceptions), about 23 states cap them (typically 3 to 5 days, up to 10 in Virginia and Kentucky), and about 23 states leave it to district discretion. Indiana limits asynchronous days to three. Some states, such as New York, set device, connectivity and special-education service requirements for remote days. Confirm the current state rule before adopting a cap.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Technology responsible for the device and connectivity certification

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent confirms the current state rule on whether remote days count toward minimum instructional time and whether the state caps them, and reports the rule to the Board before the policy is adopted.
2. The Director of Technology surveys every enrolled household for a district device and a working home internet connection, issues hotspots where needed, and certifies the results to the Board by October 1 with the count of students who could not be confirmed.
3. The Superintendent issues a written remote-day procedure to principals requiring at least two hours of live synchronous instruction for secondary students and one hour for elementary students, attendance entry in the student information system, and same-day family contact for any student absent from the synchronous session.
4. The Director of Special Education sets the process for delivering IEP services on remote days and for scheduling compensatory services within 10 school days when services cannot be delivered.

5. The Superintendent removes any remote days scheduled for staff development, conferences or other planned purposes from the current calendar.

Year one

1. Within 30 days of each remote instruction day the Superintendent reports to the Board the attendance rate for that day by school and by free-and-reduced-lunch status, compared with the prior month's in-person rate, along with minutes of live instruction delivered.
2. The Superintendent tracks the count of remote days used and their reasons and, once closures exceed five, adds in-person make-up days to the calendar and brings the revised calendar to the Board.
3. The Superintendent presents an annual summary by June 30 covering remote days used, reasons, attendance gaps, device confirmation, and IEP service delivery.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Technology repeats the device and connectivity certification to the Board by October 1 every year.
2. The Board reviews the annual June 30 summary and the current state rule on remote-day caps each year and revises the cap if the law changes.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Student attendance on remote instruction days (share logging into synchronous instruction) by school and by free-and-reduced-lunch status, compared with the prior month's in-person attendance rate; number of remote days used per year and reason for each; share of households confirmed to have a device and connectivity; minutes of live instruction per remote day.
BASELINE	The attendance rate on the first remote instruction day after adoption, by school and by free-and-reduced-lunch status, alongside the prior month's in-person rate and the October 1 device and connectivity certification count.
TARGET	**Within 1 year: no remote days used for planned purposes, no more than five remote days counted toward instructional time, every remote day delivering at least two hours of live instruction for secondary and one hour for elementary students, and the gap between remote-day attendance and the prior month's in-person rate narrowing each year, with the free-and-reduced-lunch gap no wider than the overall gap.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric attendance benchmark for remote days. It supports a cap of five days (about 23 states cap remote days, typically at 3 to 5), the two-hour and one-hour live instruction minimums, and the 10 school day compensatory services window. The research shows remote instruction at about -0.2 SD versus in-person, so the goal is to keep remote days rare and to beat a day off, not to match in-person learning.

REPORTED	Superintendent report to the Board within 30 days of each remote instruction day, Director of Technology certification by October 1, and an annual summary by June 30.

– 22. Secondary school start time TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Adolescent circadian timing shifts later, and middle and high schools that start at or after 8:30 a.m. get measurably more sleep from students; a Seattle district-wide delay of nearly an hour produced 34 more minutes of sleep per night, a 4.5 percent rise in median grades and better attendance, and a Florida time-zone natural experiment found each hour of later start relative to sunrise raised adolescent math scores by 0.08 SD. Meta-analyses and a Cochrane review agree on the sleep and attendance effects; achievement effects are positive but smaller and less consistent. (+34 min sleep per school night (Seattle); grades +4.5 percent; math +0.08 SD and reading +0.06 SD per hour later start (Florida); fewer absences and tardies; achievement gains small or mixed in some district studies) [205,206,207,208,209,210,211,212,213,214,215,216]

Where the evidence is mixed. Achievement gains are modest and uneven: Bastian and Fuller (2018) found mixed positive and negative test-score associations across North Carolina high schools even where suspensions fell and grades rose, and the Cochrane review (2017) rated the underlying studies as low quality. Costs are real: later secondary starts usually force bus-tier changes, and RAND (2017) modeled roughly 150 dollars per student per year in added transportation cost plus a one-time facilities cost, with net benefits that turn positive only after several years in high-cost scenarios. Moving secondary schools later can push elementary schools earlier, and after-school activities and student work hours are compressed. Florida enacted a 2023 mandate and then, in 2025, replaced it with a report-and-consider requirement after districts objected to bus and staffing costs.

Standard. Instruction in every school serving any of grades 6 through 12 begins no earlier than 8:30 a.m., and the policy names who reports compliance and by when.

1. The policy requires instruction in every school serving any of grades 6 through 12 to begin no earlier than 8:30 a.m. CORE
2. The policy applies the start time floor to every school serving any grade from 6 through 12, including middle schools.
3. The policy names who reports compliance with the start time requirement.
4. The policy states by when the compliance report is due.

> **Policy.** The instructional day for students in grades 6 through 12 shall begin no earlier than 8:30 a.m. in every district school, and no district school shall require student attendance at a zero period, assembly or mandatory activity before that time. The Superintendent shall present to the Board by March 1 of each year a schedule report listing the first-bell time of every building for the coming school year, the number and percentage of secondary students whose instructional day begins before 8:30 a.m., and the transportation plan and cost needed to comply. The Superintendent shall include in the annual student wellness report the median school-night sleep hours reported by secondary students on the district climate survey, together with chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building. Any building unable to comply shall be named in the report with a dated plan to comply within one school year.

Indicator. First-bell instructional start time for every building serving grades 6 through 12 (master schedule); share of secondary students starting before 8:30 a.m.; median school-night sleep from the district climate survey or YRBS item; chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building.

Red flags in real manuals. start times set solely by transportation efficiency or bus tiers; zero period or mandatory before-school instruction for secondary students; high school start time earlier than middle or elementary start time; no reporting of building start times to the board; policy delegates bell schedule to the Superintendent with no floor

Law. California SB 328 (2019) requires high schools to begin no earlier than 8:30 a.m. and middle schools no earlier than 8:00 a.m., effective July 1, 2022, with rural districts exempt. Florida enacted the same floors in 2023 (effective 2026) but in 2025 (SB 296) replaced the mandate with a requirement that districts report by June 1, 2026 that they considered later start times; districts that file the report are deemed compliant. No federal law applies.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Transportation and the Chief Academic Officer

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent directs the Director of Transportation and each secondary principal to pull the master schedule and list the first-bell instructional start time, any zero period, and any mandatory pre-bell activity for every building serving grades 6 through 12.
2. The Chief Academic Officer calculates the number and percentage of secondary students whose instructional day currently begins before 8:30 a.m. and reports the figure to the Board within 90 days.
3. The Director of Transportation drafts the bus routing options and cost estimate needed to move every secondary building to an 8:30 a.m. or later start.
4. The Superintendent confirms that the district climate survey includes a school-night sleep hours item for secondary students and asks the Director of Assessment to add one if it is missing.

Year one

1. The Superintendent presents the schedule report to the Board by March 1 listing each building's first-bell time, the share of secondary students starting before 8:30 a.m., and the transportation plan and cost to comply.
2. The Superintendent names any building that cannot comply in the March 1 report and attaches a dated plan for that building to comply within one school year.
3. Secondary principals publish master schedules for the coming school year with no instruction, zero period, assembly or mandatory activity before 8:30 a.m. in every building able to comply.
4. The Director of Assessment establishes baseline chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building and baseline median school-night sleep hours from the climate survey.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent presents the schedule report to the Board by March 1 of each year and includes the sleep, chronic absence and first-period tardy figures in the annual student wellness report.

2. The Board reviews the report at a public meeting each spring and votes to accept or return any building compliance plan.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Percentage of secondary students (grades 6 through 12) whose instructional day begins at or after 8:30 a.m., plus median school-night sleep hours reported by secondary students on the district climate survey and chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building
BASELINE	The number and percentage of secondary students starting before 8:30 a.m. in the current master schedule, and the current median school-night sleep hours, chronic absence rate and first-period tardy rate by building, all recorded in the first March 1 schedule report
TARGET	**100 percent of secondary students begin instruction at or after 8:30 a.m. by the start of the school year following the first March 1 report, with any named noncompliant building in compliance within one school year; median school-night sleep hours rise and chronic absence and first-period tardy rates fall in every converted building by the second annual wellness report**
BENCHMARK	Research gives an 8:30 a.m. floor as the standard and reports about 34 more minutes of sleep per school night, a 4.5 percent rise in median grades and better attendance after a Seattle district-wide delay of nearly an hour; the entry gives no numeric benchmark for the size of the sleep, absence or tardy change this district should expect, so the sleep and attendance target is directional
REPORTED	The Superintendent reports to the Board by March 1 each year in the schedule report and annually in the student wellness report, with figures broken out by building

Discipline and climate

– 23. Bullying prevention TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Whole-school anti-bullying programs reduce bullying perpetration by about 19 to 20 percent and victimization by about 15 to 16 percent on average across roughly 100 evaluations, with RCT-only estimates smaller (d about 0.15) but still showing mental-health gains. Written policies matter too: students in states whose anti-bullying laws contain the core US Department of Education components had 24 percent lower odds of being bullied and 20 percent lower odds of cyberbullying, and enumerated policies that name sexual orientation and gender identity are associated with lower suicide-attempt risk among LGB youth. (Perpetration -19 to -20%; victimization -15 to -16% (program meta-analyses); RCT pooled d = -0.15 bullying, -0.21 mental health; compliant state laws: 24% lower odds of bullying, 20% lower odds of cyberbullying.) 217,218,219,220,221,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230

Where the evidence is mixed. Program effects shrink with age: a three-level meta-analysis found effects near zero for grade 8 and above, so a program that works in elementary school may do nothing in high school. RCT-only pooled effects are small (d about 0.15). The policy-content findings (Hatzenbuehler 2013, 2015; Meyer 2019; Kull 2016) are cross-sectional associations between state or district policy and student reports, not causal estimates. Most trials are European; KiVa's large cluster-randomized effects in Finland have not been replicated at the same scale in US districts. Self-report prevalence varies several-fold with the definition and recall window used, so year-to-year comparisons require a fixed instrument.

Standard. The policy shall name a specific evidence-based whole-school program with a written policy and classroom rules, enumerate protected characteristics including sexual orientation and gender identity, require a published reporting channel with an investigation deadline, and require an annual prevalence survey and report to the Board.

1. The policy names a specific evidence-based whole-school anti-bullying program with a written policy and classroom rules. CORE
2. The policy enumerates protected characteristics and the list includes sexual orientation and gender identity.
3. The policy requires a published channel for reporting bullying.
4. The policy sets a deadline by which a reported incident must be investigated.
5. The policy requires an annual survey measuring the prevalence of bullying.
6. The policy requires an annual report on bullying prevalence to the Board.

> **Policy.** The district shall implement the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, an evidence-based whole-school program with published controlled evaluations, in every school. Implementation shall include this written policy, posted classroom rules against bullying, parent information and support for targeted students. Bullying, including cyberbullying, on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, or any other characteristic is prohibited. Each principal shall publish the reporting channel, including an anonymous option, in the student handbook and on the school website, shall begin an investigation within two school days of a report, and shall document the

> outcome within ten school days. The Superintendent shall administer the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire, containing a fixed bullying-victimization item, to all students in grades 3 through 12 each spring and shall report to the Board by October 1 of each year the prevalence by school, grade and demographic group, the number of reports received, the number investigated within the deadlines stated in this policy, the number substantiated, and the three-year trend.

Indicator. Annual student-reported bullying victimization prevalence (past 30 days or past year, fixed instrument such as the YRBS item or the Olweus questionnaire) by school, grade and demographic group; number of reports received, number investigated within the policy timeline, number substantiated; share of students who say they would report; all compared to the prior three years.

Red flags in real manuals. bullying prohibited only in general terms with no enumerated characteristics; no investigation timeline or no named investigator; reporting channel described only as 'tell a trusted adult' with no form, email or anonymous option; program named as 'character education' or an assembly with no whole-school component; no requirement to measure prevalence; only counts of reports; retaliation not addressed; cyberbullying excluded when it occurs off campus even where it disrupts school

Law. All 50 states have anti-bullying statutes (Montana was last, 2015); most require a district policy and many require cyberbullying coverage and a reporting procedure. The US Department of Education's 2011 analysis identified 16 policy components; the three associated with lower bullying in Hatzenbuehler 2015 are a statement of scope, a description of prohibited behaviors and a requirement that districts adopt local policies. Roughly 20 states enumerate sexual orientation and gender identity. Title IX and Title VI obligations attach when bullying is based on sex, race or national origin, and Section 504 and the IDEA when it affects a student with a disability (OCR Dear Colleague Letters of 2010 and 2014).

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with each principal responsible for school-level implementation and the Director of Student Services coordinating the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program and the annual survey.

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent designates the Director of Student Services as program coordinator and contracts for Olweus Bullying Prevention Program training for a coordinating committee at every school.
2. Each principal publishes the reporting channel, including an anonymous option, in the student handbook and on the school website, and posts classroom rules against bullying in every classroom.
3. The Director of Student Services issues a report log template so each school records the date of every report, the date the investigation began, and the date the outcome was documented against the two-school-day and ten-school-day deadlines.
4. The Superintendent sends parent information describing the enumerated protected characteristics, the reporting channel and the support available to targeted students to every family within 90 days of adoption.

5. The district counsel reviews the reporting and investigation procedure against the state anti-bullying statute and Title IX, Title VI, Section 504 and IDEA obligations and reports any gap to the Board within 60 days.

Year one

1. The Superintendent administers the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire to all students in grades 3 through 12 in the spring and records results by school, grade and demographic group as the baseline.
2. Each principal convenes the school coordinating committee at least monthly during the first year to review the report log, deadline compliance and classroom rule enforcement.
3. The Director of Student Services trains all staff, including bus drivers, aides and cafeteria staff, in the program's intervention protocol before the start of the second school year.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first annual report to the Board by October 1 covering prevalence, reports received, reports investigated within deadline, reports substantiated and the start of the three-year trend record.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent administers the fixed-item survey every spring and reports to the Board by October 1 each year with the three-year trend by school, grade and demographic group.
2. Each principal audits the report log each semester and reports to the Superintendent the share of investigations begun within two school days and documented within ten school days.
3. The Director of Student Services refreshes staff training annually and reviews the enumerated-characteristics list and the state statute for changes each year.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Annual student-reported bullying victimization prevalence on the fixed Olweus Bullying Questionnaire item, by school, grade and demographic group, plus number of reports received, number investigated within the two-school-day and ten-school-day deadlines, number substantiated, and share of students who say they would report.
BASELINE	The first spring administration of the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire in year one, broken out by school, grade and demographic group, together with the first full year of report-log counts; no prior-year district data exist until that administration.
TARGET	**Within 3 years of the baseline administration, district-wide student-reported victimization prevalence falls by at least 15 percent from baseline, consistent with the 15 to 16 percent victimization reduction in program meta-analyses, and in every year 100 percent of logged reports show an investigation begun within two school days and an outcome documented within ten school days, with the share of students who say they would report rising each year.**
BENCHMARK	Whole-school program meta-analyses across roughly 100 evaluations: perpetration down 19 to 20 percent and victimization down 15 to 16 percent; RCT-only pooled d of 0.15 for bullying and 0.21 for mental health; students in states with laws containing

	the Department of Education core components had 24 percent lower odds of being bullied and 20 percent lower odds of cyberbullying.
REPORTED	The Superintendent's annual written report to the Board by October 1, presenting prevalence by school, grade and demographic group, reports received, reports investigated within deadline, reports substantiated, and the three-year trend, with the Board recording whether the target was met in its minutes.

– 24. Corporal punishment TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. The meta-analysis specific to school corporal punishment (Visser et al. 2022) finds it associated with more externalizing behavior (r = 0.27, 21 studies, 67,400 children), more internalizing problems (r = 0.16) and lower school performance (r = -0.11, 977,367 children); a propensity-matched sample of young adults from the 19 states where it was legal shows lower high school GPA and more depressive symptoms; the 75-study meta-analysis of physical punishment finds 13 of 17 outcomes significantly worse and none better. No study has found that corporal punishment improves behavior or learning, and no study has found that ending it increases misbehavior. (School CP: externalizing r = 0.27, internalizing r = 0.16, school performance r = -0.11; physical punishment generally: 13 of 17 outcomes worse (mental health problems d = 0.53, aggression d = 0.37), immediate compliance not even reliably improved (d = 0.14, n.s.).)
231,232,233,234,235,236,237,238,239,240,241,242,243,244

Where the evidence is mixed. The evidence is meta-analytic but correlational: no randomized or natural-experiment study of school corporal punishment exists, and none is likely, so the direction of causation is argued from consistency, dose and the absence of any benefit rather than from an experiment. Font and Cage (2018) found only physical abuse, not mild corporal punishment, predicted declines in cognitive test performance, though every form predicted lower school engagement; do not claim that mild corporal punishment measurably lowers test scores on that study. There is no US difference-in-differences study of suspensions or achievement before and after a state or district ban, so a district that ends paddling without a replacement behavior system could shift to suspension; the cross-national evidence that bans are followed by less adolescent fighting (Elgar et al. 2018) is ecological. The commonly repeated claim that states permitting corporal punishment have lower ACT scores has no locatable primary source and should not be used.

Standard. Corporal punishment is prohibited in policy for every student in every setting, with physical force limited to the restraint standard, and the prohibition is communicated to staff and families annually.

1. The policy prohibits corporal punishment for every student in every setting. CORE
2. The policy limits any physical force to the restraint standard.
3. The policy requires the prohibition to be communicated to staff annually.
4. The policy requires the prohibition to be communicated to families annually.
5. The policy does not list corporal punishment among permitted consequences or allow it by the principal or designee.
6. The policy contains no parental consent forms, witness, instrument or number-of-licks rules, or reasonable force defined to include paddling.

> **Policy.** No employee, volunteer or contractor of the district shall administer corporal punishment to any student. Corporal punishment means the deliberate infliction of physical pain as a disciplinary measure, including striking with a hand or object, slapping, pinching, shaking, forced exercise and the withholding of food, water or restroom access. This prohibition applies in every district school, program, vehicle and sponsored activity and may not be waived by parental consent. Physical force shall be used only as permitted by the district's restraint and seclusion policy to prevent imminent physical harm. The Superintendent shall publish this prohibition in the

> student handbook and the staff handbook each August and shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year the number of substantiated allegations of corporal punishment in the prior school year, the action taken on each, and the figure submitted to the Civil Rights Data Collection. Any employee who administers corporal punishment shall be subject to discipline up to and including termination, and the Superintendent shall report the incident to the state child protection agency where state law requires.

Indicator. Instances of corporal punishment reported to the Civil Rights Data Collection (should be zero), with a district count reconciled to building discipline logs; presence of a written prohibition; where state law still permits it, the written opt-in consent rate, witness records and the race, sex and disability breakdown of students struck.

Red flags in real manuals. corporal punishment listed among permitted consequences; 'corporal punishment may be administered by the principal or designee'; parental consent, opt-in or opt-out forms for paddling; 'reasonable force' defined to include paddling or spanking; a witness, instrument size or number-of-licks rule, which signals the practice is retained; 'in accordance with state law' with no district prohibition where state law permits the practice

Law. Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977) held that the Eighth Amendment does not apply to school corporal punishment and that no hearing is required before it, leaving substantive due process claims for excessive force open in the circuits. As of September 2026 corporal punishment in public schools is legal by statute in 17 states (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Wyoming); in Kentucky and North Carolina every district has prohibited it by policy. Five states bar it for students with disabilities while permitting it otherwise (Louisiana 2017, Tennessee 2018, Arkansas 2019, Mississippi 2019, Oklahoma 2025). Where state law permits it, district policy is the operative prohibition. The Protecting Our Students in Schools Act (H.R. 3265, 2025) would bar it in federally funded schools and has not had a hearing. The AAP (2023) and the Secretary of Education (2023) have called for state bans.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Student Services as day-to-day lead and the Board Policy Committee as reviewer

First 90 days

1. The Board adopts the model clause by vote within 30 days and the Superintendent files it in the policy manual, superseding any prior policy that permitted corporal punishment or parental opt-in.
2. The Superintendent sends every employee, volunteer and contractor a written notice of the prohibition within 60 days and obtains a signed acknowledgment from each, retained in personnel files.
3. The Director of Student Services cross-checks the restraint and seclusion policy within 60 days so that physical force is limited to preventing imminent physical harm and no reference to paddling, striking or corporal punishment remains in any district document.
4. The Director of Student Services pulls the district's most recent Civil Rights Data Collection corporal punishment submission and building discipline logs within 90 days and reconciles the

two counts as the baseline.
5. The Superintendent names a single intake route for allegations and directs that every allegation of corporal punishment be investigated and logged, with a referral to the state child protection agency where state law requires.

Year one

1. The Superintendent publishes the prohibition in the student handbook and the staff handbook in August and documents the publication date.
2. Building principals brief all staff on the prohibition and the restraint standard during the August in-service, with sign-in sheets kept.
3. The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 the number of substantiated allegations in the prior school year, the action taken on each, and the figure submitted to the Civil Rights Data Collection.
4. Human Resources applies discipline up to and including termination to any employee substantiated as having administered corporal punishment and records the outcome.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent repeats the August handbook publication and the September 30 Board report every year.
2. The Director of Student Services reconciles the Civil Rights Data Collection count to building discipline logs each year before submission.
3. The Board reviews the policy for consistency with state law every 1 to 3 years and whenever the legislature acts on corporal punishment.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Number of instances of corporal punishment in the district, counted as substantiated allegations in the Superintendent's annual report and as the figure submitted to the Civil Rights Data Collection, reconciled to building discipline logs; plus presence of the written prohibition in both handbooks.
BASELINE	The most recent Civil Rights Data Collection corporal punishment count and the building discipline log count, reconciled, as of policy adoption; the written prohibition exists or does not.
TARGET	**Zero instances of corporal punishment reported in the first full school year after adoption and every year after, with the reconciled count and the CRDC submission both at zero, and the prohibition published in both handbooks each August.**
BENCHMARK	The indicator sets the benchmark at zero instances reported to the Civil Rights Data Collection. The entry gives no numeric target for behavioral or academic outcomes; the finding supports only the direction (no study shows ending corporal punishment increases misbehavior, and school corporal punishment is associated with worse

	externalizing behavior at r = 0.27, internalizing problems at r = 0.16 and school performance at r = -0.11).
REPORTED	The Superintendent's written report to the Board by September 30 each year, stating substantiated allegations, action taken on each, the CRDC figure and the reconciliation to building logs, with the handbook publication dates attached.

– 25. Dress codes and uniforms TIER C STAKES 2/5

Tier C: consistent correlational evidence

Finding. The best causal evidence on uniforms (school fixed effects in a large urban district) finds a modest attendance gain in secondary grades and no effect on achievement or discipline, and national longitudinal data show no behavior or attendance advantage; the evidence that dress rules improve learning is weak. The evidence on enforcement is clearer: GAO's national review found dress codes restrict items typically worn by girls more than boys, strict enforcement in more than four in five predominantly Black schools against about one third of predominantly white schools, informal class removals in 44 percent of codes, and body-measuring rules in 60 percent; Black girls receive disproportionate office referrals for dress code and other subjective infractions. (Uniforms: small secondary attendance gain, no achievement effect (Gentile and Imberman); no behavior or attendance link in national elementary data (Ansari et al.); physical-activity-enabling uniforms: no significant MVPA gain in a 42-school cluster RCT. Enforcement: strict codes in more than 80% of predominantly Black schools vs about 33% of predominantly white schools (GAO).) [245,246,247,248,249,250,251,252,253,254,255]

Where the evidence is mixed. Gentile and Imberman (2012) do find an attendance improvement in middle and high school and large increases in elementary teacher retention after uniform adoption, and Ansari et al. (2022) find low-income students in uniform schools attended better, so uniforms are not harmful on the evidence; they are simply not a lever for achievement. Cross-national PISA correlations (Baumann and Krskova 2016) link uniforms with better classroom discipline, but they cannot separate uniforms from the schools that choose them. Brunsma and Rockquemore (1998) found a small negative achievement association that later commentators disputed. The GAO findings describe enforcement patterns, not outcomes, and the harm case for strict dress codes rests on the exclusionary-discipline evidence (see exclusionary-discipline) rather than on dress-code studies themselves. The one RCT in this area (Nathan et al. 2021) tested sports uniforms for physical activity and found no significant primary effect.

Standard. Dress rules are limited to health, safety and the prohibition of hate speech and obscenity, apply identically to all students regardless of sex, do not require measuring bodies or clothing, protect religious and cultural dress and natural hair, and are enforced without removal from instruction or exclusion from school, with enforcement data reported by student group.

1. The policy limits dress rules to health, safety, and the prohibition of hate speech and obscenity. CORE
2. The policy applies dress rules identically to all students regardless of sex.
3. The policy does not require measuring students' bodies or clothing to determine compliance.
4. The policy protects religious and cultural dress and natural hair.
5. The policy enforces dress rules without removing students from instruction or excluding them from school.
6. The policy requires enforcement data to be reported by student group.

> **Policy.** The district's dress code shall be limited to requirements of health and safety and to the prohibition of clothing that displays obscenity, threats, hate speech, or the promotion of illegal substances or violence. Students shall be permitted to wear religious and cultural dress and head coverings, protective and natural hairstyles, and clothing consistent with their gender identity. No rule shall apply to one sex only, and no rule shall require a staff member to measure any part of a student's body or clothing.

> Shoulders, collarbones, midriffs and leggings shall not be grounds for discipline. A dress code violation shall be addressed by a private conversation and, where available, a loaner garment; no student shall be removed from class, sent home, assigned in-school or out-of-school suspension, or excluded from any school activity for a dress code violation, and no staff member shall comment on a student's body in enforcing this policy. Each principal shall log every dress code intervention, including informal removals, in the student information system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 each year the number of dress code interventions for the prior school year by building, race and sex, and the Board shall revise any rule whose enforcement rate for Black students or for female students exceeds twice the rate for white or male students. Any school uniform requirement shall provide free uniforms to students who qualify for free or reduced-price meals and shall not be enforced by exclusion from instruction.

Indicator. Dress code referrals, class removals and suspensions per 100 students by building, race and sex (student information system; informal removals must be logged to be counted); instructional minutes lost to dress code enforcement; share of the code's rules that are gender-specific or require measuring a student's body; parent and student complaints about dress enforcement.

Red flags in real manuals. 'fingertip length', 'two inches above the knee', 'three-finger straps' or other measurement rules; rules naming girls' items only (skirts, leggings, tank tops, spaghetti straps) or 'distracting' clothing; bans on head wraps, durags, braids, locs, hairstyles or hair length; dress code violation listed as grounds for in-school or out-of-school suspension; 'students will be sent home to change' with no requirement to log the removal; 'administration has final authority to determine appropriate dress' with no stated criteria; uniform requirement with no free-uniform provision for low-income students

Law. Tinker v. Des Moines, 393 U.S. 503 (1969) protects student expression absent substantial disruption, which limits content-based dress rules. Title IX and Title VI expose sex-specific and racially disparate enforcement to federal complaint, and GAO (2022) asked the Department of Education to issue equity guidance; the recommendations remained open as of August 2025. More than twenty states have enacted CROWN Acts barring discrimination based on hair texture and protective styles in schools. Religious dress is protected under the First Amendment and state religious-freedom statutes. The federal government sets no dress code standard; state statutes commonly authorize but do not require district dress codes and uniforms, and several (for example California Education Code 35183) require an opt-out or free uniforms when a uniform is adopted.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Student Services as day-to-day lead and each building principal responsible for logging and enforcement in their school.

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent directs the General Counsel to audit every existing dress rule in the district and each building handbook against the clause, flagging any rule that is sex-specific, requires

measuring a body or garment, or restricts shoulders, collarbones, midriffs or leggings.
2. The Director of Student Services rewrites the district dress code and every building handbook to the model clause's limits (health, safety, obscenity, threats, hate speech, promotion of illegal substances or violence) and strikes the flagged rules.
3. The Director of Technology adds a dress code intervention category to the student information system with required fields for building, student race and sex, type of intervention, and whether any instructional time was lost, so informal removals can be logged.
4. Each principal trains all staff within 60 days on the private-conversation response, the ban on body comments, the loaner garment process, and the duty to log every intervention including informal removals.
5. The Business Office establishes a loaner garment supply in each building and a procedure for providing free uniforms to students who qualify for free or reduced-price meals in any school that keeps a uniform requirement.

Year one

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 the prior year's dress code interventions by building, race and sex, with rates per 100 students and instructional minutes lost.
2. The Board reviews the report and revises or repeals any rule whose enforcement rate for Black students or for female students exceeds twice the rate for white or male students.
3. The Director of Student Services reviews parent and student complaints about dress enforcement quarterly and refers any report of class removal, send-home, suspension or body comment to the principal's supervisor for corrective action.
4. The General Counsel reviews the revised code against Title IX, Title VI, the state CROWN Act if one is in force, the First Amendment, and any state uniform opt-out or free-uniform statute, and reports compliance to the Board.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent delivers the September 30 enforcement report to the Board every year and the Board acts on any rule that crosses the two-to-one threshold.
2. Each principal spot-checks the intervention log against staff and student reports at least once per semester to confirm informal removals are being logged.
3. The Director of Student Services re-audits the district and building codes every year for gender-specific rules and body-measuring rules and reports the share remaining to the Board.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Dress code interventions, class removals and suspensions per 100 students by building, race and sex, drawn from the student information system log that includes informal removals; instructional minutes lost to dress code enforcement; share of code rules that are gender-specific or require measuring a student's body; parent and student complaints about dress enforcement.
BASELINE	The first full school year of logged data after the student information system category is live, reported by September 30; the district has no prior count because informal

	removals were not logged.
TARGET	**Zero class removals, send-homes, suspensions or activity exclusions for dress code violations in every year after adoption; zero gender-specific rules and zero body-measuring rules in the district and building codes within 90 days; and no student group's dress code intervention rate exceeding twice the rate for white or male students in any building by the end of year one, holding in years two and three.**
BENCHMARK	The entry provides no numeric benchmark for an acceptable intervention rate; the only numbers it supports are the GAO national findings (strict codes in more than 80 percent of predominantly Black schools against about 33 percent of predominantly white schools, informal class removals in 44 percent of codes, body-measuring rules in 60 percent) and the clause's own two-to-one disparity threshold, so the target is set on direction and on the clause's threshold.
REPORTED	Annual report to the Board by September 30 covering the prior school year, presented by the Superintendent, with the count of rules revised or repealed and the number of complaints received, and posted publicly with the Board minutes.

– 26. Physical restraint and seclusion TIER D STAKES 4/5

Tier D: professional standard or expert consensus

Finding. No outcome study shows that restraint or seclusion improves behavior or learning; the GAO found hundreds of allegations of abuse and death linked to their use in schools between 1990 and 2009, with untrained staff and non-aggressive children with disabilities as the recurring pattern. In 2021-22 about 105,700 students were restrained or secluded, and students served under IDEA were 14 percent of enrollment but 76 percent of those physically restrained and 68 percent of those secluded. A systematic review of 15 studies finds that school-wide prevention approaches reduce the frequency of restraint, but none is an RCT. (IDEA students: 14% of enrollment, 76% of physical restraints, 68% of seclusions (2021-22); earlier CRDC analysis: students with disabilities 7 times as likely to be restrained and 4 times as likely to be secluded; reduction programs: most of 15 studies report significant decreases, magnitudes uncontrolled.) 256,257,258,259,260,261,262,263,264,265,266

Where the evidence is mixed. The evidence base is thin and the tier reflects that. Harm evidence is case-based (GAO's closed cases, media investigations) and from medical literature on restraint deaths rather than from controlled school studies. The reduction literature (Hodgkiss and Harding 2023; Trader et al. 2017) is mostly single-site pre-post designs without control groups. Federal counts are unreliable: GAO found about 70 percent of districts reported zero incidents in 2015-16 and that large districts had reported zeros in error, so trend claims from the CRDC are weak. Practitioners argue that restraint remains necessary in genuine emergencies to prevent injury, and no study claims otherwise; the standard here limits rather than bans physical restraint while banning seclusion, mechanical and chemical restraint and restraints that restrict breathing.

Standard. Seclusion, mechanical restraint, chemical restraint and any restraint that restricts breathing are prohibited; physical restraint is limited to imminent danger of serious physical harm, performed by trained staff, with same-day parent notice, a written incident report, a debrief, a behavior-plan review after repeated use, and quarterly public reporting.

1. The policy prohibits seclusion, mechanical restraint, chemical restraint and any restraint that restricts breathing. CORE
2. The policy limits physical restraint to situations of imminent danger of serious physical harm.
3. The policy requires that physical restraint be performed only by trained staff.
4. The policy requires same-day notice to parents after any physical restraint.
5. The policy requires a written incident report, a debrief, and a behavior-plan review after repeated use of restraint.
6. The policy requires quarterly public reporting of restraint use.

> **Policy.** No student shall be placed in seclusion, defined as involuntary confinement alone in a room or area the student is prevented from leaving. No student shall be subjected to mechanical restraint, chemical restraint, prone or supine restraint, or any hold that restricts breathing or places pressure on the neck, chest or back. Physical restraint shall be used only when a student's behavior poses an imminent danger of serious physical harm to the student or others, only by staff who hold current certification in a Board-approved crisis intervention program, and only for as long as the danger persists; it shall never be used as punishment, as a consequence, for property damage alone, or for noncompliance. The staff member who applied the restraint shall

> notify the principal before the end of the school day and the principal shall notify the parent or guardian verbally the same day and in writing within one school day. A written incident report describing the behavior, the hold, its duration, the staff involved, any injury and the parent notification shall be completed within two school days and placed in the student's record. The principal shall convene a debriefing with the staff involved within two school days, and the student's IEP, Section 504 or behavior support team shall meet within ten school days after any second restraint in a school year to revise the student's behavior intervention plan. The Superintendent shall report to the Board each quarter, and publish on the district website by September 30 for the prior school year, the number of restraints by building, disability status, race and sex, the number of injuries, and the district's Civil Rights Data Collection submission.

Indicator. Incidents of physical restraint, mechanical restraint and seclusion per 100 students by building and by disability status, race and sex, reconciled between the district's incident log and the Civil Rights Data Collection submission (a zero submission from a district with special education programs is itself a red flag); injuries to students and staff during incidents; share of incidents with same-day parent notification; share of incidents involving a student with no behavior intervention plan.

Red flags in real manuals. seclusion, 'time-out room', 'calm room' or 'isolation room' permitted with the door closed or blocked; restraint or seclusion listed as a disciplinary consequence; prone, supine or mechanical restraint not expressly prohibited; restraint permitted to prevent property damage or for 'disruption' or 'noncompliance'; parent notification 'within a reasonable time' or not required; no training requirement, or training 'as resources allow'; no incident report, debrief or reporting to the Board; 'reasonable force' clause with no imminent-harm limit

Law. There is no federal statute on restraint or seclusion in schools; the Keeping All Students Safe Act (H.R. 6617 and S. 3448, introduced December 11, 2025) would ban seclusion and mechanical, chemical and breathing-restricting restraint in federally funded schools and has not advanced. The Department of Education's 2012 Resource Document sets fifteen principles that most state laws track. Every district must report restraint and seclusion incidents to the Civil Rights Data Collection, and GAO (2019, 2020) found that reporting unreliable. State law governs: Kern et al. (2024) find most states have a statute or guidance, with wide variation; Georgia prohibits seclusion outright; many states permit seclusion with conditions. IDEA requires that a student's IEP team consider positive behavioral interventions when behavior impedes learning (34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(i)), which is the legal hook for a behavior plan review after repeated restraint.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Special Education as the designated restraint and seclusion coordinator

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent issues a written directive to all principals within 30 days that seclusion, mechanical restraint, chemical restraint, prone and supine restraint and any hold restricting breathing are prohibited effective immediately, and orders every seclusion room or area closed or repurposed.

2. The Director of Special Education adopts a single incident report form and a district-wide incident log within 60 days, and reconciles the current log against the district's most recent Civil Rights Data Collection submission to establish the baseline.
3. The Human Resources Director inventories which staff hold current certification in the Board-approved crisis intervention program and schedules certification for every building so each school has trained staff by day 90.
4. Each principal reviews the past year's incident log within 90 days and refers any student restrained two or more times to the IEP, Section 504 or behavior support team for a behavior intervention plan review within ten school days.
5. The Superintendent delivers the first quarterly report to the Board covering restraints by building, disability status, race and sex, injuries, and the share of incidents with same-day parent notification.

Year one

1. The Director of Special Education trains every principal and crisis-certified staff member on the imminent-danger standard, the same-day parent notice, the two-day incident report, the two-day debrief and the ten-day plan review, and audits a sample of incident reports each quarter for compliance.
2. The Director of Special Education implements a school-wide positive behavioral intervention and support program in every building, starting with the buildings that had the highest restraint rate per 100 students in the baseline year.
3. The Superintendent publishes the prior school year's restraint data and the Civil Rights Data Collection submission on the district website by September 30 and certifies to the Board that the two sources match.
4. The Board reviews the full year of quarterly reports and the disability, race and sex breakdowns at a public meeting and directs corrective action for any building that is an outlier.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes the annual data by September 30, with the incident log reconciled to the Civil Rights Data Collection submission every year.
2. The Human Resources Director verifies annually that every staff member authorized to apply a physical restraint holds current crisis intervention certification and removes authorization when certification lapses.
3. The Director of Special Education reviews every student with a second restraint in a school year to confirm the behavior intervention plan was revised within ten school days.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Incidents of physical restraint, mechanical restraint and seclusion per 100 students, by building and by disability status, race and sex, from the district incident log reconciled to the Civil Rights Data Collection submission; injuries to students and staff; share of incidents with same-day parent notification; share of incidents involving a student with no behavior intervention plan.

BASELINE	The prior school year's incident log and the district's most recent Civil Rights Data Collection submission, reconciled within 60 days of adoption; nationally, students served under IDEA were 14 percent of enrollment but 76 percent of physical restraints and 68 percent of seclusions in 2021-22, and earlier CRDC analysis found students with disabilities 7 times as likely to be restrained and 4 times as likely to be secluded.
TARGET	**Zero seclusions, mechanical restraints, chemical restraints and prone or supine restraints from the first quarterly report onward; physical restraints per 100 students declining each year for 3 years against the baseline year; 100 percent of incidents with same-day parent notification and a written report within two school days by the end of year one; the share of restraints involving students with disabilities moving toward their share of enrollment over 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric target for an acceptable restraint rate. The only benchmarks are the prohibited practices, which have a benchmark of zero, and the national disproportionality figures (IDEA students 14 percent of enrollment, 76 percent of restraints, 68 percent of seclusions), which the district can compare its own ratios against. A systematic review of 15 studies finds school-wide prevention approaches reduce restraint frequency, but magnitudes are uncontrolled and none is an RCT, so no expected percentage reduction is supported.
REPORTED	The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes on the district website by September 30 for the prior school year the number of restraints by building, disability status, race and sex, the number of injuries, the share with same-day parent notification, and the district's Civil Rights Data Collection submission, with a note explaining any difference between the log and the submission; a zero submission from a district with special education programs is flagged for Board inquiry.

– 27. School climate measurement TIER C STAKES 3/5

Tier C: consistent correlational evidence

Finding. School climate is a medium-sized correlate of achievement (meta-analysis of 37 K-12 studies), buffers the achievement penalty of low socioeconomic status, and predicts adolescent mental health, engagement and graduation; within-school improvements in safety, leadership and academic expectations measured on New York City's annual survey track lower teacher turnover and higher achievement in a design the authors call consistent with causation. Climate is changeable: a cluster-randomized trial of schoolwide PBIS reduced office referrals by 33 percent. What the evidence does not show is that surveying alone changes anything; the survey is the instrument that makes the rest of the manual's climate commitments testable. (School climate to achievement: medium pooled correlation (37 studies); safety and expectations gains linked to achievement gains and lower teacher turnover within schools over time; climate intervention RCT: office referrals -33%; no direct effect estimated for the act of surveying.) [267,268,269,270,271,272,273,274,275,276,277,278]

Where the evidence is mixed. Nearly all climate-outcome evidence is correlational and most reviews say so; schools with high achievement may produce good climate reports rather than the reverse. Definitions and instruments vary widely, which inflates heterogeneity across studies. Self-report scales show reference bias and normative developmental declines after grade 6 that can be misread as a worsening school, so year-over-year comparisons need a fixed instrument and cohort-aware interpretation. Using climate scores for high-stakes accountability may distort responses; the CORE districts use them for improvement, not sanctions. Response rates below about 70 percent make school-level scores unreliable, and no study evaluates whether mandating a survey, by itself, improves outcomes.

Standard. The policy shall require a validated climate survey of students, staff and families every year, with a fixed instrument, a minimum response rate, results published by school and demographic group, and a requirement that each school improvement plan respond to its lowest climate domain.

1. The policy requires a validated school climate survey of students, staff and families to be administered every year. CORE
2. The policy names a fixed survey instrument that is kept the same from year to year.
3. The policy sets a minimum response rate for the climate survey.
4. The policy requires survey results to be published by school and by demographic group.
5. The policy requires each school improvement plan to respond to that school's lowest climate domain.
6. The policy does not use climate survey results for staff evaluation or school sanctions.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall administer a validated school climate survey (the ED School Climate Surveys or an instrument with published reliability and validity evidence) to all students in grades 3 through 12, all staff and all families each spring, using the same core items for at least five consecutive years. Each principal shall obtain a response rate of at least 70 percent of enrolled students and staff. The Director of Research and Accountability shall publish by August 31 of each year the results by school, grade band, race, disability status, English learner status and gender, with three-year trends and the relationship of climate scores to chronic absenteeism, suspension rates and achievement. Each school improvement plan submitted by October 1 shall identify the school's lowest-scoring climate domain and the actions and budget assigned

> to it, and the Superintendent shall present the district summary to the Board at a public meeting by October 31. Climate results shall be used for improvement and shall not be used as the sole basis for any personnel action.

Indicator. Annual climate survey response rate by school and respondent group (target at least 70% of students and staff); domain scores (safety, relationships, engagement, environment) by school, grade band and demographic group with three-year trend; correlation of school climate scores with chronic absenteeism, suspension rate and achievement; the number of school improvement plans that cite a climate finding.

Red flags in real manuals. climate survey 'may' be administered or is left to principal discretion; no named or validated instrument; no response-rate requirement; results reported only districtwide, not by school or demographic group; no link from survey results to the school improvement plan; survey used for staff evaluation or school sanctions; instrument changed every year so trends cannot be read

Law. ESSA (20 USC 6311(c)(4)(B)(v)) requires each state accountability system to include at least one indicator of school quality or student success, and several states use climate surveys for it. California's Local Control and Accountability Plan requires districts to report on school climate (Priority 6), typically with the California Healthy Kids Survey. Illinois (105 ILCS 5/2-3.153) requires a biennial statewide learning-conditions survey (5Essentials) of students and teachers. Maryland, Georgia, Nevada and others administer statewide climate surveys and publish school-level results. The federal EDSCLS instrument is free. Student surveys that ask about protected topics may trigger the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (20 USC 1232h) notice and opt-out requirements.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Research and Accountability administering the survey and publishing results

First 90 days

1. The Director of Research and Accountability selects the ED School Climate Surveys or another instrument with published reliability and validity evidence and fixes the core items the district will keep for at least five consecutive years.
2. The Superintendent sets the spring administration window for students in grades 3 through 12, all staff and all families, and issues each principal the 70 percent response rate requirement for students and staff.
3. The district legal counsel reviews the student items against the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment and the Director of Research and Accountability prepares the parent notice and opt-out form before any item on a protected topic is asked.
4. The Director of Research and Accountability builds the reporting template that breaks results out by school, grade band, race, disability status, English learner status and gender, with fields for three-year trends and the links to chronic absenteeism, suspension rates and achievement.

Year one

1. Each principal administers the survey in the spring, tracks daily completion and reaches at least 70 percent of enrolled students and staff before the window closes.

2. The Director of Research and Accountability publishes the first results by August 31 and the relationship of climate scores to chronic absenteeism, suspension rates and achievement.
3. Each principal names the school's lowest-scoring climate domain in the school improvement plan due October 1 and lists the actions and budget assigned to it.
4. The Superintendent presents the district summary to the Board at a public meeting by October 31 and confirms that climate results have not been used as the sole basis for any personnel action.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Research and Accountability repeats the survey each spring with the same core items and adds the new year to the three-year trend tables published by August 31.
2. The Superintendent reviews each October which schools fell below the 70 percent response rate and which improvement plans failed to cite a climate finding, and reports both counts to the Board by October 31.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of schools that reach a 70 percent response rate among students and staff, results published by school and demographic group by August 31, and the number of school improvement plans that name the lowest-scoring climate domain with assigned actions and budget
BASELINE	No district climate survey administered under a fixed instrument; the first spring administration sets the baseline for domain scores by school and group
TARGET	**In year one, every school reaches at least 70 percent of enrolled students and staff, results are published by August 31, and every school improvement plan submitted by October 1 cites its lowest-scoring climate domain; by year three, domain scores in safety, relationships, engagement and environment show a rising three-year trend at each school, with no demographic group falling**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives a 70 percent response rate floor for students and staff; it gives no numeric benchmark for domain score gains and notes that surveying alone has no estimated direct effect, so the score target is directional
REPORTED	The Director of Research and Accountability publishes results by August 31 each year and the Superintendent presents the district summary to the Board at a public meeting by October 31, with the response rate by school and the count of improvement plans citing a climate finding

– 28. Social-emotional learning TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Universal, sequenced social-emotional learning programs improve social-emotional skills, behavior and achievement: the 2011 meta-analysis of 213 programs found skills gains of 0.57 SD and an 11 percentile-point achievement gain in the 35 studies that measured it, follow-up effects persist at 0.13 to 0.33 SD six months to years later, and the 2023 meta-analysis of 424 studies with 575,361 students confirms positive effects across skills, behavior, climate and achievement. Effects are smaller in independent, at-scale trials than in developer-led efficacy trials and depend on implementation quality; some universal mental-health curricula have produced null or harmful results. (Skills +0.57 SD, achievement +0.27 SD (11 percentile points), conduct problems -0.22 SD, emotional distress -0.24 SD (Durlak 2011); follow-up academic +0.33 SD in the few studies measuring it (Taylor 2017); reading and math about +0.25 SD (Corcoran 2018); effects roughly halve in independent at-scale trials (Wigelsworth 2016).) [279,280,281,282,283,284,285,286,287,288,289]

Where the evidence is mixed. The 11 percentile-point figure comes from 35 of 213 studies, mostly developer-led, and Wigelsworth's 2016 meta-analysis found effects shrink substantially when trials are run independently and at scale. The largest independent UK trial of PATHS (45 schools, 4,516 children) found only small teacher-rated gains in social competence and nothing on academic outcomes, and effects of the 4Rs program in New York were modest after two years. Universal mental-health-flavored programs have failed outright: the MYRIAD mindfulness trial was null in 85 schools and a DBT-skills program worsened depression and anxiety. Program adoption without fidelity monitoring is the common failure mode; Durlak's SAFE criteria (sequenced, active, focused, explicit) and implementation quality moderate every meta-analytic estimate. SEL has also become politically contested in several states, and districts that cannot explain what is taught lose parent trust.

Standard. A sequenced, explicitly taught SEL program with an independent evidence rating is delivered in every grade K-12 at its designed dose, with annual implementation-fidelity checks, published scope and sequence for families, and annual measurement on the climate survey.

1. The policy requires a sequenced, explicitly taught SEL program delivered in every grade K-12 at its designed dose. CORE
2. The policy requires the SEL program to have an independent evidence rating.
3. The policy requires annual implementation-fidelity checks of the SEL program.
4. The policy requires a published scope and sequence of the SEL program for families.
5. The policy requires annual measurement of SEL on the climate survey.

> **Policy.** The district shall adopt and deliver in every grade K-12 a sequenced social-emotional learning program that holds a CASEL SELect rating or a What Works Clearinghouse rating of moderate or strong evidence, taught at the dose specified by the program developer. The Director of Curriculum shall publish the scope and sequence and the lesson materials for family review on the district website before the first day of school each year and shall provide a written opt-out process. Principals shall complete implementation-fidelity observations in every classroom at least twice each year using the program's fidelity tool, and the Director of Curriculum shall provide coaching to any classroom below the program's fidelity threshold within 30 days. The Director of Curriculum shall report to the Board by November 1 of each year the program in use at

> each grade, the share of classrooms meeting the fidelity threshold, climate survey results on belonging and trusted adults by school, and discipline referrals by school.

Indicator. Adoption of a named, sequenced SEL program with a CASEL SELect or What Works Clearinghouse evidence rating in every grade; share of classrooms delivering the program at the scheduled dose, from fidelity walk-throughs; climate survey items on belonging, trusted adults and peer support (state climate survey or Panorama); office discipline referrals and suspensions by school.

Red flags in real manuals. social-emotional learning is prohibited or restricted in the curriculum; SEL may be integrated at the discretion of the teacher (no program, no dose); character education assemblies substitute for a sequenced curriculum; no measurement of climate or implementation; program selected without an evidence rating; no family-facing scope and sequence or opt-out process

Law. Illinois was the first state to mandate K-12 SEL standards (105 ILCS 5/2-3.153, Children's Mental Health Act of 2003) and most states now publish SEL standards or competencies, usually as guidance rather than mandate. Since 2022 several states have restricted or renamed SEL content in curriculum law or standards reviews (including Oklahoma and Florida), so program materials must be transparent to families. ESSA Title IV-A funds may support SEL programs.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Curriculum

First 90 days

1. The Director of Curriculum inventories the SEL program in use at each grade K-12 and checks each against the CASEL SELect list and the What Works Clearinghouse ratings to identify grades with no program or a program without a moderate or strong evidence rating.
2. The Director of Curriculum presents to the Board within 60 days a selection of candidate programs holding a CASEL SELect or What Works Clearinghouse moderate or strong rating for any grade lacking one, with the developer's specified dose and cost, including whether ESSA Title IV-A funds can cover it.
3. The Director of Curriculum drafts the written family opt-out process and the website format for publishing the scope and sequence and lesson materials, and the Superintendent reviews it with district counsel against current state SEL law.
4. Principals schedule the two annual fidelity observations per classroom on the school calendar and obtain the program developer's fidelity tool and fidelity threshold for each adopted program.
5. The Director of Curriculum confirms with the Superintendent that the state climate survey or Panorama survey includes items on belonging, trusted adults and peer support and sets the administration date.

Year one

1. The Director of Curriculum publishes the scope and sequence and lesson materials for every grade on the district website before the first day of school, together with the written opt-out process.
2. Principals complete the first fidelity observation in every classroom by the end of the first semester and the second by the end of the year, and the Director of Curriculum provides coaching to each classroom below the fidelity threshold within 30 days of the observation.

3. The Director of Curriculum collects the fidelity results, the climate survey results on belonging and trusted adults by school, and office discipline referrals and suspensions by school, and reports them to the Board by November 1.
4. The Director of Curriculum trains all teachers new to the program in its delivery before they begin teaching it, at the dose and sequence the developer specifies.

Ongoing

1. Principals complete two fidelity observations per classroom each year and the Director of Curriculum coaches any classroom below threshold within 30 days.
2. The Director of Curriculum republishes the scope and sequence and lesson materials before the first day of school each year and reports to the Board by November 1 on program in use by grade, share of classrooms meeting the fidelity threshold, climate survey results by school, and discipline referrals by school.
3. The Director of Curriculum rechecks each program's CASEL SELect or What Works Clearinghouse rating annually and brings any program that loses its rating to the Board for replacement.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of grades K-12 using a program with a CASEL SELect or What Works Clearinghouse moderate or strong rating; share of classrooms meeting the program's fidelity threshold on observations; climate survey scores on belonging and trusted adults by school; office discipline referrals and suspensions by school.
BASELINE	Year-one inventory of programs by grade and the first round of fidelity observations, plus the first climate survey administration and the prior year's discipline referrals and suspensions by school.
TARGET	**Every grade K-12 using a rated program within 1 year; the share of classrooms meeting the fidelity threshold rising each year from the year-one baseline; climate survey scores on belonging and trusted adults rising and discipline referrals and suspensions falling at each school within 1 to 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	The research gives effect sizes, not an operational threshold: skills +0.57 SD, achievement +0.27 SD (11 percentile points), conduct problems -0.22 SD, emotional distress -0.24 SD in Durlak 2011, with effects roughly halving in independent at-scale trials (Wigelsworth 2016) and depending on implementation quality. No numeric fidelity or climate survey benchmark is given in the entry, so the target is directional against the district's own baseline.

REPORTED	The Director of Curriculum reports to the Board by November 1 each year the program in use at each grade, the share of classrooms meeting the fidelity threshold, climate survey results on belonging and trusted adults by school, and discipline referrals and suspensions by school, and posts the report on the district website alongside the published scope and sequence.

– 29. Student searches and due process in discipline TIER D STAKES 3/5

Tier D: professional standard or expert consensus

Finding. This domain is governed by constitutional standards rather than outcome research: Goss v. Lopez requires notice and an opportunity to respond before any suspension of ten days or less, New Jersey v. T.L.O. permits school searches on reasonable suspicion when justified at inception and reasonable in scope, and Safford v. Redding holds that a search of a student's underwear requires suspicion that the item is dangerous or hidden there. The one federal randomized trial of random drug testing found lower self-reported use among tested students (16 versus 22 percent) with no spillover to untested students, while national correlational studies find no association between testing and student drug use. (Legal standards, not effect sizes. Drug testing: tested students 16% vs 22% past-30-day use in the federal RCT; no effect on untested students or on intentions; national surveys show no association.) [290,291,292,293,294,295,296,297,298]

Where the evidence is mixed. Outcome evidence on searches and hearings is almost nonexistent; nobody has randomized due process. The drug-testing literature is the only causal evidence and it is mixed: the federal RCT (James-Burdumy et al. 2010) found less reported use among students actually subject to testing in seven volunteer districts, with no generalizable national estimate, while Yamaguchi et al. (2003) found no association between school testing and student drug use in national Monitoring the Future data, the SATURN prospective trial of athlete testing found no reduction in past-month use, and Sznitman and Romer (2014) found that a positive school climate, not testing, predicted less use. Courts have upheld suspicionless drug testing of students in extracurricular activities (Vernonia 1995; Earls 2002), so the limit on it here is a policy choice grounded in weak benefit evidence, not a legal requirement. Procedural-justice research in schools is correlational: students who see discipline as fair report less misconduct and more engagement, but the designs cannot show that hearings cause the difference.

Standard. Policy states the Goss procedures for every short suspension and a formal hearing with written notice, representation, evidence and a written decision for any exclusion beyond ten days; searches require individualized reasonable suspicion documented in writing, strip searches are prohibited, and searches and hearings are logged and reported by student group.

1. The policy requires notice and an opportunity to respond before every suspension of ten days or less. CORE
2. The policy requires a formal hearing with written notice, representation, evidence and a written decision for any exclusion beyond ten days.
3. The policy requires individualized reasonable suspicion for any search of a student.
4. The policy requires that the suspicion for each search be documented in writing.
5. The policy prohibits strip searches.
6. The policy requires that searches and hearings be logged and reported by student group.

> **Policy.** Before any suspension of ten school days or fewer, the principal or designee shall tell the student the charge, explain the evidence, and give the student an opportunity to present the student's side; where a student's presence poses a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting instruction, the student may be removed immediately and this conference shall occur within one school day. Written notice of the suspension, its basis and the appeal procedure shall be sent to the parent or guardian the same day. Any proposed exclusion of more than ten school days or

> expulsion shall require written notice to the parent at least five school days before a hearing before a hearing officer or Board panel not employed at the referring school, at which the student may be represented, present evidence and witnesses, and question the district's evidence, and a written decision with findings shall issue within five school days of the hearing; for a student with a disability, the manifestation determination required by law shall be completed within ten school days of the decision to remove. A search of a student's person, belongings, locker or vehicle shall require individualized reasonable suspicion, recorded in writing by the staff member before or immediately after the search, that the search will turn up evidence of a violation of law or school rules, and shall be no more intrusive than the suspected violation warrants. No student shall be strip searched or required to remove or expose undergarments by any district employee; where there is reasonable suspicion of an imminent danger to life, the principal shall contact law enforcement. Random or suspicionless searches of lockers may be conducted only under a written annual notice to students and families; the district shall not conduct suspicionless drug testing of students. Each principal shall log every search of a student's person or belongings and every suspension conference in the student information system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 each year, for the prior school year and by building, race and disability status, the number of searches, the number of suspensions and expulsions, the share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference, the number of appeals and their outcomes, and the number of complaints alleging a search or hearing violation.

Indicator. Share of suspensions for which the student record documents notice of charges, the evidence explained and the student's response before removal (discipline record audit); share of expulsion hearings with written notice, a hearing officer independent of the referring school, and a written decision; number of student searches logged with the basis for suspicion, by building, race and disability; strip searches (should be zero); complaints and appeals filed and their outcomes.

Red flags in real manuals. 'the principal may suspend a student without a conference' or no mention of notice and opportunity to respond; expulsion decided by the same principal who referred the student, with no independent hearing; 'students have no expectation of privacy' applied to their person as well as lockers; search authority stated without a reasonable-suspicion standard or with 'any reason'; strip search or 'search of undergarments' permitted by any employee; suspicionless drug testing of all students or as a condition of parking or activities without a stated basis; no appeal procedure, or an appeal available only 'at the discretion of the superintendent'; no record-keeping requirement for searches

Law. Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975) sets the minimum process for suspensions of ten days or less and signals that longer exclusions need more. New Jersey v. T.L.O., 469 U.S. 325 (1985) sets the reasonable-suspicion standard for searches by school officials; Safford v. Redding, 557 U.S. 364 (2009) bars underwear searches absent suspicion of danger or concealment there; Vernonia (1995) and Earls (2002) permit suspicionless drug testing of students in athletics and competitive extracurriculars. IDEA (34 CFR 300.530 to 300.536) requires a manifestation determination within ten school days of a decision to change the

placement of a student with a disability for discipline, and Section 504 imposes a parallel duty. FERPA governs access to discipline records and the student's right to review them for a hearing. Many state statutes prescribe expulsion hearing procedures and timelines that are more specific than Goss; the clause above is a floor that state law may raise. Searches by school resource officers or police are judged under ordinary Fourth Amendment standards in some circuits, so policy should state which standard applies when an officer conducts the search.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Student Services as day-to-day owner and the General Counsel reviewing procedures

First 90 days

1. The General Counsel reviews the clause against state expulsion hearing statutes, IDEA 34 CFR 300.530 to 300.536, Section 504 and FERPA, and drafts the administrative procedure, including which search standard applies when a school resource officer or police officer conducts the search.
2. The Director of Student Services adds required fields to the student information system so every search is logged with the written basis for suspicion and every suspension conference is logged with the charge, the evidence explained and the student's response.
3. The Superintendent issues the written annual notice to students and families describing when random locker searches may occur and stating that the district does not conduct suspicionless drug testing.
4. The Director of Student Services trains every principal, assistant principal and dean on the Goss conference, the one school day limit for emergency removals, same-day written notice to parents, the reasonable-suspicion search record and the strip search prohibition.
5. The Superintendent names a pool of hearing officers or Board panel members not employed at any referring school and publishes the expulsion hearing procedure, including the five school day notice and five school day decision timelines.

Year one

1. The Director of Student Services audits a sample of suspension records from each building each semester for the documented pre-removal conference and same-day parent notice, and reports the results to the principal and Superintendent.
2. The Director of Special Education tracks every removal of a student with a disability and confirms the manifestation determination is completed within ten school days of the decision to remove.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first report to the Board by September 30 covering searches, suspensions, expulsions, documented conferences, appeals, complaints and strip searches, broken out by building, race and disability status.
4. The General Counsel reviews every complaint alleging a search or hearing violation within 30 days and recommends corrective action to the Superintendent.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 each year on the prior year's searches, suspensions, expulsions, conference documentation, appeals and complaints by building, race and disability.

2. The Director of Student Services retrains new administrators within 90 days of hire and all administrators annually on search and due process procedures.
3. The General Counsel reviews the procedure each year against changes in state statute and court decisions and brings any needed amendments to the Board.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference (charge, evidence and student response) and same-day parent notice; share of expulsion hearings with timely written notice, an independent hearing officer and a written decision within five school days; number of searches logged with a written basis, by building, race and disability; number of strip searches; manifestation determinations completed within ten school days; complaints and appeals and their outcomes.
BASELINE	Set from the first discipline record audit and the first September 30 report after adoption; the entry provides no district baseline.
TARGET	**Zero strip searches in every year; every exclusion over ten days has written notice at least five school days before the hearing and a written decision within five school days after it; every manifestation determination completed within ten school days; the share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference and same-day parent notice rises each year, with the gap between buildings and between student groups narrowing, as shown in the September 30 report within 1 to 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric benchmark for conference documentation or search rates; the only numeric evidence is the federal drug testing trial (16 versus 22 percent use), which the clause does not rely on because it bars suspicionless drug testing. The standards are legal floors from Goss, T.L.O., Safford and IDEA, so full compliance is the benchmark.
REPORTED	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by September 30, disaggregated by building, race and disability status, with the discipline record audit results attached.

– 30. Suspension and expulsion TIER A STAKES 5/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Out-of-school suspension lowers the suspended student's own math and reading achievement (Philadelphia student panel with instrumental variables), and attending a school with a one standard deviation higher suspension rate raises the chance of adult arrest and incarceration by 15 to 20 percent (North Carolina boundary-change natural experiment). Reforms that ended suspension for minor nonviolent conduct raised achievement and attendance in New York City and Chicago, while reforms that cut suspensions without a replacement behavior system lowered achievement and raised absences for most students in Los Angeles and Philadelphia. (Suspended student: lower math and reading scores; strict school: +15 to 20% adult arrest and incarceration; NYC reform: +0.05 SD math over three years; LAUSD reform: lower scores and GPA, more absences for most students; Chicago reform: about +1 day attendance per year.)
299,300,301,302,303,304,305,306,307,308,309,310,311,312,313,314,315

Where the evidence is mixed. Peer effects cut both ways. Pope and Zuo (2023) find Los Angeles' near-elimination of suspensions lowered test scores and GPAs and raised absences and teacher turnover for most students, with gains only for the highest-risk students. Lacoe and Steinberg (2018) find Philadelphia's 2012 reform did not cut total suspensions, and serious misconduct, truancy and achievement all moved the wrong way district-wide; the companion paper shows peers were unharmed only in schools that fully implemented the reform. Hwang and Domina (2021) find classmates' math scores rise when disruptive peers are suspended in a low-suspension district, and Carrell, Hoekstra and Kuka (2018) show one disruptive elementary classmate lowers peers' adult earnings 3 percent. Sorensen et al. (2022) find harsher principals do reduce reported minor misconduct, at the cost of more juvenile complaints and lower graduation for everyone in the building. The 2025 Campbell meta-analysis finds school-based programs reduce exclusion only modestly, and out-of-school suspension is the least responsive outcome. The lesson across studies is that removing suspension without an alternative system harms peers; pairing it with a tiered behavior system (see pbis-restorative) does not.

Standard. Out-of-school suspension is limited to conduct that endangers persons or seriously disrupts instruction after documented alternatives, is barred for defiance, dress code, tardiness and attendance offenses, is capped in length, continues instruction during exclusion, and is reported annually with disparity ratios by building.

1. The policy limits out-of-school suspension to conduct that endangers persons or seriously disrupts instruction. CORE
2. The policy requires documented alternatives to be tried before an out-of-school suspension is imposed.
3. The policy bars out-of-school suspension for defiance, dress code, tardiness and attendance offenses.
4. The policy caps the length of an out-of-school suspension.
5. The policy requires instruction to continue for the student during the period of exclusion.
6. The policy requires annual reporting of suspensions with disparity ratios by building.

> **Policy.** Out-of-school suspension shall be used only when a student's presence poses a danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of serious disruption to instruction, and only after the principal has documented the less restrictive interventions attempted under the district's tiered behavior system. No student shall be suspended out of school for defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, truancy or other attendance-related

> conduct. A single out-of-school suspension shall not exceed five school days except for conduct for which state or federal law requires a longer exclusion. Every suspended student shall receive assignments and instruction during the exclusion and a re-entry meeting with a staff member on the first day back. Each principal shall report monthly to the Superintendent the number of suspensions, days lost and the offense category for each, by race, disability status, sex and English-learner status. The Superintendent shall publish to the Board by September 30 of each year a report for the prior school year showing suspensions and expulsions per 100 students by building and student group, the risk ratio for Black students and for students with disabilities, and the corrective plan for any building whose risk ratio exceeds 2.0. The Board shall review this policy against that report at a public meeting each October.

Indicator. Out-of-school suspensions per 100 students and instructional days lost, by building and by race, disability, sex and English-learner status (district student information system, reconciled to the Civil Rights Data Collection); share of suspensions for subjective or nonviolent categories such as defiance, disrespect and dress code; risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities against white and non-disabled peers; attendance and achievement of non-suspended peers in buildings that reduce suspensions.

Red flags in real manuals. mandatory or automatic suspension for a first offense other than weapons or serious violence; suspension listed as a consequence for defiance, disrespect, insubordination, profanity or dress code; 'zero tolerance' language applied beyond the federal firearm requirement; no cap on the length of a suspension or on cumulative days per year; no requirement to provide assignments or instruction during suspension; no requirement to report suspensions by building or by student group; 'the principal may suspend for any conduct the principal deems disruptive'

Law. Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975) requires notice and an opportunity to respond before any suspension of ten days or less, with immediate removal allowed only for danger or ongoing disruption and the hearing to follow as soon as practicable; longer exclusions require more formal process. The Gun-Free Schools Act (20 U.S.C. 7961) requires a one-year expulsion for bringing a firearm to school, modifiable case by case by the superintendent. IDEA (34 CFR 300.530) requires a manifestation determination before removals beyond ten school days for students with disabilities. Several states now restrict suspension for minor conduct by statute, for example California Education Code 48900(k) bars 'willful defiance' suspensions in grades K-8 and, through 2029, grades 9-12, and Illinois Public Act 99-0456 (2015) requires exhaustion of alternatives before exclusion.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through the Director of Student Services (or equivalent), with each building principal responsible for compliance in that building

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent issues administrative regulations within 30 days that define the danger and serious-disruption thresholds, list the barred offense categories (defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, truancy and other attendance conduct), and set the five-school-day cap with the state and federal exceptions.

2. The Director of Student Services, with the data office, adds required fields to the student information system within 60 days so every out-of-school suspension records the offense category, days lost, documented prior interventions and the student's race, disability status, sex and English-learner status, reconciled to Civil Rights Data Collection definitions.
3. Each principal, within 90 days, designates the staff member who will conduct first-day-back re-entry meetings and the process for sending assignments and instruction to suspended students.
4. The Director of Student Services trains every principal and assistant principal within 90 days on Goss v. Lopez notice and hearing steps, the IDEA manifestation determination requirement before removals beyond ten school days, and the district's tiered behavior system documentation that must precede any suspension.
5. The Superintendent sends the first monthly building suspension report to the Board within 90 days and identifies any building already using out-of-school suspension for the barred categories.

Year one

1. Each principal submits the monthly report to the Superintendent showing suspensions, days lost and offense category by race, disability status, sex and English-learner status, and the Superintendent reviews it against the barred categories and the five-day cap.
2. The Director of Student Services audits a sample of suspension files each semester to confirm that less restrictive interventions were documented before exclusion and that every suspended student received assignments and a re-entry meeting.
3. The Superintendent publishes the first annual report to the Board by September 30 showing suspensions and expulsions per 100 students by building and student group, the risk ratio for Black students and for students with disabilities, and a corrective plan for any building with a risk ratio above 2.0.
4. The Superintendent reports to the Board in year one on attendance and achievement of non-suspended students in buildings that reduce suspensions, so the Board can confirm the district is replacing suspension with a behavior system rather than only removing it.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent delivers the annual report by September 30 each year and the Board reviews this policy against it at a public meeting each October.
2. Each building with a risk ratio above 2.0 operates under a written corrective plan with a named principal and quarterly check-ins with the Director of Student Services until the ratio falls to 2.0 or below.
3. The data office reconciles district suspension figures to each Civil Rights Data Collection submission and reports any discrepancy to the Superintendent.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Out-of-school suspensions per 100 students and instructional days lost, by building and by race, disability, sex and English-learner status; share of suspensions for subjective or nonviolent categories (defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, attendance); risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities; attendance and achievement of non-suspended peers in buildings that reduce suspensions.

BASELINE	The prior school year's suspensions and expulsions per 100 students, days lost, offense category shares and risk ratios by building, drawn from the student information system and reconciled to the most recent Civil Rights Data Collection submission, as published in the first September 30 report.
TARGET	**Within one year of adoption, zero out-of-school suspensions recorded for defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, truancy or other attendance conduct, and no single suspension exceeding five school days outside the state and federal exceptions; within 1 to 3 years, every building's risk ratio for Black students and for students with disabilities at or below 2.0, with suspensions per 100 students and days lost declining each year while attendance and achievement of non-suspended students in those buildings hold steady or improve.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric rate benchmark for suspensions per 100 students; the only numeric thresholds it supports are the 2.0 risk ratio and the five-school-day cap in the clause. Research reference points: NYC's reform that ended suspension for minor conduct raised math about 0.05 SD over three years and Chicago's raised attendance about one day per year, while reforms without a replacement behavior system lowered scores and raised absences in Los Angeles and Philadelphia.
REPORTED	Monthly principal reports to the Superintendent; an annual Superintendent report to the Board by September 30 covering the prior school year, published publicly, with the corrective plan for any building above a 2.0 risk ratio; Board review of the policy at a public meeting each October.

– 31. Tiered positive behavior supports and restorative practices TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. School-wide PBIS has the strongest evidence of any discipline framework: a meta-analysis of 29 group studies including seven RCTs finds small-to-medium reductions in discipline referrals and gains in achievement, and the five-year Maryland RCT found children in PBIS schools 33 percent less likely to receive an office referral with fewer suspensions. Restorative practices are promising but mixed: the Pittsburgh RCT cut days lost to suspension 36 percent against 18 percent in controls and narrowed racial gaps, but did not improve achievement and worsened it in grades 6 to 8, while the Maine middle school RCT found no significant intent-to-treat effects. (PBIS: 33% lower odds of an office referral (Maryland RCT); meta-analytic effects small to medium on discipline and achievement. Restorative: suspension days -36% vs -18% control (Pittsburgh RCT), academic harm in grades 6 to 8, null in Maine.) [316,317,318,319,320,321,322,323,324,325,326,327]

Where the evidence is mixed. PBIS effects depend on implementation fidelity and are modest; most RCT evidence is from elementary schools, and a 2026 meta-analysis limited to children through grade 5 found no statistically significant pooled effect, with hints of larger effects in pre-K and kindergarten. PBIS is a framework rather than a curriculum, so naming it in policy without the tiered systems, data review and coaching does not reproduce the trial results. For restorative practices, the two RCTs disagree: Pittsburgh showed suspension reductions in elementary grades but no improvement in middle grades, for male students, for students with IEPs or for violent incidents, no reduction in arrests and lower middle-grade achievement; Maine showed no intent-to-treat effect, and reviews (Darling-Hammond et al. 2020; Lodi et al. 2021) rest mostly on non-experimental studies. Trauma-informed whole-school approaches had no eligible rigorous evidence as of a 2019 Campbell review. The honest position is PBIS as the spine, restorative practices as a complement for repair after incidents, and two or more years of coaching for either.

Standard. Every building operates a school-wide tiered behavior support system named in policy, with a leadership team, taught expectations, data review at least monthly, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, annual fidelity assessment with a recognized instrument, and public reporting of referrals, exclusions and fidelity by building; restorative practices are adopted as a complement with the same reporting.

1. The policy requires every building to operate a school-wide tiered behavior support system that the policy names. CORE
2. The policy requires each building to have a leadership team, taught expectations, and Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
3. The policy requires each building to review behavior data at least monthly.
4. The policy requires an annual fidelity assessment of the system using a recognized instrument.
5. The policy requires public reporting of referrals, exclusions and fidelity results by building.
6. The policy adopts restorative practices as a complement to the tiered system with the same public reporting.

> **Policy.** The district shall operate Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), a school-wide multi-tiered system of behavior support, in every school building. Each principal shall maintain a building leadership team that meets at least monthly to review discipline data, shall ensure that school-wide behavioral expectations are taught to all students each semester, and shall maintain functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams that

> provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, including function-based behavior intervention plans, for students whose behavior does not respond to Tier 1 supports. The district shall adopt restorative practices, including restorative conferences and circles, in every building as a complement to the tiered system and not as a substitute for it. Each school shall complete the Tiered Fidelity Inventory or another recognized fidelity instrument approved by the Board by May 1 each year, and the Superintendent shall provide coaching to any school scoring below 70 percent at Tier 1. The Superintendent shall budget for at least two years of external coaching for any school newly adopting the system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board, and shall publish on the district website, by September 30 each year, for the prior school year and by building and by race, disability status and sex, office discipline referrals, out-of-school suspensions and other exclusions per 100 students, fidelity scores, and the use and outcomes of restorative conferences and other restorative practices, and shall present a corrective plan for any building whose referral risk ratio for Black students or students with disabilities exceeds 2.0.

Indicator. Office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students by building and student group (student information system); annual fidelity score on a recognized instrument (Tiered Fidelity Inventory, with 70 percent or higher at Tier 1 as the benchmark); share of buildings with functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; student and teacher climate survey results; referral risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities.

Red flags in real manuals. no tiered behavior framework named anywhere in the discipline policy; a 'discipline matrix' of consequences with no mention of prevention, teaching expectations or Tier 2 and 3 supports; 'PBIS' named without a fidelity measure, a team, data review or coaching; restorative practices named as the sole discipline approach with no tiered system behind them; 'schools are encouraged to' language with no requirement or reporting; no reporting of referrals or exclusions by building or student group

Law. IDEA regulations require that when a child's behavior impedes learning the IEP team consider, and where necessary include, positive behavioral interventions and supports (34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(i)); the Department's August 1, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter explains that duty. ESSA (20 U.S.C. 7118) allows Title IV-A funds for school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. Some states require tiered supports or restorative alternatives before exclusion, for example Illinois Public Act 99-0456 (2015), and California Education Code 48900.5 requires that other means of correction be documented before suspension for most offenses.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through a district PBIS coordinator and each building principal

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent names a district PBIS coordinator and confirms that each principal has formed a building leadership team that will meet at least monthly to review discipline data.

2. The district data office configures the student information system to report office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students by building, race, disability status and sex, and computes a baseline referral risk ratio for Black students and students with disabilities in each building.
3. The Superintendent identifies which buildings have no functioning tiered system and secures at least two years of external coaching for each of them in the next budget cycle, citing Title IV-A eligibility under ESSA for the funding request.
4. Each principal schedules the Tiered Fidelity Inventory or another Board-approved instrument for completion by May 1 and reports the date to the Superintendent.
5. The Superintendent selects a restorative practices training provider and sets a calendar for staff training in restorative conferences and circles in every building.

Year one

1. Each principal ensures school-wide behavioral expectations are taught to all students each semester and documents the dates and materials used.
2. Each principal stands up Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams and ensures that students who do not respond to Tier 1 supports receive function-based behavior intervention plans, coordinated with IEP teams where 34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(i) applies.
3. Each school completes the Tiered Fidelity Inventory by May 1, and the Superintendent assigns coaching to every school scoring below 70 percent at Tier 1.
4. By September 30 the Superintendent reports to the Board and publishes on the district website the referral, exclusion, fidelity and restorative practice data by building and student group, with a corrective plan for any building whose referral risk ratio for Black students or students with disabilities exceeds 2.0.

Ongoing

1. Building leadership teams review discipline data at least monthly and adjust Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports based on what the data show.
2. The Superintendent repeats the annual fidelity assessment, the September 30 public report and corrective plans each year, and administers student and teacher climate surveys to accompany the report.
3. The district PBIS coordinator monitors achievement in grades 6 to 8 in buildings using restorative practices and reports any decline to the Board so that restorative practices remain a complement to, not a substitute for, the tiered system.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students by building and student group; annual Tier 1 fidelity score on the Tiered Fidelity Inventory; share of buildings with functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; referral risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities; student and teacher climate survey results.
BASELINE	Prior school year referrals and suspensions per 100 students by building and student group from the student information system, the first-year Tiered Fidelity Inventory

	score for each building, and the current count of buildings with functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams, all established in the first 90 days.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, every building completes a fidelity assessment and has functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; within 3 years, every building scores 70 percent or higher at Tier 1, office referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students decline from baseline in every building, and no building has a referral risk ratio above 2.0 for Black students or students with disabilities.**
BENCHMARK	Tiered Fidelity Inventory score of 70 percent or higher at Tier 1 is the recognized fidelity benchmark; referral risk ratio of 2.0 is the policy's corrective-plan trigger. For outcomes, the Maryland RCT found 33 percent lower odds of an office referral in PBIS schools and the Pittsburgh RCT found suspension days down 36 percent against 18 percent in controls; these are reference points from the research, not district targets, and the entry gives no numeric benchmark for the size of a district's own decline.
REPORTED	Superintendent reports to the Board and publishes on the district website by September 30 each year, for the prior school year, by building and by race, disability status and sex, including fidelity scores, restorative practice use and outcomes, and a corrective plan for any building over the 2.0 risk ratio threshold.

Safety

– 32. Behavioral threat assessment TIER B STAKES 4/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Schools that use the Comprehensive School Threat Assessment Guidelines (CSTAG, formerly the Virginia guidelines) resolve student threats with far less exclusion: in a randomized trial, threatened students in CSTAG schools were about one third as likely to receive a long-term suspension (OR 0.35) and four times as likely to receive counseling, and statewide Virginia comparisons show lower odds of suspension (OR 0.59) and law-enforcement action (OR 0.47) than under generic threat procedures, with almost no threats carried out and no racial disparity in outcomes among assessed students. (Long-term suspension OR 0.35 and alternative placement OR 0.13 (RCT); suspension OR 0.59, police action OR 0.47 versus generic approaches (statewide); about 1 in 100 threats attempted; no Black-White gap in suspension among assessed students.) [328,329,330,331,332,333,334,335,336]

Where the evidence is mixed. Nearly all outcome research comes from the model's developer (Cornell and colleagues at the University of Virginia), who has a financial interest in CSTAG training. The single RCT is small (201 students in 40 schools) and measures disciplinary responses, not whether violence was prevented; no study can show that threat assessment reduces attacks because attacks are rare. In Florida's statewide data, Black students are over-referred for threat assessment relative to enrollment even though outcomes after referral show smaller disparities than general discipline, so parity after referral does not mean parity in who gets referred. Students receiving special education were about a third of Virginia cases, well above their enrollment share. Teams that are poorly trained reclassify transient threats as substantive and the exclusion benefit disappears; fidelity predicted lower suspension in the RCT.

Standard. The policy shall establish a multidisciplinary threat assessment team at every school using a named, evidence-based model (CSTAG or equivalent), require initial and refresher training for every team member, require that the team's default response is support and supervision rather than exclusion, and require annual reporting of case counts, outcomes and demographic referral rates to the Board.

1. The policy requires that the threat assessment team's default response is support and supervision rather than exclusion. CORE
2. The policy establishes a multidisciplinary threat assessment team at every school.
3. The policy names an evidence-based threat assessment model, such as CSTAG or an equivalent, that the teams use.
4. The policy requires initial and refresher training for every threat assessment team member.
5. The policy requires annual reporting to the Board of case counts, outcomes and demographic referral rates.

> **Policy.** Each school shall maintain a threat assessment team composed at minimum of an administrator, a school counselor or psychologist, and a school resource officer or other law-enforcement liaison, trained in the Comprehensive School Threat Assessment Guidelines or another model with published controlled evaluation. The team shall classify each threat as transient or substantive, shall develop a written support and supervision plan for every substantive case, and shall not impose out-of-school suspension, expulsion or law-enforcement referral solely because a threat assessment

> was opened. Every team member shall complete initial training before serving and a refresher at least every three years, and the Director of Student Services shall keep the training roster. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year the number of assessments by school, the transient and substantive counts, the disciplinary, law-enforcement and counseling outcomes, the referral rate per 1,000 students by race, disability status and gender compared with enrollment, and any threat later carried out.

Indicator. Number of threat assessments per 1,000 students by school and demographic group; share classified transient versus substantive; share of assessed students who received out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement, law-enforcement referral, or counseling and a support plan; referral rate by race, disability status and gender compared with enrollment; team training completion; number of assessed threats later carried out.

Red flags in real manuals. threat assessment described as an investigation whose outcome is suspension or expulsion; any threat treated as automatic exclusion ('zero tolerance for threats'); team consists only of administrators or only of law enforcement; no training requirement or no named model; no distinction between transient and substantive threats; police notification required for every threat regardless of classification; no reporting of referral rates by demographic group

Law. Virginia Code 22.1-79.4 (2013) was the first statewide mandate for threat assessment teams in every public school. Florida Statutes 1006.07(7) (Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act, 2018) requires a threat assessment team in every school using a state-standardized instrument. Texas Education Code 37.115 (SB 11, 2019) requires safe and supportive school teams for threat assessment. Roughly a dozen other states have since mandated or funded teams. FERPA permits sharing education records with the team under the health-or-safety emergency and school-official exceptions; the IDEA manifestation determination still applies to any disciplinary change of placement for a student with a disability.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Student Services

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent designates the Director of Student Services as the district threat assessment coordinator and names the three required members (administrator, counselor or psychologist, and law-enforcement liaison) for every school's team within 30 days.
2. The Director of Student Services contracts CSTAG or an equivalent model with published controlled evaluation and schedules initial training so every team member completes it before serving.
3. The Director of Student Services builds the training roster and a case log that records, for each threat, the transient or substantive classification, the support and supervision plan, and every disciplinary, law-enforcement and counseling outcome.
4. The Director of Student Services, with district counsel, issues written guidance to principals that opening an assessment is not by itself grounds for out-of-school suspension, expulsion or police referral, and that IDEA manifestation determination applies to any change of placement for a student with a disability.

5. Each principal briefs staff and families on how to report a concern and what a threat assessment is, within 90 days.

Year one

1. Each school team classifies every reported threat as transient or substantive and the Director of Student Services spot-checks that every substantive case has a written support and supervision plan within 180 days.
2. The Director of Student Services computes referral rates per 1,000 students by race, disability status and gender against enrollment for each school and flags any school whose rate departs from its enrollment share.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first annual report to the Board by September 30 with assessment counts by school, transient and substantive counts, outcomes, demographic referral rates and any threat later carried out.
4. The Director of Student Services confirms 100 percent of team members hold current initial training by the end of year one and records the date each refresher falls due.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 each year and the Board reviews the demographic referral rates and outcome shares in open session.
2. The Director of Student Services keeps every team member on a refresher cycle of no more than three years and replaces departing members before a team operates short.
3. The Director of Student Services reviews any assessed threat later carried out as a case study and reports corrective steps to the Board within 90 days.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of assessed students who received out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement or law-enforcement referral versus the share who received counseling and a support plan, and the referral rate per 1,000 students by race, disability status and gender compared with enrollment.
BASELINE	First-year September 30 report: count of assessments by school, the transient versus substantive split, outcome shares, demographic referral rates, team training completion, and any threat carried out.
TARGET	**Within 1 to 3 years, the share of assessed students receiving counseling and a support plan rises each year while the share receiving out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement or law-enforcement referral falls each year; every substantive case has a written plan; team training completion is 100 percent; the referral rate by race, disability status and gender matches enrollment with no group gap; and assessed threats later carried out stay near the published level of about 1 in 100 or below.**
BENCHMARK	CSTAG schools in a randomized trial showed long-term suspension OR 0.35 and alternative placement OR 0.13 compared with controls, and statewide Virginia

	comparisons showed suspension OR 0.59 and police action OR 0.47 versus generic procedures, with about 1 in 100 threats attempted and no Black-White suspension gap among assessed students; the entry gives no district-level numeric target, so the target is directional.
REPORTED	Superintendent to the Board by September 30 each year, as the clause requires, with a one-page comparison to the prior year and to the published CSTAG figures.

– 33. Hazing and athletics safety TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Hazing is common in high school (48 percent of students in groups report hazing activities, 17 percent of grade 6 to 12 athletes in one survey, and only 14 percent of hazed students call it hazing), but no controlled study shows that any hazing policy or program reduces hazing; the evidence supports clear definitions, mandatory reporting and consent-does-not-matter language as a standard. For concussion, state remove-from-play and return-to-play laws produced a rise in reported concussions (better identification) followed by falling recurrent-concussion rates about 2.6 years after passage, and mandated preseason heat-acclimatization rules cut exertional heat illness in football by roughly half. (Hazing: prevalence 17% (athletes) to 48% (all group members); no measured program effect. Concussion laws: reported concussions up (reporting 47% to 71%), recurrent concussion rate declining 2.6 years post-law; incident rate trend reversed from +1.85% to -1.08% per month. Heat rules: exertional heat illness IRR about 0.45 (95% CI 0.23 to 0.87).)
337,338,339,340,341,342,343,344,345,346,347,348,349,350

Where the evidence is mixed. The hazing half of this domain is tier D: prevalence surveys are old (Alfred 2000, Hazing in View 2008, Gershel 2003) and self-reported, and the only published high school prevention evaluation is a two-school pilot that measured knowledge, not behavior. For concussion laws, all evaluations are ecological interrupted time series; the initial rise in reported concussions is almost certainly detection, and the later decline in new concussions could partly reflect reporting fatigue rather than prevention. Laws do not include prevention components (contact limits), and recurrent-concussion declines were larger but not statistically significant in states that named the clearing provider. Emergency action plans, athletic trainer coverage and sudden cardiac arrest protocols rest on professional-body standards (NATA, Korey Stringer Institute) with policy rankings rather than outcome trials.

Standard. The policy shall define hazing by listed behaviors regardless of consent, require every coach, sponsor and student participant to receive annual training, require coaches to report suspected hazing to the principal within 24 hours, and require immediate removal from play after a suspected concussion with written clearance by a licensed health care provider, a preseason heat-acclimatization schedule, and a venue-specific emergency action plan rehearsed annually.

1. The policy defines hazing by listed behaviors and states that the definition applies regardless of the participant's consent. CORE
2. The policy requires every coach, sponsor and student participant to receive annual hazing training.
3. The policy requires coaches to report suspected hazing to the principal within 24 hours.
4. The policy requires immediate removal from play after a suspected concussion, with return permitted only on written clearance by a licensed health care provider.
5. The policy requires a preseason heat-acclimatization schedule.
6. The policy requires a venue-specific emergency action plan that is rehearsed annually.

> **Policy.** Hazing, meaning any act required as a condition of joining or remaining in any team, club or group that endangers the physical or mental health or safety of a student or subjects a student to humiliation, including physical abuse, forced consumption of any substance, excessive exercise, sleep deprivation, confinement, forced nudity or sexual acts, ridicule or degrading tasks, and coercion to break the law or Board policy, is prohibited regardless of consent. Every coach, activity sponsor and student participant shall complete hazing-prevention training each year before the season. Every coach and

> sponsor shall report suspected hazing to the principal within 24 hours, and the principal shall report each case to the Superintendent within three school days. Every student athlete and parent shall sign a hazing and concussion acknowledgment each year. A student suspected of a concussion shall be removed from practice or play immediately and shall not return until a licensed health care provider trained in concussion management provides written clearance, with a graduated return-to-learn plan coordinated by the school nurse. Preseason practices shall follow the National Athletic Trainers' Association heat-acclimatization schedule. Each athletic venue shall have a written venue-specific emergency action plan rehearsed with local EMS each August, and an automated external defibrillator shall be reachable within three minutes of every practice and competition site. The Athletic Director shall report to the Board by July 31 each year the number of hazing reports and substantiated cases by activity, concussions and other serious injuries by sport, compliance with return-to-play clearance, and emergency action plan rehearsal dates by venue.

Indicator. Hazing: number of hazing reports and substantiated cases per season by team or group; climate-survey item on initiation experiences; share of coaches and activity sponsors with current hazing training. Athletics safety: concussions recorded in the athletic trainer injury log per 1,000 athlete-exposures, share with documented written clearance before return, days to return; exertional heat illness and cardiac events per season; share of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes; athletic trainer coverage by sport.

Red flags in real manuals. hazing addressed only as 'initiation activities are discouraged' or only within a code-of-conduct list; consent or voluntary participation treated as a defense; no training requirement for coaches or sponsors; return to play after concussion permitted on coach or parent judgment; no mention of return-to-learn or academic accommodations after concussion; no heat-acclimatization schedule or no emergency action plan requirement; no athletic trainer or no AED requirement for competitions

Law. All 50 states and the District of Columbia enacted youth sports concussion laws between 2009 (Washington's Lystedt Law) and 2014, nearly all with the three core components: education of athletes, parents and coaches; immediate removal from play; and written clearance by a licensed provider before return. Forty-four states have criminal anti-hazing statutes (Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, New Mexico, South Dakota and Wyoming do not); many apply to secondary schools and some require district policies. The federal Stop Campus Hazing Act (December 2024) applies only to higher education. Several state athletic associations mandate heat-acclimatization periods and emergency action plans; the Korey Stringer Institute ranks state high school policies at https://koreystringer.institute.uconn.edu/state-high-school-sports-safety-policies/.

How to implement it. Owner: Athletic Director, with the Superintendent accountable to the Board

First 90 days

1. The Athletic Director drafts the hazing definition, 24-hour coach reporting rule, consent-does-not-matter language and remove-from-play standard into administrative regulations and brings them

to the Board for adoption within 60 days.
2. The Athletic Director inventories every athletic venue and records which have a written venue-specific emergency action plan and an AED reachable within three minutes, reporting gaps to the Superintendent within 90 days.
3. The school nurse and Athletic Director select a licensed-provider concussion clearance form and a graduated return-to-learn template and distribute them to every building within 90 days.
4. The Superintendent assigns the Athletic Director and principals to confirm each coach and activity sponsor has completed hazing-prevention training before the next season begins.
5. The Athletic Director sets up the athletic trainer injury log to record concussions per 1,000 athlete-exposures, documented written clearance and days to return, starting with the current season.

Year one

1. Each principal collects a signed hazing and concussion acknowledgment from every student athlete and parent before the first practice of each season.
2. The Athletic Director schedules and documents a rehearsal of each venue's emergency action plan with local EMS in August and records the date by venue.
3. Every head coach runs preseason practices on the National Athletic Trainers' Association heat-acclimatization schedule, and the Athletic Director audits practice plans for compliance.
4. The Superintendent adds a climate-survey item on initiation experiences in teams and groups and administers it to students in grades 6 to 12 within the first year.

Ongoing

1. The Athletic Director reports to the Board by July 31 each year the hazing reports and substantiated cases by activity, concussions and serious injuries by sport, return-to-play clearance compliance, and emergency action plan rehearsal dates by venue.
2. Each principal reports every hazing case to the Superintendent within three school days and confirms annual training completion for coaches, sponsors and student participants before each season.
3. The Athletic Director reviews athletic trainer coverage by sport each year and recommends to the Superintendent any changes needed to maintain injury logging and immediate removal from play.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of coaches, sponsors and student participants with current hazing training; hazing reports and substantiated cases per season by team or group; climate-survey item on initiation experiences; concussions per 1,000 athlete-exposures and share with documented written clearance before return; exertional heat illness and cardiac events per season; share of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes.

BASELINE	Set in year one from the first season of athletic trainer injury logs, the first climate survey, the training roster, and the venue inventory; the district has no prior hazing or concussion counts of its own.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of coaches and sponsors trained before the season, 100 percent of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes, and 100 percent of concussion returns with documented written clearance. Reported concussions and hazing reports are expected to rise in the first 1 to 2 years as identification improves; within 3 years, the recurrent-concussion rate and exertional heat illness count per season should decline from the year-one baseline, consistent with the 2.6-year post-law decline and the roughly 0.45 incidence rate ratio seen for heat rules.**
BENCHMARK	Hazing: national prevalence of 17 percent of grade 6 to 12 athletes and 48 percent of students in groups, with only 14 percent of hazed students calling it hazing; no controlled study gives a program-effect benchmark, so the hazing target is directional. Concussion: state laws raised reporting from 47 to 71 percent and reversed the incident trend from +1.85 to -1.08 percent per month, with recurrent concussions falling about 2.6 years after passage. Heat: mandated acclimatization cut exertional heat illness in football by about half (IRR 0.45, 95 percent CI 0.23 to 0.87).
REPORTED	Athletic Director to the Board by July 31 each year, with the Superintendent presenting the climate-survey initiation item and any substantiated hazing cases in the same report.

– 34. Lockdown and active shooter drills TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Announced, procedure-only lockdown drills paired with training raise students' and staff's sense of preparedness and correct execution (classroom procedural accuracy up 27 percentage points after training) without raising measured anxiety, and students in one district reported less fear and lower perceived risk after drills. High-intensity simulations with actors, gunfire or deception are a different intervention: a 114-school interrupted time series of 54 million social media posts found anxiety and stress up 42 percent and depression up 39 percent after active shooter drills, and the American Academy of Pediatrics calls for ending children's participation in high-intensity drills and prohibiting deception. (Procedure-only drills with training: preparedness up, lockdown accuracy +27 points, state anxiety not higher (one study lower) post-drill; simulation-style drills: anxiety and stress +42%, depression +39% in community social media after drills; 60% of youth in a national text poll say drills make them feel scared and hopeless.) [351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363]

Where the evidence is mixed. No randomized or controlled comparison of drill types exists; the preparedness and anxiety findings come from pre-post surveys without control groups, mostly from one research team (Schildkraut and Nickerson) in one large urban district and one rural high school. The Everytown and Georgia Tech social media study cannot separate the effect of the drill from news coverage or the type of drill, and was funded by an advocacy organization. Avoidance behaviors increased after drills even as fear fell. No study shows that drills reduce deaths; the real-event analysis of lockdowns is descriptive. Younger children, students with disabilities and students with trauma histories are under-studied, and the effects of monthly drill frequencies mandated in some states are unknown.

Standard. The policy shall require lockdown drills to be announced in advance to staff, students and families, to teach the procedure without simulated gunfire, actors, props or deception, to be developmentally adjusted and accommodate students with disabilities and trauma histories, to include a debrief, and to be observed and reported annually; student participation in any high-intensity simulation shall be prohibited.

1. The policy prohibits student participation in any high-intensity simulation and bars simulated gunfire, actors, props or deception from lockdown drills. CORE
2. The policy requires lockdown drills to be announced in advance to staff, students and families.
3. The policy requires lockdown drills to teach the lockdown procedure itself.
4. The policy requires drills to be developmentally adjusted and to accommodate students with disabilities and trauma histories.
5. The policy requires a debrief after each lockdown drill.
6. The policy requires lockdown drills to be observed and reported annually.

> **Policy.** Each school shall conduct lockdown drills at the frequency required by state law. Every drill shall be announced to staff, students and families at least one school day in advance and again immediately before it begins, and shall practice the lockdown procedure only. No drill in which students participate shall use simulated gunfire, weapons, actors posing as attackers, theatrical injuries, or any statement that the event is real. Students with disabilities, students with known trauma histories and students in pre-kindergarten through grade 2 shall receive accommodations set in advance by the school counselor and the building administrator, and a parent may excuse a student from any drill. Each drill shall be observed by an administrator using a procedural

> checklist and followed by a classroom debrief the same day. The Director of Safety shall report to the Board by June 30 of each year the number, type and date of drills held in each school, procedural accuracy results, counseling contacts in the week following each drill, and the drill-related items from the annual climate survey.

Indicator. Number and type of drills held per school per year (procedure-only versus simulation, announced versus unannounced); share of classrooms executing the lockdown procedure correctly in observed drills; student and staff perceived-preparedness and anxiety items on the annual climate survey before and after drills; counseling referrals in the week after each drill; parent notification compliance.

Red flags in real manuals. unannounced lockdown drills or drills 'conducted as if real'; use of blanks, airsoft, simunition, actors, masks or fake blood with students present; students instructed to attack or throw objects at an intruder (ALICE-style counter training) in elementary grades; no parent notification requirement; no accommodation for students with disabilities or trauma histories; no debrief or follow-up; no record of drills reported to the Board

Law. Most states mandate some number of lockdown or security drills per year (for example New York Education Law 807 requires four lockdown drills and eight evacuation drills; New Jersey requires one security drill per month). New York's 2024 regulation amendments require advance notice to parents and prohibit drills that mimic an actual shooting with actors or props. Florida Statutes 1006.07(4) requires active assailant drills at the same frequency as fire drills and, since 2023, requires age-appropriate, trauma-informed conduct and parent notification. Several states (for example Illinois, Oregon, Texas) have adopted trauma-informed drill requirements since 2021; districts should check their state's current drill statute before adopting a frequency.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Safety, with the Superintendent accountable to the Board

First 90 days

1. The Director of Safety confirms the district's current state drill statute (for example New York Education Law 807, New Jersey monthly security drills, Florida Statutes 1006.07(4)) and sets the annual lockdown drill frequency for each school in writing.
2. The Director of Safety and the Superintendent cancel any scheduled drill that uses simulated gunfire, weapons, actors posing as attackers, theatrical injuries or statements that the event is real, and notify principals in writing that student participation in such simulations is prohibited.
3. The Director of Safety issues a one-page announced-drill protocol covering the one-school-day advance notice to staff, students and families, the immediate pre-drill announcement, the procedural checklist for administrator observation, and the same-day classroom debrief.
4. Each building administrator and school counselor identify students with disabilities, students with known trauma histories and students in pre-kindergarten through grade 2 and record the accommodations set in advance for each group, along with the parent excusal process.
5. The Director of Safety adds drill-related perceived-preparedness and anxiety items to the annual climate survey and sets up a log of counseling contacts in the week following each drill.

Year one

1. Each school conducts every required lockdown drill under the announced, procedure-only protocol, with an administrator completing the procedural checklist and the classroom debrief held the same day.
2. The Director of Safety delivers staff training on the lockdown procedure in every school before the first drill of the year, since training is what moved procedural accuracy in the evidence.
3. Building administrators confirm parent notification before every drill and document the date of notice and any parent excusals.
4. The Director of Safety reports to the Board by June 30 the number, type and date of drills in each school, procedural accuracy results, counseling contacts in the week after each drill, and the drill-related climate survey items.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Safety reports annually to the Board by June 30 on drill counts and type, procedural accuracy, post-drill counseling contacts and climate survey drill items.
2. The Director of Safety and the Superintendent recheck the state drill statute each year and amend the required frequency or conduct rules within 90 days of any change.
3. Building administrators and school counselors update the accommodation lists for students with disabilities, trauma histories and grades pre-kindergarten through 2 at the start of each school year.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of drills that are announced and procedure-only; share of observed classrooms executing the lockdown procedure correctly; drill-related preparedness and anxiety items on the annual climate survey; counseling contacts in the week after each drill; parent notification compliance.
BASELINE	Year-one counts from the Director of Safety's first June 30 report: number and type of drills per school, first-year procedural accuracy, first-year climate survey drill items and post-drill counseling contacts, and the share of drills with documented parent notice.
TARGET	**Within one year, 100 percent of drills in which students participate are announced, procedure-only and preceded by parent notification, with zero simulation-style drills; from year one to year three, the share of classrooms executing the procedure correctly rises each year while drill-related anxiety items on the climate survey do not rise and post-drill counseling contacts do not increase.**
BENCHMARK	The evidence reports a 27 percentage point gain in classroom procedural accuracy after training with procedure-only drills and no rise in state anxiety; it gives no fixed accuracy threshold, so the accuracy target is directional. The 42 percent anxiety and 39 percent depression increases describe simulation-style drills the policy prohibits and serve only as the harm to avoid.

REPORTED	Annual report from the Director of Safety to the Board by June 30, with drill counts and types by school, procedural checklist results, post-drill counseling contacts, climate survey drill items and parent notification compliance.

– 35. School resource officers and school policing TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. The strongest causal studies agree that placing police in schools increases suspensions, expulsions, police referrals and arrests, with the largest increases for Black students, male students and students with disabilities; a Texas quasi-experiment ties federal school-police grants to a 6 percent rise in middle school discipline, a 2.5 percent drop in high school graduation and a 4 percent drop in college enrollment. Safety effects are mixed: a national regression discontinuity finds SROs reduce some violence but not gun incidents, while a matched COPS-grant study finds no safety gain and more recorded drug and weapon offenses. (Discipline +6% (Texas); graduation -2.5%, college enrollment -4%; exclusionary discipline rate ratio 1.21 (meta-analysis); suspensions, referrals and arrests up with largest effects for Black students and students with disabilities; some non-gun violence down (RD), gun incidents unchanged.) [364,365,366,367,368,369,370,371,372,373]

Where the evidence is mixed. Sorensen et al. 2023 find real reductions in some forms of in-school violence, and Owens 2017 finds SROs improve measured safety and help police make drug arrests, so the claim that SROs do nothing for safety is not supported. Much of the recorded-offense increase may be detection and reporting rather than more misbehavior. Several studies identify effects off federal COPS grants, which may not generalize to districts that fund officers locally. The 2023 Campbell review found no true experiments and high heterogeneity, with the direction of effects depending on how officers are used; surveys show many students and staff feel safer with an officer present. Officer role (law enforcement only versus mixed mentoring role) changes recording and referral behavior, which is why the MOU, not the headcount, is the policy lever.

Standard. If the district places law-enforcement officers in schools, the policy shall require a written memorandum of understanding that bars officer involvement in routine discipline, defines the narrow conditions for arrest or referral, requires youth-specific training, and requires annual public reporting of arrests, referrals and use of force by school and demographic group; the Board shall review the data before renewing any officer assignment.

1. The policy requires a written memorandum of understanding that bars officer involvement in routine student discipline. CORE
2. The policy requires the memorandum of understanding to define the narrow conditions under which an officer may arrest or refer a student.
3. The policy requires officers placed in schools to complete youth-specific training.
4. The policy requires annual public reporting of arrests, referrals and use of force by school and demographic group.
5. The policy requires the Board to review the reported data before renewing any officer assignment.

> **Policy.** No law-enforcement officer shall be assigned to a district school except under a written memorandum of understanding approved by the Board and the law-enforcement agency, reviewed annually. The memorandum shall provide that officers shall not participate in enforcing the student code of conduct, shall not be called for behavior that would be handled by school staff in the officer's absence, and shall not question a student about a school matter without an administrator present and parent notification, except in an imminent-safety emergency. Each officer shall complete training in adolescent development, de-escalation, disability awareness and implicit bias before assignment and annually thereafter, documented by the Director of Safety.

> The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 of each year, and publish on the district website, the number of arrests, citations, law-enforcement referrals and uses of force in each school for the prior school year, disaggregated by race, disability status and gender, with the share arising from non-criminal conduct, and the Board shall review this report before renewing any officer assignment.

Indicator. Annual counts and rates per 1,000 students of school-based arrests, citations, law-enforcement referrals and use of force, by school and by race, disability status and gender (the Civil Rights Data Collection reports referrals and arrests); share of referrals for non-criminal code-of-conduct matters; out-of-school suspension rate by school; student and staff perceived-safety items on the annual climate survey; complaints against officers.

Red flags in real manuals. officers authorized to enforce the code of conduct or 'assist with discipline'; no memorandum of understanding, or an MOU not reviewed by the Board; no restriction on questioning or searching students without an administrator present; no reporting of arrests or referrals by demographic group; officer stationed in the discipline office; mandatory police notification for low-level offenses such as disorderly conduct or 'disruption'; no training requirement beyond state peace-officer certification

Law. No federal mandate. Florida Statutes 1006.12 (2018) requires a safe-school officer at every public school. Texas SB 11 (2019) funds officers and mandates safety committees. Several states and large districts (for example Illinois Public Act 101-0282 and California AB 2316 proposals, and Minneapolis, Denver, Oakland board actions in 2020) regulate or removed officer assignments. The Civil Rights Data Collection requires every district to report school-related arrests and law-enforcement referrals, which is the baseline data source. The Fourth Amendment reasonable-suspicion standard for school searches (New Jersey v. T.L.O.) does not automatically extend to searches directed by police officers, and Miranda warnings apply to custodial questioning by officers (J.D.B. v. North Carolina, 2011).

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Safety as the day-to-day lead and the Board Safety Committee as the review body

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent and district counsel draft the memorandum of understanding with the law-enforcement agency, including the bar on code-of-conduct enforcement, the narrow arrest and referral conditions, the administrator-present and parent-notification rule for questioning, and the annual review date, and present it to the Board within 90 days.
2. The Director of Safety pulls the district's most recent Civil Rights Data Collection submission on school-related arrests and law-enforcement referrals, adds citations and use-of-force counts from agency records, and files it with the Board as the baseline, disaggregated by school, race, disability status and gender.
3. The Director of Safety arranges and documents completion of adolescent development, de-escalation, disability awareness and implicit bias training for every officer currently assigned, before any officer continues under the new memorandum.
4. Each principal and the Director of Safety issue written guidance to school staff stating which behaviors are handled by school staff and may not be referred to an officer, and brief staff at a

faculty meeting within 60 days.
5. The Superintendent adds student and staff perceived-safety items and a question about officer interactions to the annual climate survey instrument.

Year one

1. The Director of Safety builds a single incident log that records every arrest, citation, law-enforcement referral and use of force by school, date, student demographic group and whether the underlying conduct was criminal or a code-of-conduct matter, and reviews it with principals each quarter.
2. The Superintendent delivers the first annual report to the Board by October 15 and publishes it on the district website, with the share of referrals arising from non-criminal conduct and out-of-school suspension rates by school.
3. The Board holds a public review of the report and the baseline before voting on renewal of each officer assignment, and records in the minutes the data it relied on.
4. District counsel and the Director of Safety establish a complaint channel for students and families regarding officer conduct and report complaint counts in the annual report.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year and the Board reviews the data before renewing any memorandum or officer assignment.
2. The Director of Safety documents annual refresher training for every assigned officer and confirms the memorandum is re-signed by both parties each year.
3. The Director of Safety reconciles the district incident log against the Civil Rights Data Collection submission each reporting cycle so the public figures match the federal filing.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Annual counts and rates per 1,000 students of school-based arrests, citations, law-enforcement referrals and uses of force, by school and by race, disability status and gender; share of referrals arising from non-criminal code-of-conduct matters; out-of-school suspension rate by school; perceived-safety items on the climate survey; complaints against officers.
BASELINE	The district's most recent Civil Rights Data Collection submission of school-related arrests and law-enforcement referrals, supplemented by agency records for citations and use of force, filed with the Board within the first 90 days and disaggregated by school and demographic group.
TARGET	**Within 1 year of adoption, the share of law-enforcement referrals arising from non-criminal code-of-conduct matters falls from baseline and continues to fall each year; within 3 years, arrest and referral rates per 1,000 students decline from baseline overall and for Black students, male students and students with disabilities, with the gap between those groups and the district rate narrowing each year, while perceived-safety items do not decline.**

BENCHMARK	The research reports effect sizes for officer presence (discipline up 6 percent, graduation down 2.5 percent, college enrollment down 4 percent, exclusionary discipline rate ratio 1.21) but gives no numeric standard for an acceptable arrest or referral rate, so the target is directional against the district's own baseline and against the Civil Rights Data Collection figures for comparable districts.
REPORTED	The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year and publishes the report on the district website; the Board reviews it in a public meeting before voting on renewal of any officer assignment or memorandum of understanding.

Health and wellbeing

– 36. Classroom temperature, ventilation and indoor air TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Heat cuts learning: across 10 million PSAT retakers, each 1 degree F hotter school year reduced that year's learning by about 1 percent in schools without air conditioning, and air conditioning offset nearly all of it; hot school days fall hardest on Black and Hispanic students and explain roughly 5 percent of the racial achievement gap. Poor ventilation costs attendance and scores: in 162 California classrooms each additional 1 L/s per person of outdoor air cut illness absence 1.6 percent, a 140-classroom study found math scores rose 0.5 percent per L/s-person up to the 7.1 L/s-person standard and a further 0.5 percent per degree C cooler within 20 to 25 C, and a double-blind crossover experiment found 3 to 7 percent more correct answers when outdoor air rose from 1.7 to 6.6 L/s-person. (Learning -1% per +1 F school-year temperature without AC, mostly offset by AC; illness absence -1.6% per +1 L/s-person ventilation; math +0.5% per L/s-person and +0.5% per 1 C cooler (20 to 25 C); test speed +12% and errors -2% when classroom CO2 falls from 2100 to 900 ppm (pooled model); most US classrooms ventilate below the ASHRAE 62.1 rate.) [374,375,376,377,378,379,380,381,382,383,384,385,386,387,388,389]

Where the evidence is mixed. The heat evidence is tier A (several large natural experiments agree); the ventilation evidence is weaker: Mendell and Haverinen-Shaughnessy are prospective observational studies, Petersen is a small crossover with four classrooms, and Wargocki's 12 percent figure is a pooled model prediction rather than a measured effect. Graff Zivin, Hsiang and Neidell found heat lowers math performance on the day of the test but found no long-run effect of early-life temperature exposure. Stafford's Texas study found renovations that fixed indoor air problems raised test scores, but renovations change many things at once. Air conditioning and ventilation upgrades are capital-intensive (an elementary school HVAC replacement runs into the millions) and raise energy costs, and ASHRAE 241 is a voluntary standard. CO2 is an indicator of ventilation, not a pollutant at classroom levels.

Standard. Every occupied classroom is kept between 68 and 78 F during instruction, every classroom is ventilated at or above the ASHRAE 62.1 outdoor air rate with MERV-13 filtration and continuous CO2 monitoring held below 1,000 ppm, and the district has a written heat response plan with a trigger temperature, cooling priorities and a capital plan to air-condition every classroom.

1. The policy requires every occupied classroom to be kept between 68 and 78 F during instruction. CORE
2. The policy requires every classroom to be ventilated at or above the ASHRAE 62.1 outdoor air rate.
3. The policy requires MERV-13 filtration for classroom ventilation.
4. The policy requires continuous CO2 monitoring in classrooms held below 1,000 ppm.
5. The policy requires a written heat response plan with a trigger temperature and cooling priorities.
6. The policy requires a capital plan to air-condition every classroom.

> **Policy.** The district shall maintain every occupied classroom at a temperature between 68 and 78 degrees F during instructional time. When a classroom cannot be held at or below 82 degrees F, the principal shall relocate instruction to a cooled space, and no student shall be taught in a room at or above 88 degrees F. The Director of Facilities shall install a continuous carbon dioxide monitor in every classroom, shall operate ventilation systems to supply at least the outdoor air rate in ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1

> with filters rated MERV-13 or higher, and shall investigate and correct any classroom whose CO2 exceeds 1,000 ppm for more than 10 percent of occupied hours in a month. The Director of Facilities shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year the classrooms without mechanical cooling, the number of instructional hours above 78 degrees F by building during the prior year, the monthly CO2 exceedance rate by building, filter replacement records, and a prioritized capital plan to provide cooling and code-rate ventilation in every classroom, and the Superintendent shall include that plan in the annual capital budget request.

Indicator. Share of classrooms with mechanical cooling and share of instructional hours above 78 F, from building management system or classroom data loggers; classroom CO2 (share of occupied hours above 1,000 ppm) from continuous monitors; measured outdoor air rate per person at commissioning; illness absence by building; number of heat-related early dismissals.

Red flags in real manuals. thermostats shall be set no lower than 78 degrees in cooling season (energy policy overriding learning); windows shall remain closed at all times (security policy with no ventilation substitute); portable air cleaners and fans are prohibited in classrooms; no heat response plan or trigger temperature; ventilation addressed only as a maintenance item without a rate or CO2 standard; energy savings policy with no classroom temperature range

Law. No federal classroom temperature or ventilation standard; ASHRAE 62.1 is adopted through state building and mechanical codes for new construction only, and ASHRAE 241 (2023) is voluntary. California Title 24 requires CO2 sensors in classrooms using demand-controlled ventilation and sets a 7.1 L/s-person school ventilation rate. New York's 2024 school heat law (effective September 2025) requires relief measures when a classroom reaches 82 F and bars occupancy at 88 F or above. OSHA has no indoor temperature standard for schools. ESSER funds (through 2024) paid for many HVAC upgrades; the EPA Indoor Air Quality Tools for Schools program is voluntary guidance.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Facilities, with the Superintendent accountable for the capital budget request

First 90 days

1. The Director of Facilities inventories every classroom within 30 days, recording whether it has mechanical cooling, its ventilation system type, and its current filter rating.
2. The Director of Facilities installs data loggers or uses the building management system in every building within 60 days to record classroom temperature during instructional hours.
3. The Director of Facilities orders continuous CO2 monitors for every classroom within 60 days and begins installation in the buildings with the highest share of classrooms without cooling.
4. The Superintendent issues a written heat response procedure within 90 days that directs principals to relocate instruction when a classroom cannot be held at or below 82 F and bars teaching in any room at or above 88 F.
5. The Director of Facilities replaces all filters with MERV-13 or higher within 90 days in every system that can accept them and lists the systems that cannot.

Year one

1. The Director of Facilities completes CO2 monitor installation in every classroom and sets a monthly report of the share of occupied hours above 1,000 ppm by building.
2. The Director of Facilities commissions a measurement of outdoor air rate per person in each building and schedules corrective work for every system below the ASHRAE 62.1 rate.
3. The Director of Facilities delivers the first annual report to the Board by September 30, including the prioritized capital plan to cool and ventilate every classroom.
4. The Superintendent includes the capital plan in the next annual capital budget request to the Board.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Facilities investigates and corrects every classroom whose CO2 exceeds 1,000 ppm for more than 10 percent of occupied hours in any month and logs the fix.
2. The Director of Facilities reports to the Board each September 30 on classrooms without cooling, instructional hours above 78 F by building, monthly CO2 exceedance by building, and filter replacement records.
3. The Superintendent requests capital funding each year until every classroom has mechanical cooling and code-rate ventilation.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of classrooms with mechanical cooling, instructional hours above 78 F by building, share of occupied classroom hours with CO2 above 1,000 ppm, measured outdoor air rate per person at commissioning, illness absence by building, and number of heat-related early dismissals
BASELINE	First-year inventory and logger data: count of classrooms without mechanical cooling, instructional hours above 78 F in the prior year, and monthly CO2 exceedance rate once monitors are installed
TARGET	**Within 1 year every classroom has a continuous CO2 monitor and no building exceeds 1,000 ppm for more than 10 percent of occupied hours in any month; within 3 years the share of classrooms without mechanical cooling and the instructional hours above 78 F fall each year, no student is taught at or above 88 F, and illness absence by building declines**
BENCHMARK	Classroom temperature held between 68 and 78 F; CO2 below 1,000 ppm; outdoor air at or above the ASHRAE 62.1 rate (California sets 7.1 L/s-person); MERV-13 filtration; New York law requires relief at 82 F and bars occupancy at 88 F
REPORTED	Annual report from the Director of Facilities to the Board by September 30, with monthly CO2 exceedance rates by building available to the Board on request

– 37. Lead in school drinking water TIER B STAKES 2/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Lead harms learning at every measured level: in Rhode Island, each 1 ug/dL lower average preschool blood lead cut the chance of scoring substantially below proficient in third-grade reading by about 1 percentage point on a 12 percent base, Swedish and North Carolina natural experiments find the same for school grades, crime and suspensions, and Flint's water crisis lowered math achievement and raised special education classification district-wide. Lead in school water is common: in seven state testing programs 13 to 81 percent of tested schools had at least one outlet above 5 ppb, and 37 percent of US districts that tested found elevated lead, but no study links school-water lead itself to achievement, so testing policy rests on the blood-lead evidence plus prevalence data. (Below-proficient reading -0.96 pct points per 1 ug/dL lower blood lead (base 12%); Flint: math achievement down and special education classification up across the district; 37% of testing districts found elevated lead (GAO); 4 of 7 states found more than 20% of schools with an outlet above 5 ppb.)
390,391,392,393,394,395,396,397,398,399,400,401,402,403

Where the evidence is mixed. The causal chain is indirect: the strong studies measure blood lead from all sources (paint, soil, water) and no study isolates school drinking water's contribution to blood lead or achievement, and Flint's effects appeared even in homes with copper service lines, which points to stress and disruption as well as lead. Water is a smaller lead source than paint and dust for most children, and a child drinks only part of the day's water at school. Sampling results depend heavily on protocol (first draw versus flushed, stagnation time, which outlets), so a single clean test does not prove safety and a single high test may reflect one fixture. Remediation costs are real (fixture replacement, filtered bottle fillers, re-testing every few years) and there is no agreed health-based action level for schools: EPA uses 15 ppb for water systems and recommends schools act at 5 ppb or lower, AAP recommends 1 ppb.

Standard. Every outlet used for drinking or cooking in every building is tested for lead with first-draw samples at least every 3 years and after any plumbing work, any outlet above 5 ppb is taken out of service within 24 hours until fixed or replaced, results are posted publicly within 30 days, and every building has filtered drinking stations.

1. The policy requires first-draw lead testing of every outlet used for drinking or cooking in every building at least every 3 years. CORE
2. The policy requires outlets to be retested for lead after any plumbing work.
3. The policy requires any outlet above 5 ppb to be taken out of service within 24 hours until fixed or replaced.
4. The policy requires lead test results to be posted publicly within 30 days.
5. The policy requires every building to have filtered drinking stations.

> **Policy.** The Director of Facilities shall test every outlet used for drinking or food preparation in every district building for lead using the sampling protocol in the EPA 3Ts guidance, with the initial test of every outlet completed by June 30, 2027 and each outlet retested at least once every 3 years and within 90 days after any plumbing repair or replacement affecting it. Any outlet with a result at or above 5 parts per billion shall be removed from service within 24 hours of receipt of the result and shall not be returned to service until replacement or filtration and a follow-up sample below 5 parts per billion. The Director of Facilities shall post all results by outlet on the district website and notify families and staff of each building within 30 calendar days of receipt,

> and shall install at least one filtered bottle-filling station certified to NSF/ANSI 53 for lead on every floor of every building, with filters replaced on the manufacturer's schedule and the replacement logged. The Director of Facilities shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year the outlets tested, the results, the outlets removed from service and their status, and the filter replacement log.

Indicator. Share of drinking and cooking outlets tested within the last 3 years, and share above 5 ppb, from the district's published results; days between a result above the action level and outlet shutoff; number of filtered bottle-filling stations per building; share of families notified within 30 days; blood lead screening rates from the county health department where available.

Red flags in real manuals. testing shall be conducted as required by the local water utility only; action level set at 15 or 20 parts per billion; flushing shall be used as the sole remediation; results provided to parents upon request only; testing limited to a sample of outlets per building; no retest interval or no requirement to test after plumbing work; no provision for lead in water at all

Law. Schools on municipal water are not regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act; the 2021 Lead and Copper Rule Revisions (40 CFR 141.92) require community water systems to offer sampling of five outlets in each elementary school and child care facility over a five-year cycle and on request for secondary schools, and the October 2024 Lead and Copper Rule Improvements continue the schools program with lists of eligible facilities due to states by November 2027. The WIIN Act of 2016 funds a voluntary EPA grant program for school testing and remediation. State laws vary: New York requires testing of every outlet every 3 years with a 5 ppb action level (10 NYCRR Subpart 67-4, amended 2022), New Jersey requires testing every 3 years, Illinois (415 ILCS 5/17.12) requires testing in schools built before 2000, California AB 746 (2017) required water systems to test schools built before 2010, and Michigan's 2023 Filter First law requires filtered stations in every school.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Facilities

First 90 days

1. The Director of Facilities inventories every outlet used for drinking or food preparation in every district building, assigns each a unique identifier, and files the inventory with the Superintendent within 60 days.
2. The Director of Facilities adopts a written sampling protocol following the EPA 3Ts guidance, contracts a certified laboratory, and asks the community water system whether it will sample eligible elementary schools under 40 CFR 141.92 at no cost.
3. The Business Manager applies for WIIN Act school lead testing and remediation grant funds and any state testing program money within 90 days.
4. The Director of Facilities completes first-draw testing of all outlets in the earliest-built elementary buildings within 90 days and removes any outlet at or above 5 ppb from service within 24 hours of the result.
5. The Director of Communications prepares the results web page by outlet and the family and staff notification template so that posting within 30 days of results is possible from the first batch.

Year one

1. The Director of Facilities completes initial testing of every outlet in every building, posts results by outlet on the district website, and notifies families and staff of each building within 30 calendar days of receipt.
2. The Director of Facilities replaces or filters every outlet at or above 5 ppb and returns each to service only after a follow-up sample below 5 ppb, keeping a status log for the Board.
3. The Director of Facilities installs at least one NSF/ANSI 53 certified filtered bottle-filling station on every floor of every building and starts a filter replacement log on the manufacturer's schedule.
4. The Director of Facilities delivers the first annual report to the Board by September 30 listing outlets tested, results, outlets removed from service and their status, and the filter replacement log.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Facilities retests each outlet at least once every 3 years and within 90 days after any plumbing repair or replacement affecting it, with the retest calendar reviewed each June.
2. The Director of Facilities reports to the Board by September 30 each year, and the Board checks that no outlet above 5 ppb stayed in service more than 24 hours after its result was received.
3. The Superintendent requests county health department blood lead screening rates each year and includes them in the annual report where available.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of drinking and cooking outlets tested within the last 3 years, share of tested outlets at or above 5 ppb, days between a result at or above 5 ppb and outlet shutoff, number of NSF/ANSI 53 filtered bottle-filling stations per building floor, and share of families notified within 30 days, all drawn from the district's published results and the annual Board report.
BASELINE	Most districts have no complete outlet inventory or test record; across seven state testing programs 13 to 81 percent of tested schools had at least one outlet above 5 ppb, and 37 percent of US districts that tested found elevated lead.
TARGET	**100 percent of drinking and cooking outlets tested by June 30, 2027 and retested within every 3 year cycle thereafter; every outlet at or above 5 ppb out of service within 24 hours of the result; 100 percent of results posted and families notified within 30 days; at least one filtered station on every floor of every building by the end of year one; and the share of outlets at or above 5 ppb falling each cycle toward zero.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric benchmark for school-water lead and achievement, since no study links school-water lead itself to achievement; the 5 ppb action level and 3 year retest cycle follow New York 10 NYCRR Subpart 67-4 and New Jersey law, and the filtered station requirement follows Michigan's 2023 Filter First law. The 1 ug/dL blood lead effect on reading is the supporting evidence, not a district target.

REPORTED	The Director of Facilities reports to the Board by September 30 each year, with results posted by outlet on the district website within 30 days of receipt and the filter replacement log attached.

– 38. Physical education minutes and activity policy TIER B STAKES 2/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Meta-analyses of experimental studies find that physical activity delivered through physical education improves classroom behavior and academic outcomes, with the gains concentrated in programs that raise the quality and intensity of PE lessons (cognition g 0.38, academic performance g 0.15) rather than in simply adding minutes (academic g 0.09, not significant). Instrumental-variable estimates using state PE mandates show more PE time increases physical activity and lowers obesity among fifth-grade boys without crowding out test scores. SHAPE America's standard is 150 minutes per week in elementary and 225 in secondary school. (Quality-focused PE interventions: cognition +0.38 SD, academic performance +0.15 SD; PA interventions: math +0.21 SD, on-task behavior +0.77 SD; more PE time: no crowd-out of test scores, lower BMI z-score for boys; added minutes alone: academic +0.09 SD (null)) [404,405,406,407,408,409,410,411,412,413]

Where the evidence is mixed. Adding PE minutes without changing lesson quality has little measurable academic effect. Packham and Street (2019) used a regression discontinuity on Texas Fitness Now, a 37 million dollar daily-PE mandate for low-income middle schools, and found no overall fitness improvement, no test-score or attendance gain, and some evidence of lower attendance and more disciplinary incidents. Cawley, Meyerhoefer and Newhouse (2007) found binding state PE requirements raised activity but not weight outcomes for high school students. Singh et al. (2019) rated only 11 of 58 PA intervention studies as high quality and called the evidence on overall academic performance inconclusive, while confirming math benefits. Observed PE lessons average well under the 50 percent moderate-to-vigorous activity target, so minutes on a schedule overstate activity delivered.

Standard. Every student receives at least 150 minutes per week of PE in elementary and 225 minutes per week in secondary grades, taught by a certified physical educator, with no waivers for athletics or other courses and no PE time withheld as punishment.

1. The policy guarantees every student at least 150 minutes per week of PE in elementary grades and 225 minutes per week in secondary grades. CORE
2. The policy requires that PE be taught by a certified physical educator.
3. The policy allows no waivers from PE for athletics, band, JROTC, or other courses.
4. The policy prohibits withholding PE time as punishment.

> **Policy.** Every student in kindergarten through grade 5 shall receive at least 150 minutes per week of physical education, and every student in grades 6 through 12 at least 225 minutes per week, taught by a teacher certified in physical education and designed so that at least half of each class period is spent in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity. Recess, athletics, marching band, JROTC and online courses shall not substitute for physical education, and physical education shall not be withheld or assigned as a disciplinary consequence. Elementary students shall additionally receive daily recess under Policy on Recess. The Director of Curriculum shall certify each building's PE minutes by grade and the certification status of each PE teacher to the Superintendent by September 30 of each year, and the Superintendent shall report these figures, the results of at least one observed-activity sample per building, and a dated correction plan for any shortfall to the Board by December 1 of each year.

Indicator. Scheduled PE minutes per week by grade and building (master schedule); share of PE sections taught by a certified physical educator; observed share of PE lesson time in moderate-to-vigorous activity from a sampled SOFIT or equivalent observation each year; waiver and substitution counts; fitness assessment results where the state requires them.

Red flags in real manuals. PE waived for athletics, band, JROTC or academic courses; PE minutes defined as a range or 'as scheduling permits'; recess or classroom activity breaks counted as PE; PE taught by classroom teachers without certification; physical activity used as punishment or withheld as punishment; no weekly minute floor stated for any grade span

Law. No federal minimum; the federal Local School Wellness Policy rule (7 CFR 210.31) requires districts in the school meal programs to set physical activity goals. State minute mandates vary: California Education Code 51210 requires 200 minutes per 10 school days in grades 1-6 and 51222 requires 400 minutes per 10 days in grades 7-12; Texas Education Code 28.002(l) requires 30 minutes daily or 135 minutes weekly of structured activity in K-5. Most states require PE in unspecified amounts and allow substitutions; see SHAPE America's Shape of the Nation state profiles.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Curriculum, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Curriculum pulls each building's master schedule and records scheduled PE minutes per week by grade, flagging every grade below 150 minutes in K-5 or 225 minutes in 6-12.
2. The Human Resources Director verifies the physical education certification of every teacher assigned a PE section and lists any section taught by a non-certified teacher.
3. Each principal reports to the Director of Curriculum every current waiver or substitution of athletics, marching band, JROTC, recess or online coursework for PE, and every instance in the last year of PE withheld as discipline.
4. The Director of Curriculum and the Student Services Director revise the student discipline code to remove PE withholding as a consequence and notify staff in writing.
5. The Superintendent names a PE lead who selects SOFIT or an equivalent observation tool and trains at least two observers before the end of the 90 days.

Year one

1. Each principal rebuilds the master schedule for the next school year so that every grade meets the 150 or 225 minute standard, and the Director of Curriculum certifies the minutes and certification status to the Superintendent by September 30.
2. The PE lead completes at least one observed-activity sample per building and records the share of lesson time spent in moderate-to-vigorous activity.
3. The Human Resources Director posts and fills certified PE positions for any section still taught by a non-certified teacher, or the Superintendent presents a dated hiring plan to the Board.
4. The Superintendent reports minutes by grade and building, certification share, observation results, waiver counts and a dated correction plan for any shortfall to the Board by December 1.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Curriculum certifies PE minutes and teacher certification to the Superintendent by September 30 every year, and the Superintendent reports to the Board by December 1 every

year.
2. The PE lead repeats at least one observed-activity sample per building each year and uses the results to plan PE teacher professional development on lesson intensity.
3. The Superintendent includes PE minutes and activity goals in the triennial Local School Wellness Policy assessment required by 7 CFR 210.31.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of grade levels in each building scheduled for at least 150 minutes per week of PE (K-5) or 225 minutes per week (6-12); share of PE sections taught by a certified physical educator; observed share of PE lesson time in moderate-to-vigorous activity; count of waivers, substitutions and disciplinary withholdings.
BASELINE	Scheduled PE minutes per week by grade and building from the master schedule in the first 90 days, certification status of each PE section from Human Resources, waiver and substitution counts from principals, and the first observed-activity sample taken in year one.
TARGET	**By the September 30 certification in year two, every grade in every building is scheduled for at least 150 minutes (K-5) or 225 minutes (6-12) of PE per week, every PE section is taught by a certified physical educator, waivers, substitutions and disciplinary withholdings are zero, and the observed share of lesson time in moderate-to-vigorous activity is at least half in each building and rising from baseline in each later year.**
BENCHMARK	SHAPE America's standard of 150 minutes per week in elementary and 225 minutes per week in secondary school, with at least half of class time in moderate-to-vigorous activity per the model clause; by comparison, California requires 200 minutes per 10 days in grades 1-6 and 400 minutes per 10 days in grades 7-12, and Texas requires 135 minutes weekly in K-5. The research supports quality and intensity over added minutes alone, so the activity-share measure carries as much weight as the minutes count.
REPORTED	Superintendent's annual PE report to the Board by December 1, built on the Director of Curriculum's September 30 certification, with minutes by grade and building, certification share, observation results, waiver and withholding counts, and a dated correction plan for any shortfall.

– 39. Recess TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Daily recess is associated with better classroom behavior and attention: in a national sample of 11,000 third graders, children with at least one daily recess of 15 or more minutes had better teacher-rated class behavior, a within-subject experiment found fourth graders more on task and less fidgety on recess days, and a cluster-randomized trial of a structured-recess program (Playworks) in 27 to 29 schools reduced teacher-reported bullying and exclusion and cut transition time back to learning. The AAP and CDC state that recess is a necessary break and should not be withheld as punishment or to complete work. (Daily recess of 15 or more minutes: better teacher-rated class behavior (n about 11,000); recess days: more on task, less fidgeting, all ADHD children benefited; Playworks RCT: less bullying and exclusion, fewer minutes lost in transition; LiiNK four 15-minute recesses: off-task behavior down, attentional focus up) 414,415,416,417,418,419,420,421,422,423

Where the evidence is mixed. No randomized trial varies the amount of recess itself; the Playworks RCT tests a coached recess program, and its accelerometer and student-survey measures of physical activity showed null or marginal effects even where teacher reports were positive. The LiiNK results come from two private schools with no random assignment. Brez and Sheets (2017) found no clear classroom benefit of recess timing in their small experiment. The large national association (Barros et al. 2009) is cross-sectional and children without recess were disproportionately poor, Black and urban, so the comparison is confounded. Recess competes with instructional minutes and requires supervision staffing.

Standard. Every elementary student receives at least 20 minutes of daily supervised recess, scheduled separately from physical education and lunch, which no staff member may withhold as a disciplinary consequence or to complete academic work.

1. The policy prohibits any staff member from withholding recess as a disciplinary consequence or to complete academic work. CORE
2. The policy guarantees every elementary student at least 20 minutes of recess each day.
3. The policy requires that recess be supervised.
4. The policy schedules recess separately from physical education and lunch.

> **Policy.** Every student in kindergarten through grade 5 shall receive at least twenty (20) minutes of supervised, unstructured recess each school day, held outdoors when weather permits, and scheduled in addition to physical education and separate from the seated lunch period. Recess shall not be withheld, shortened or assigned as a consequence for behavior, incomplete work, tardiness or missed assignments, and no staff member shall require a student to complete academic work during recess. A student may be removed from recess only for an immediate safety risk, and any such removal shall be recorded in the student information system the same day with the reason. Each building principal shall certify the building recess schedule to the Superintendent by September 15 of each year. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by November 1 of each year the daily recess minutes for each elementary building, the number of recorded recess removals by building and reason, and the correction plan for any building below twenty minutes.

Indicator. Scheduled daily recess minutes for every elementary building (master schedule); count of recess-withholding incidents logged in the student information system as a disciplinary action or make-up-work consequence; share of K-5 students with at least 20 minutes of recess every day.

Red flags in real manuals. recess may be withheld as a consequence; loss of recess listed among disciplinary consequences; recess may be used to complete missing work; recess counted toward physical education minutes; recess at teacher discretion or as time permits; no minimum daily recess minutes stated

Law. No federal law. Florida Statutes 1003.455 requires 100 minutes per week of unstructured free-play recess for K-5 with at least 20 consecutive minutes daily (traditional public schools only). New Jersey (2018) requires a daily 20 minute recess for K-5. Washington RCW 28A.230.295 (2024-25) requires 30 minutes daily for K-5. Pennsylvania HB 1505 requires 30 minutes daily for K-5 from 2027-28. Several other states, including Arizona, Connecticut, Missouri, Rhode Island and Virginia, set daily recess or activity minimums or bar withholding recess as punishment; check the state code.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with each elementary building principal responsible for the building schedule and the student services director responsible for the incident log

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent issues an administrative regulation within 30 days defining recess as at least 20 minutes of supervised unstructured play scheduled apart from physical education and the seated lunch period, and stating that no staff member may withhold, shorten or assign recess as a consequence or require academic work during it.
2. Each elementary principal revises the building master schedule within 60 days so every K-5 class has at least 20 minutes of daily recess and certifies the schedule to the Superintendent by September 15.
3. The student information system administrator adds a recess removal record type with a required reason field and a same-day entry rule within 60 days, and removes recess from the list of available disciplinary consequences.
4. Each principal briefs all teachers, paraprofessionals and recess supervisors on the policy at a staff meeting within 90 days and sends a one-page notice home to families.

Year one

1. The Superintendent reviews certified schedules and recess removal records by building each quarter and requires a written correction plan from any building below 20 minutes or with a pattern of removals not tied to an immediate safety risk.
2. The Superintendent reports to the Board by November 1 the daily recess minutes for each elementary building, the number of recorded recess removals by building and reason, and any correction plans.
3. The student services director audits a sample of discipline and make-up-work records from each building once during the year to confirm recess has not been withheld as a consequence.

Ongoing

1. Each elementary principal recertifies the building recess schedule to the Superintendent by September 15 every year.

2. The Superintendent delivers the November 1 recess report to the Board every year and flags any building below 20 minutes or any rise in recess removals.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of K-5 students scheduled for at least 20 minutes of daily recess per the certified master schedules, and the count of recess removals logged in the student information system by building and reason
BASELINE	The first September 15 schedule certifications and the first year of logged recess removals establish the baseline; many districts will have no prior count because recess withholding was not tracked
TARGET	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of K-5 students in every elementary building have at least 20 minutes of scheduled daily recess, and all logged recess removals cite an immediate safety risk, with the count of removals declining year over year in years 1 to 3**
BENCHMARK	The research supports at least one daily recess of 15 or more minutes for better classroom behavior; the policy standard is 20 minutes daily, matching Florida (20 consecutive minutes daily, 100 minutes per week) and New Jersey (20 minutes daily), while Washington and Pennsylvania (from 2027-28) set 30 minutes daily
REPORTED	Superintendent reports to the Board by November 1 each year with recess minutes by building, recess removals by building and reason, and correction plans for any building below 20 minutes

– 40. School nurses and health services TIER C STAKES 3/5

Tier C: consistent correlational evidence

Finding. A full-time registered nurse in every school pays for itself: the Massachusetts cost-benefit study found $2.20 in avoided medical costs, teacher time and parent lost wages for every $1 spent. Schools that add a full-time nurse show lower illness absence, with the clearest gains for students with asthma (23 percent fewer days missed with a full-time versus part-time nurse in Toledo; fewer illness absences and emergency visits after San Jose added full-time nurses), but the attendance evidence is quasi-experimental, integrative reviews rate it weak, and no study shows a nurse effect on test scores. (Benefit-cost ratio 2.2 (Massachusetts); students with asthma -23% days absent with full-time vs part-time nurse; illness absence fell in schools adding full-time RNs; teachers in schools without a full-time nurse spent about an hour a day on student health; achievement effects unproven.) [424,425,426,427,428,429,430,431,432,433,434]

Where the evidence is mixed. No randomized or natural-experiment study of nurse staffing exists; the two best quasi-experiments (Telljohann 2004, Rodriguez 2013) are small and matched rather than randomized, and Yoder's 2019 review found nurse presence associated with less absence and missed class time but not with achievement. A matched 46-school study of licensed practical nurses (not RNs) found at best negligible attendance gains at $68,228 per school per year (Leach 2022), which suggests the benefit depends on scope of practice and on what the nurse is asked to do. The Massachusetts benefit-cost figure rests on modeled productivity savings, not measured outcomes. NASN itself abandoned the fixed 1:750 ratio in 2020 in favor of a workload and acuity analysis, so there is no single staffing number the research supports.

Standard. Every school building has a licensed registered nurse on site for the full instructional day, every day school is in session, with additional nursing staff assigned from an annual workload and acuity analysis; LPNs and unlicensed health aides work only under RN delegation and supervision.

1. The policy requires a licensed registered nurse on site in every school building for the full instructional day, every day school is in session. CORE
2. The policy assigns additional nursing staff based on an annual workload and acuity analysis.
3. The policy allows LPNs and unlicensed health aides to work only under registered nurse delegation and supervision.
4. The policy contains no language making nurse presence contingent on available funding, sharing a nurse among buildings, or as-needed contracting.
5. The policy contains no language allowing clerical staff or health aides to staff the health office in a nurse's absence.

> **Policy.** The district shall employ at least one full-time registered nurse assigned to each school building for the full instructional day on every day students are present. The Coordinator of Health Services, a registered nurse, shall complete a workload and acuity analysis for each building by June 30 of each year using the student health conditions, medication and treatment orders, individualized healthcare plans and enrollment in that building, and the Superintendent shall assign additional licensed nursing staff where the analysis shows a single nurse cannot provide safe care. Licensed practical nurses and health aides shall practice only under the delegation and supervision of a registered nurse. The Coordinator of Health Services shall report to the Board by

> October 15 of each year the nursing staff assigned to each building, the results of the workload analysis, the number of days each building lacked a registered nurse on site, and illness-related absence rates for students with chronic health conditions.

Indicator. Share of school buildings with a registered nurse on site every full school day, from the district's staffing roster; nurse-to-student ratio and acuity-adjusted workload by building; illness-related absence and chronic absence for students with asthma, diabetes, seizure disorders and food allergies, from the student information system; emergency 911 calls from schools.

Red flags in real manuals. a school nurse may be shared among buildings as funds permit; the health office may be staffed by clerical staff or a health aide in the absence of a nurse; unlicensed personnel may administer medication without delegation by a registered nurse; school nurse services shall be provided to the extent funding is available; nurse services provided by contract on an as-needed basis only; no requirement for a nurse on site during the school day

Law. No federal mandate for school nurses. IDEA and Section 504 require health services needed for an eligible student to access education. State requirements vary widely: Pennsylvania's Public School Code (24 P.S. 14-1402) sets a maximum of 1,500 students per certified school nurse; many states require only access to nursing services. Since the 2014 CMS reversal of the free-care rule, districts may bill Medicaid for school health services to enrolled students, and most states have expanded school-based Medicaid billing since 2023.

How to implement it. Owner: Coordinator of Health Services (a registered nurse), reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Coordinator of Health Services audits the current staffing roster within 30 days and lists every building that lacks a full-time registered nurse on site for the full instructional day.
2. The Coordinator of Health Services builds the workload and acuity analysis template using student health conditions, medication and treatment orders, individualized healthcare plans and enrollment for each building.
3. The Superintendent directs Human Resources to post registered nurse positions for every building identified as uncovered and reports the hiring timeline to the Board within 60 days.
4. The Coordinator of Health Services issues written delegation and supervision procedures so that every LPN and health aide is assigned to a named supervising registered nurse within 90 days.
5. The business office confirms the district is enrolled to bill Medicaid for school health services to eligible students and assigns a staff member to file claims.

Year one

1. The Coordinator of Health Services completes the first workload and acuity analysis for every building by June 30 and the Superintendent assigns additional licensed nursing staff where it shows a single nurse cannot provide safe care.
2. The Superintendent and Human Resources fill every registered nurse vacancy so each building has a full-time RN on site every day students are present by the start of the next school year.

3. The Coordinator of Health Services and the student information system administrator set up tracking of days each building lacked an RN, illness-related absence for students with asthma, diabetes, seizure disorders and food allergies, and 911 calls from schools.
4. The Coordinator of Health Services delivers the first annual report to the Board by October 15 covering nursing staff by building, workload results, days without an RN, and illness-related absence for students with chronic conditions.

Ongoing

1. The Coordinator of Health Services repeats the workload and acuity analysis by June 30 each year and the Superintendent adjusts nursing assignments before the next school year begins.
2. The Coordinator of Health Services reports to the Board by October 15 each year and the Board reviews the report in open session.
3. The business office reports Medicaid reimbursement for school health services to the Board annually so the Board can weigh it against nursing costs.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of school buildings with a registered nurse on site every full school day, and number of days any building lacked an RN, from the district staffing roster; illness-related absence rate for students with asthma, diabetes, seizure disorders and food allergies, from the student information system; count of emergency 911 calls from schools.
BASELINE	Roster audit and student information system data for the school year before adoption, recorded by the Coordinator of Health Services in the first 90 days.
TARGET	**100 percent of buildings have a full-time RN on site every day students are present, with zero uncovered days, within 1 year of adoption; illness-related absence for students with chronic health conditions declines from the baseline within 2 years and does not rise thereafter.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric target for coverage or absence. The Massachusetts study found a benefit-cost ratio of 2.2 and Toledo found 23 percent fewer days absent for students with asthma with a full-time versus part-time nurse, but these are quasi-experimental findings rated weak by integrative reviews and should not be adopted as a district target. Pennsylvania law sets a maximum of 1,500 students per certified school nurse, which the district may use as an outer ceiling for ratio, not a goal. No achievement effect is established, so test scores are not a measure.

REPORTED	Coordinator of Health Services reports to the Board by October 15 each year: nursing staff by building, workload and acuity results, days each building lacked an RN on site, illness-related and chronic absence for students with chronic health conditions, 911 calls from schools, and Medicaid reimbursement received.

– 41. School-based mental health, counseling and suicide prevention TIER A STAKES 4/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Mental health services delivered in school by school staff reduce student mental health problems (Hedges g = 0.39 across 43 controlled trials with 49,941 elementary students; g = 0.76 for targeted services), and placing licensed clinicians in schools raised treatment use 8 percent and cut self-reported suicide attempts about 15 percent across 263 Minnesota schools. Counselors have causal effects: an additional counselor reduces disciplinary incidents and raises achievement (Carrell and Hoekstra), individual counselors move graduation and college attendance as much as teachers do (Mulhern), and one more high school counselor raises four-year college enrollment by up to 10 points in a regression-discontinuity design. Universal suicide prevention programs that teach help-seeking (YAM in the SEYLE trial, SOS) roughly halve new suicide attempts, but the largest Sources of Strength trial found no overall reduction and harm where fidelity was poor. (Services: g = 0.39 overall, 0.76 targeted; in-school clinicians: treatment use +8%, suicide attempts -15%; counselors: fewer disciplinary incidents and higher attainment, effects comparable to teacher effects; YAM: new suicide attempts and severe ideation about -50% at 12 months; Sources of Strength: no overall effect on attempts across 40 schools.)
435,436,437,438,439,440,441,442,443,444,445,446,447,448,449,450,451,452

Where the evidence is mixed. The ASCA 250:1 ratio is a professional benchmark, not a research finding: the 2021 meta-analysis found only a small negative effect of higher ratios with serious design bias in the underlying studies, and ratio evidence does not say which staff or services matter. Universal programs can backfire: the MYRIAD trial (85 UK schools) found no benefit from school mindfulness training, a 1,071-student DBT-skills program (WISE Teens) worsened depression (d = -0.22) and anxiety (d = -0.28), and in the 40-school Sources of Strength trial poorly implemented schools saw more new suicide attempts among 9th graders than controls. The Minnesota suicide-attempt result is self-reported and the suspension result there is weaker. Counselor effects vary widely between individuals (Mulhern), so headcount alone does not guarantee results. Universal screening finds more students with depression but creates a referral load the district must be able to meet.

Standard. Every school meets or has a funded plan to reach 250 students per counselor, 500 per school psychologist and 250 per school social worker; every school has a licensed mental health clinician on site at least weekly through district staff or a community partner; secondary students are screened annually for depression with parental consent and a same-week referral pathway; every secondary school runs an evidence-based suicide prevention program with annual fidelity monitoring and a written postvention protocol.

1. The policy requires every school to meet, or have a funded plan to reach, 250 students per counselor, 500 per school psychologist and 250 per school social worker. CORE
2. The policy requires every school to have a licensed mental health clinician on site at least weekly through district staff or a community partner.
3. The policy requires secondary students to be screened annually for depression with parental consent.
4. The policy provides a same-week referral pathway for students identified through depression screening.
5. The policy requires every secondary school to run an evidence-based suicide prevention program with annual fidelity monitoring.
6. The policy requires every secondary school to have a written postvention protocol.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall staff each school at no more than 250 students per school counselor, 500 students per school psychologist and 250 students per school

> social worker, and for any school above a ratio shall present to the Board by March 1 of each year a funded plan to reach it within three years. Every school shall have a licensed mental health clinician, employed by the district or by a contracted community provider, on site at least one day each week, and a student referred for a mental health concern shall be offered an initial appointment within 10 school days. Each secondary school shall offer annual universal screening for depression and suicide risk using a validated instrument with parental consent; a student at elevated risk shall receive same-day follow-up by a licensed professional, and every student whose screening indicates a need for services shall be referred to school-based or community services within the same week. Each secondary school shall deliver an evidence-based suicide prevention program listed by a recognized registry and shall maintain a written postvention protocol, approved by the Director of Student Services, governing the school's response after a suicide death or attempt. The Director of Student Services shall document program adherence each semester, suspend any component not delivered as designed, and report to the Board by November 1 of each year the staffing ratios by building, the number and share of students served by an on-site licensed clinician, the share of students screened and the share referred who began services, time to first appointment, suspension rates, and the fidelity findings.

Indicator. Students per school counselor, school psychologist and school social worker by building (district staffing roster against October 1 enrollment); number and share of students receiving school-based mental health services from a licensed clinician on site; share of students screened and share referred who begin services within 30 days; student survey items on depression, suicidal ideation and attempts (YRBS or state climate survey); suspension rate; suicide prevention program fidelity checks.

Red flags in real manuals. counselors may be assigned test coordination, scheduling, or administrative duties; mental health services shall be provided to the extent that funds are available; students shall be referred to outside providers (with no on-site provision); no suicide prevention policy or one limited to crisis response only; universal screening prohibited without a referral pathway stated; student-to-counselor ratios set above 400:1 or left unstated; school psychologists limited to special education evaluations

Law. No federal ratio mandate. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (2022) funded school-based mental health professional pipelines through the Department of Education, and 2023 CMS guidance expanded school Medicaid billing for mental health services. More than 20 states require annual suicide prevention training for school staff (Jason Flatt Act statutes), and several (including California AB 2246 and Texas) require every secondary school to adopt a suicide prevention policy. The Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment and most state laws require parental consent for universal mental health screening. ESSA Title IV-A funds may be used for school-based mental health services.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Student Services, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Student Services pulls the October 1 enrollment and the staffing roster and computes students per counselor, school psychologist and school social worker for every building against the 250, 500 and 250 standards.
2. The Director of Student Services surveys each building for whether a licensed mental health clinician is on site at least one day each week and lists the schools without one.
3. The Superintendent opens talks with community mental health providers and the state Medicaid agency on contracted on-site clinicians and school Medicaid billing under the 2023 CMS guidance.
4. Each secondary principal reports whether the school runs a registry-listed suicide prevention program and has a written postvention protocol, and the Director of Student Services approves or returns each protocol.
5. The Director of Student Services selects a validated depression and suicide risk screening instrument and drafts a parental consent form that meets the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment and state law.

Year one

1. By March 1 the Superintendent presents to the Board a funded plan to bring every building above a ratio to the 250, 500 and 250 standards within three years, drawing on ESSA Title IV-A and Bipartisan Safer Communities Act pipeline funds where eligible.
2. By the start of the second semester every school has a district or contracted licensed clinician on site at least one day each week, and each building logs time from referral to first appointment against the 10 school day standard.
3. Each secondary school completes its first universal screening with parental consent, gives same-day follow-up by a licensed professional to students at elevated risk, and refers students who need services within the same week.
4. Each secondary school delivers its registry-listed suicide prevention program, and the Director of Student Services completes the first semester adherence review and suspends any component not delivered as designed.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Student Services documents program adherence each semester and reports to the Board by November 1 the staffing ratios by building, students served by on-site clinicians, screening and referral shares, time to first appointment, suspension rates and fidelity findings.
2. The Superintendent updates the funded staffing plan each year and presents it to the Board by March 1 for any building still above a ratio.
3. The Director of Student Services reviews every postvention protocol annually and after any suicide death or attempt.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Students per school counselor, school psychologist and school social worker by building; share of students screened and share of referred students who begin services within 30 days; time to first appointment; number and share of students served by an on-site licensed clinician; student survey items on depression, suicidal ideation and attempts; suspension rate; suicide prevention fidelity checks.

BASELINE	First-year staffing roster against October 1 enrollment, the first screening cycle's screened and referred shares, the first semester's referral-to-appointment log, the most recent YRBS or state climate survey items on ideation and attempts, and the prior year's suspension rate.
TARGET	**Every building at or below 250 students per counselor, 500 per school psychologist and 250 per school social worker within three years of the first March 1 plan; every school with a licensed clinician on site weekly by the end of year one; every referred student offered an initial appointment within 10 school days; share of referred students beginning services within 30 days rising each year; self-reported suicide attempts and suspension rates declining over 1 to 3 years with every program component passing fidelity checks.**
BENCHMARK	The entry supplies the 250, 500 and 250 staffing ratios as the standard. For outcomes it reports in-school clinicians raising treatment use 8 percent and cutting self-reported suicide attempts about 15 percent in Minnesota, and YAM cutting new attempts about 50 percent at 12 months, but these come from research settings and are not district targets; Sources of Strength showed no overall effect and harm where fidelity was poor, so the fidelity check is a benchmark in its own right.
REPORTED	Director of Student Services to the Board by November 1 each year, with the funded staffing plan from the Superintendent by March 1 each year; the ratio, clinician access, screening and referral figures are broken out by building and the survey and suspension items are compared with the baseline year.

– 42. Seated lunch time TIER B STAKES 2/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Children with fewer than 20 minutes seated to eat consume less of their lunch, especially fruit and vegetables: in a randomized crossover trial, 10 minutes of seated time versus 20 cut fruit consumption by 11 percentage points and vegetables by 14 points, and observational cafeteria studies in Massachusetts and California show the same pattern at scale. CDC guidance is at least 20 minutes seated after being served. (10 vs 20 seated minutes: fruit consumption -11 percentage points, vegetables -14 points (RCT); under 20 minutes: entree, milk and vegetable consumption all lower (observational); longer lunch period raises odds of eating fruit 1.4x and vegetables 1.5x) [453,454,455,456,457,458]

Where the evidence is mixed. The only randomized trial (Burg et al. 2021) enrolled 38 children at a university summer camp, not a school cafeteria, and found no difference in entree or beverage consumption between 10 and 20 minutes. The school-based studies are cross-sectional and cannot rule out that schools with longer lunches differ in other ways. No study links seated lunch minutes to achievement or attendance; the outcome evidence is dietary intake and plate waste. Longer lunches cost instructional minutes or require staggered periods and more cafeteria supervision.

Standard. Every building schedule provides each student at least 20 minutes seated to eat lunch after being served, and the district measures and reports seated time, not period length.

1. The policy guarantees every student at least 20 minutes seated to eat lunch after being served. CORE
2. The policy applies the seated lunch time requirement to every building schedule in the district.
3. The policy requires the district to measure seated eating time rather than lunch period length.
4. The policy requires the district to report seated eating time, not period length.

> **Policy.** Each building schedule shall provide every student at least twenty (20) minutes of seated time to eat lunch after receiving the meal, and at least ten (10) minutes seated for breakfast served at school. Lunch periods shall be scheduled so that no student receives a meal fewer than twenty minutes before the period ends. Elementary buildings shall schedule recess before lunch where the facility permits. The Director of Food Services, with each building principal, shall observe serving-line times in every cafeteria at least once each semester and shall report seated lunch minutes by building and lunch period to the Superintendent. The Superintendent shall include seated lunch minutes by building, the number of buildings not meeting twenty minutes, and a dated correction plan for each in the annual wellness report presented to the Board no later than its first regular meeting in October.

Indicator. Seated minutes per lunch period by building, measured from the time the last student in line is served to the end of the period (master schedule plus a cafeteria line-time observation each semester); share of buildings meeting 20 seated minutes; plate-waste or production-record data from food service.

Red flags in real manuals. lunch period of 20 minutes or less with no reference to seated time; lunch period length defined only as bell-to-bell; lunch may be shortened for testing, assemblies or discipline;

students may be held from lunch to complete work; no building-level reporting of lunch time

Law. No federal minimum. USDA school meal rules set nutrition standards but not seated time. Connecticut General Statutes 10-221o requires a lunch period of at least 20 minutes for full-day students. Louisiana law requires no less than 20 minutes of seated lunch time. California has state guidance recommending 20 minutes seated but no statute. Most states leave lunch length to districts; CDC reports about half of districts neither require nor recommend 20 minutes.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Food Services, with each building principal; Superintendent reports to the Board

First 90 days

1. The Director of Food Services, with each building principal, observes serving-line time in every cafeteria within 30 days and records minutes from the last student served to the end of each lunch period.
2. The Superintendent compares each building's master schedule against the observed line times and lists every lunch period that gives any student fewer than 20 seated minutes within 60 days.
3. Each principal of a building below 20 seated minutes submits a dated correction plan to the Superintendent within 90 days, covering schedule changes, added serving lines, or staggered release to the cafeteria.
4. Elementary principals report to the Superintendent within 90 days whether their facility permits recess before lunch and the date by which it will be scheduled.

Year one

1. Each principal implements the correction plan so that every lunch period in the building provides 20 seated minutes for lunch and 10 seated minutes for breakfast by the start of the next school year.
2. The Director of Food Services repeats the serving-line observation in every cafeteria in the second semester and reports seated minutes by building and lunch period to the Superintendent.
3. The Director of Food Services adds plate-waste or production-record data for fruit and vegetables to the report so the Board can see whether consumption moves with seated time.
4. The Superintendent presents seated lunch minutes by building, the number of buildings below 20 minutes, and a dated correction plan for each in the annual wellness report at the first regular Board meeting in October.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Food Services and each principal observe serving-line times once each semester and report seated minutes by building and lunch period to the Superintendent.
2. The Superintendent includes seated lunch minutes, the count of buildings below 20 minutes, and dated correction plans in every annual wellness report presented to the Board by its first regular October meeting.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Seated lunch minutes per lunch period by building, measured from the time the last student in line is served to the end of the period, from the master schedule plus a cafeteria line-time observation each semester; the share of buildings meeting 20 seated minutes; fruit and vegetable plate-waste or production-record data from food service.
BASELINE	First-semester serving-line observation in every cafeteria within 90 days of adoption, establishing seated minutes per lunch period, the number of buildings below 20 minutes, and current fruit and vegetable plate waste.
TARGET	**Every building and every lunch period provides at least 20 seated minutes for lunch and 10 for breakfast by the start of the next school year, with the count of buildings below 20 minutes at zero in each annual report thereafter and fruit and vegetable plate waste moving down from baseline over 1 to 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	CDC guidance of at least 20 minutes seated after being served; Connecticut General Statutes 10-221o (20-minute lunch period) and Louisiana law (no less than 20 minutes seated); CDC reports about half of districts neither require nor recommend 20 minutes. The entry gives no numeric benchmark for plate waste, so the plate-waste target is directional only.
REPORTED	Annual wellness report presented to the Board no later than its first regular meeting in October, showing seated lunch minutes by building and lunch period, the number of buildings not meeting 20 minutes, a dated correction plan for each, and fruit and vegetable plate-waste or production-record data.

– 43. Universal free school meals and breakfast after the bell TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Making meals free for every student (the Community Eligibility Provision or a district-wide universal free lunch) raises school-meal participation and produces small but real gains in test scores and fewer suspensions: the New York City difference-in-differences study found math and ELA gains of 0.03 to 0.08 SD, state CEP rollouts found elementary math gains of about 0.02 to 0.06 SD, and CEP cut suspensions by roughly 17 percent for white elementary boys with negative but imprecise estimates elsewhere. Moving breakfast after the bell reliably raises breakfast participation (from about 43 to 74 percent of students in one 446-school district), but the best causal studies of breakfast-in-classroom find little or no test-score gain from the service change itself. (Universal free lunch: math +0.03 to +0.06 SD, ELA +0.03 to +0.08 SD; participation +5 to +11 pct points; suspensions about -17% for one elementary subgroup; no BMI increase. Breakfast after the bell: participation roughly +30 pct points; test-score effect near zero in NYC and in a 446-school propensity study.) 459,460,461,462,463,464,465,466,467,468,469,470

Where the evidence is mixed. Breakfast-in-classroom raised participation in New York City with no detectable gain in achievement or attendance (Corcoran, Elbel and Schwartz 2016), and the 446-school Anzman-Frasca study found better participation and slightly better attendance but no achievement change; only Imberman and Kugler (2014) found test-score gains from in-class breakfast, and they could not separate nutrition from the timing of the test. The 2024 JAMA Network Open systematic review of CEP rated the attendance evidence low certainty (no or slight improvement in 2 studies) and the suspension and obesity evidence very low certainty. Gordon and Ruffini could not rule out large positive or negative discipline effects for middle and high schools, and the math gains in CEP studies are small (0.02 to 0.06 SD) and concentrated among elementary students and students newly gaining access. Districts with an identified student percentage near the 25 percent floor receive less than full federal reimbursement under CEP and must cover the gap from general funds.

Standard. Every school with an identified student percentage at or above the federal CEP threshold operates under CEP or a state universal-meals program so that no student is charged for breakfast or lunch, and every school serves breakfast after the start of the instructional day (in-classroom, grab-and-go, or second-chance) so that breakfast participation reaches at least 70 percent of lunch participation.

1. The policy requires every school at or above the federal CEP identified student percentage threshold to operate under CEP or a state universal-meals program. CORE
2. The policy states that no student is charged for breakfast or lunch at schools operating under CEP or a state universal-meals program.
3. The policy requires every school to serve breakfast after the start of the instructional day, in-classroom, grab-and-go, or second-chance.
4. The policy sets a target that breakfast participation reaches at least 70 percent of lunch participation.
5. The policy contains no language allowing alternate meals, meal denial, or collection referrals for students with unpaid meal balances.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall enroll every eligible school in the Community Eligibility Provision or an equivalent universal free meals program at each federal election window, and no student shall be charged for a reimbursable breakfast or lunch in a participating school. Every school shall serve breakfast after the start of the

> instructional day through breakfast in the classroom, grab-and-go, or second-chance breakfast. No student shall be denied a reimbursable meal, served an alternate meal, or identified to peers because of an unpaid meal balance. The Director of Nutrition Services shall report to the Board by October 15 of each year the CEP status of each school, the average daily participation in breakfast and lunch by school for the prior year, and the schools where breakfast participation is below 70 percent of lunch participation together with a corrective plan.

Indicator. Average daily participation in breakfast and lunch as a share of enrollment, by school, from the district's monthly USDA reimbursement claims; share of eligible schools operating under CEP; chronic absence and out-of-school suspension rates from the state report card, compared across years of adoption.

Red flags in real manuals. students with unpaid meal balances shall be served an alternate meal; breakfast shall be served before the start of the school day only; the district may participate in the Community Eligibility Provision at the discretion of the Superintendent; students may be denied a meal until the balance is paid; meal debt may be referred to a collection agency; no language on breakfast service or CEP at all in a district with high-poverty schools

Law. CEP is federal (Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, 42 U.S.C. 1759(a)); USDA lowered the identified student percentage threshold from 40 to 25 percent in 2023 (7 CFR 245.9). Several states fund universal free meals statewide (including California, Maine, Colorado, Minnesota, New Mexico, Vermont, Michigan and Massachusetts). Several states require breakfast after the bell in high-poverty schools (including Texas, Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico, West Virginia and Illinois). USDA requires districts to have a written unpaid meal charge policy (SP 46-2016).

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Nutrition Services, reporting to the Superintendent

First 90 days

1. The Director of Nutrition Services pulls the identified student percentage for every school from the state direct certification match and lists each school at or above the 25 percent CEP threshold under 7 CFR 245.9.
2. The Superintendent files CEP elections for every eligible school, or enrolls them in the state universal-meals program where one exists, at the next federal election window.
3. The Director of Nutrition Services inventories each school's current breakfast model and start time and computes breakfast participation as a share of lunch participation from the last 12 months of USDA reimbursement claims.
4. The Superintendent adopts and posts the written unpaid meal charge policy required by USDA SP 46-2016 that bars alternate meals, meal denial, and identification of students over balances.
5. The Director of Nutrition Services selects a breakfast after the bell model (in-classroom, grab-and-go, or second-chance) with each principal for every school now serving breakfast only before the instructional day.

Year one

1. Principals launch breakfast after the bell in every school by the start of the second semester, with the Director of Nutrition Services training cafeteria staff and teachers on serving and counting procedures.
2. The Director of Nutrition Services builds a monthly dashboard of breakfast and lunch average daily participation by school from the reimbursement claims and shares it with principals within 30 days of each claim.
3. The Director of Nutrition Services delivers the first annual report to the Board by October 15 listing CEP status by school, prior-year participation by school, and a corrective plan for every school where breakfast participation is below 70 percent of lunch participation.
4. The Superintendent confirms that no school is charging students for reimbursable meals and that no alternate-meal or debt-identification practices remain, through a principal attestation collected within 180 days.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent re-elects CEP for every eligible school at each federal election window and adds newly eligible schools as direct certification data changes.
2. The Director of Nutrition Services reports to the Board by October 15 each year on CEP status, participation by school, and corrective plans for schools below the 70 percent breakfast-to-lunch ratio.
3. The Superintendent reviews chronic absence and out-of-school suspension rates from the state report card alongside participation data each year to track outcomes across years of adoption.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Average daily breakfast and lunch participation as a share of enrollment by school, breakfast participation as a share of lunch participation by school, and share of eligible schools operating under CEP, all from monthly USDA reimbursement claims; chronic absence and out-of-school suspension rates from the state report card.
BASELINE	Prior-year average daily participation in breakfast and lunch by school from the last 12 months of reimbursement claims, the current breakfast-to-lunch participation ratio by school, the count of eligible schools under CEP, and the most recent state report card chronic absence and suspension rates, all recorded before the first CEP election and before any breakfast model change.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of schools at or above the 25 percent identified student percentage threshold operate under CEP or a state universal-meals program, and every school serves breakfast after the bell; within 2 years, every school's breakfast participation reaches at least 70 percent of its lunch participation, and district lunch participation rises by at least 5 percentage points over baseline, with suspension and chronic absence rates trending down across years of adoption.**
BENCHMARK	Universal free lunch raised participation 5 to 11 percentage points and produced math gains of 0.03 to 0.06 SD and ELA gains of 0.03 to 0.08 SD in NYC and state CEP

	rollouts; breakfast after the bell raised breakfast participation from about 43 to 74 percent of students in a 446-school district (roughly 30 points); the standard's 70 percent breakfast-to-lunch ratio is the operating threshold. The entry gives no numeric benchmark for suspension or absence change beyond one subgroup (about 17 percent fewer suspensions), so those are tracked directionally.
REPORTED	Annual report by the Director of Nutrition Services to the Board by October 15, with CEP status by school, prior-year breakfast and lunch participation by school, the list of schools below the 70 percent breakfast-to-lunch ratio with corrective plans, and state report card chronic absence and suspension rates compared across years of adoption.

– 44. Vision screening and eyeglasses TIER A STAKES 2/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Screening every student and then delivering eye exams and free glasses on site improves reading: the Baltimore cluster randomized trial of 2,304 students in grades 3 to 7 found a 0.09 SD reading gain after one year, with gains of 0.28 SD for students in the lowest baseline quartile and 0.25 SD for students in special education; rural China trials found math gains of 0.11 to 0.16 SD from free glasses. The gains fade by the second year unless glasses are replaced and wear is followed up, and screening alone, without exams and glasses, does nothing for achievement. (Reading +0.09 SD at 1 year overall, +0.28 SD for lowest-quartile readers (Baltimore RCT); math +0.11 to +0.16 SD (China cluster RCTs); FCAT pass rate +2 pct points averaged over all students (Florida RCT); no sustained effect at 2 years without follow-up.) [471,472,473,474,475,476,477]

Where the evidence is mixed. Effects fade: Baltimore found no sustained impact at two years and no effect on the state PARCC test, and the Florida trial also reports fade-out. Screening without a guaranteed exam and glasses did not raise achievement in Florida, and the 2018 Cochrane review found only low-certainty evidence that school screening programs by themselves improve outcomes. Compliance is the binding constraint: many students stop wearing or lose their glasses within months, and the Baltimore and Los Angeles programs needed replacement pairs and classroom follow-up. Math effects in the US trials were small (0.03 SD in Baltimore elementary grades) and the Los Angeles study was observational.

Standard. Every student is screened for distance and near vision at school entry and at least every two years thereafter (and whenever a teacher refers), every student who fails is guaranteed a comprehensive eye exam and glasses at no cost to the family, delivered on site or through a partner within 90 days, with a replacement pair and a documented wear check each semester.

1. The policy guarantees every student who fails screening a comprehensive eye exam and glasses at no cost to the family. CORE
2. The policy screens every student for distance and near vision at school entry and at least every two years thereafter.
3. The policy provides that a student is screened whenever a teacher refers the student.
4. The policy requires the exam and glasses to be delivered on site or through a partner within 90 days.
5. The policy provides a replacement pair of glasses each semester.
6. The policy requires a documented wear check each semester.

> **Policy.** The district shall screen the distance and near vision of every student at school entry, in kindergarten and in grades 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9, in any year in which a student has not been screened within the previous two years, upon new enrollment, and whenever a teacher refers a student, using an evidence-based screening protocol administered by the school nurse or trained staff. For every student who fails screening, the school nurse shall record the referral in a referral log and shall arrange a comprehensive eye examination and, when prescribed, eyeglasses, delivered on site or through a school-based vision partner within 90 calendar days of referral, at no cost to the family; the district may bill the student's insurance where available and shall cover any remaining cost. The nurse shall provide one replacement pair per year on request. Each semester, classroom teachers shall conduct a wear check confirming that each student with

> prescribed glasses has them and is wearing them, shall document the result in the referral log, and the nurse shall follow up with the family of any student who does not. The Coordinator of Health Services shall report to the Board by December 15 of each year, by school and by grade, the number and share of students screened, the number referred, the share of referred students examined within 60 days and fitted with glasses within 90 days, the share wearing glasses at the semester check, and the reading growth of students who received glasses as measured by the district's benchmark assessment.

Indicator. Share of students screened each year by grade; share of students who fail screening who receive a comprehensive eye exam within 60 days and glasses within 90 days (from the school nurse's referral log); share still wearing glasses at a 3-month classroom check; reading growth of students who received glasses, from the district's benchmark assessment.

Red flags in real manuals. vision screening may be conducted as resources allow; parents shall be notified of screening failures (with no provision for exams or glasses); screening is limited to distance acuity only; the district assumes no responsibility for follow-up care; screening frequency longer than every two years; no named role responsible for referral follow-up

Law. Most states require school vision screening at specified grades, with varying frequency and methods; Illinois requires a comprehensive eye examination by an optometrist or ophthalmologist for kindergarten entry (105 ILCS 5/27-8.1). Medicaid EPSDT covers eye exams and glasses for enrolled children, so a district program can bill or refer for most low-income students. The USPSTF recommends screening children ages 3 to 5 for amblyopia and finds insufficient evidence for or against screening older children, which is about health screening, not the achievement effect of correction.

How to implement it. Owner: Coordinator of Health Services

First 90 days

1. The Coordinator of Health Services adopts an evidence-based screening protocol for distance and near vision and sets the screening calendar for kindergarten and grades 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 within 30 days.
2. The Coordinator of Health Services trains every school nurse and designated screening staff on the protocol and on the referral log, including the 60-day exam and 90-day glasses fields, within 60 days.
3. The Superintendent signs an agreement with a school-based vision partner (optometrist or ophthalmologist) to deliver comprehensive exams and glasses on site or by referral, and the business office sets up Medicaid EPSDT and private insurance billing, within 90 days.
4. Each school nurse opens the referral log and begins screening newly enrolled and teacher-referred students immediately, recording every failed screening on the day it occurs.

Year one

1. Each school nurse completes screening of every student in the designated grades and every student not screened within the previous two years, and arranges an exam and glasses for every student who fails within 90 calendar days of referral.

2. Classroom teachers conduct the semester wear check for every student with prescribed glasses, document it in the referral log, and the nurse contacts the family of any student without glasses and issues a replacement pair on request.
3. The Coordinator of Health Services matches students who received glasses to the district's benchmark assessment and delivers the first report to the Board by December 15, by school and by grade.

Ongoing

1. The Coordinator of Health Services reports to the Board each December 15 the screening, referral, 60-day exam, 90-day glasses, wear-check and reading-growth figures by school and grade.
2. Each school nurse re-screens every student at least every two years and continues the semester wear check and replacement-pair process, since the research shows gains fade by year two without follow-up.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	From the school nurse's referral log and the district benchmark assessment: share of students screened each year by grade; share of referred students examined within 60 days and fitted with glasses within 90 days; share still wearing glasses at the semester classroom check; reading growth of students who received glasses versus their prior-year growth.
BASELINE	First year of the referral log: the share of students screened by grade, the share of referrals that reached an exam and glasses within 60 and 90 days, the share wearing glasses at the first semester check, and the prior-year reading growth of the students later fitted with glasses.
TARGET	**By the end of year one, every student in the designated grades is screened, every student who fails screening is examined within 60 days and fitted with glasses within 90 days, and the share wearing glasses at each semester check rises from the first check onward; by the end of year two, reading growth of students who received glasses exceeds their own prior-year growth, with the largest gains among students in the lowest baseline reading quartile and students in special education.**
BENCHMARK	Baltimore cluster RCT (2,304 students, grades 3 to 7): reading +0.09 SD at one year overall, +0.28 SD for the lowest baseline quartile, +0.25 SD for students in special education; China cluster RCTs: math +0.11 to +0.16 SD; Florida RCT: FCAT pass rate +2 percentage points. No sustained effect at two years without replacement glasses and wear follow-up, so the wear-check and replacement figures are the leading indicators.
REPORTED	Coordinator of Health Services to the Board by December 15 each year, by school and by grade, with the semester wear-check results and the 60-day and 90-day delivery

shares shown separately so the Board can see whether the follow-up that sustains the effect is happening.

Family and community

– 45. Attendance messaging to families TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Large randomized trials show that plain, personalized letters and text messages telling families how many days their child has missed, and why it matters, reduce chronic absence by about 10 to 15 percent (2 to 7 percentage points) at a cost of roughly $6 to $9 per student or $5 to $10 per added day of attendance. Supportive, simply worded messages outperform legalistic ones, and automated alerts about missed classes and assignments also cut course failure in secondary school. (Mailings: chronic absence -10% (K-12) to -15% (K-5); texts: -2 to -7 points in grades 3-5, -20% in Head Start; supportive truancy notice: 40% more effective than standard notice; cost $5 to $10 per added day)
478,479,480,481,482,483,484,485,486,487,488,489

Where the evidence is mixed. Effects on attendance are real but modest: a 10 percent reduction in chronic absence leaves nine in ten chronically absent students still absent, and the adaptive-text trial found no achievement gain after one year. Message content matters less than expected (benefit-framed and consequence-framed texts performed alike), while delivery details matter a lot: an opt-in default for an alert platform produced near-zero take-up compared with opt-out (Bergman, Lasky-Fink and Rogers 2020). Nudges that worked in district trials have failed when scaled by states or national organizations in another domain (FAFSA completion), so district-level ownership and data linkage appear to be preconditions. Check & Connect mentoring produced larger per-student gains than letters but at roughly 50 times the cost per added day, so messaging is a complement to, not a substitute for, case management for the most absent students.

Standard. Policy requires the district to send every family a plain-language, personalized absence update (days missed, why it matters, whom to call) at least when a student reaches 5 and 10 percent absence and again at each term, by mail and text in the family's preferred language, with supportive rather than legalistic wording, and to maintain current family contact information; legal truancy notices required by state law must use the same plain-language format.

1. The policy requires sending every family a personalized absence update stating days missed, why it matters, and whom to call. CORE
2. The policy requires absence updates at least when a student reaches 5 and 10 percent absence and again at each term.
3. The policy requires absence updates to be sent by mail and text in the family's preferred language.
4. The policy requires absence updates to use plain-language, supportive wording rather than legalistic wording.
5. The policy requires the district to maintain current family contact information.
6. The policy requires legal truancy notices required by state law to use the same plain-language format.

> **Policy.** The district shall maintain for every student at least one verified family mailing address and one verified mobile number, confirmed at enrollment and at the start of each school year, and shall record each family's preferred language for written and spoken communication. The Superintendent shall operate an attendance messaging system that sends each family a personalized absence message, by mail or text in the

> family's preferred language, when the student has missed 5 percent of enrolled days, again at 10 percent, and at the end of each grading period thereafter. Each message shall state the number of days the student has missed to date, compare it with typical attendance, explain in plain language why regular attendance matters, and name a school staff member with a phone number to contact for help. Messages shall be written at or below a sixth-grade reading level, shall not threaten fines, prosecution or exclusion, and shall be designed so that families are enrolled by default and may opt out. Any truancy notification required by state law shall be issued in the same plain-language format with the required legal content appended. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 31 each year the share of families with verified contact information, the number of absence messages sent by language, the share of students reaching 5 percent absence whose family was messaged within 10 school days, and the chronic absence rate by school and subgroup for the prior year.

Indicator. Share of enrolled students whose family received at least one personalized absence message (days missed to date, in the family's preferred language) within 10 school days of reaching 5 percent absence, from the student information system messaging log; chronic absence rate by school and subgroup; and family contact information completeness (percent of students with a working phone number or address on file).

Red flags in real manuals. absence letters sent only after the statutory truancy threshold, with no earlier personalized notice; notices that cite statute, fines or court action as the opening message; family communication only in English, or translation 'where feasible' with no named responsibility; parent portal or alert system that requires families to opt in with no default enrollment; no requirement to verify family phone numbers and addresses each year; messages that give a school-wide attendance exhortation but not the child's own days missed

Law. Most state compulsory attendance laws require written notice to parents after a set number of unexcused absences (for example California Education Code 48260.5, Texas Education Code 25.095); these notices are the legally required floor and the evidence favors rewriting them in plain, supportive language rather than adding a separate system. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act require that notices reach limited-English families in a language they understand. The TCPA permits informational school texts to numbers families provide.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Student Services as day-to-day lead and the student information system administrator as technical lead

First 90 days

1. The student information system administrator runs a contact data audit within 30 days and reports to the Superintendent the percent of students with a verified mailing address, a verified mobile number, and a recorded preferred language.
2. The Director of Student Services drafts the 5 percent, 10 percent, and end-of-term message templates at or below a sixth-grade reading level, stating days missed, a comparison with typical

attendance, why attendance matters, and a named staff contact with phone number, and has them translated into each language spoken by at least one family.
3. District legal counsel reviews the state-required truancy notice and rewrites it in the same plain-language format with the required legal content appended, within 60 days.
4. Each principal names one staff member per school as the attendance contact whose phone number appears in messages, and the Superintendent confirms the list within 60 days.
5. The student information system administrator configures automated triggers at 5 percent and 10 percent absence and at each grading period, with default enrollment and an opt-out flag, and tests them on a sample of records within 90 days.

Year one

1. School registrars verify each family's address, mobile number, and preferred language at enrollment and again at the start of the school year, and the student information system administrator reports completeness to the Superintendent at 180 days.
2. The Director of Student Services launches messaging districtwide by the first grading period and reviews the messaging log monthly to confirm that families are messaged within 10 school days of a student reaching 5 percent absence.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first report to the Board by October 31 covering verified contact information, messages sent by language, timeliness at the 5 percent trigger, and chronic absence by school and subgroup.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 31 each year on the four measures named in the clause.
2. The Director of Student Services reviews the message templates and translation list each summer and removes any wording that threatens fines, prosecution, or exclusion.
3. The student information system administrator re-runs the contact data audit at the start of each school year and flags schools with incomplete records to their principals.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of students reaching 5 percent absence whose family received a personalized absence message in the family's preferred language within 10 school days, from the student information system messaging log; chronic absence rate by school and subgroup; and percent of students with a verified phone number or address on file.
BASELINE	Prior-year chronic absence rate by school and subgroup from district records, the contact data audit completed in the first 30 days, and the messaging timeliness rate from the first full year of operation.

TARGET	**Messaging timeliness at the 5 percent trigger rises each year from the first-year rate; verified contact information coverage rises each year from the 30-day audit; and the district chronic absence rate falls from the prior-year baseline within 1 to 3 years, with a reduction of about 10 percent (K-12) to 15 percent (K-5) as the reference range from the evidence.**
BENCHMARK	Randomized trials: mailings reduced chronic absence about 10 percent (K-12) to 15 percent (K-5); texts reduced it 2 to 7 percentage points in grades 3 to 5 and 20 percent in Head Start; supportive truancy notices were 40 percent more effective than standard notices; cost about $6 to $9 per student or $5 to $10 per added day of attendance. The entry gives no numeric benchmark for messaging timeliness or contact information completeness.
REPORTED	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 31, covering the prior year, with the four measures broken out by school, subgroup, and language.

– 46. Community schools and integrated student supports TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Quasi-experimental evaluations of the two largest community school systems find consistent gains in attendance and behavior and smaller, slower gains in achievement: New York City's 2014 initiative cut chronic absence by 7 to 8 percentage points, raised graduation 4.9 points over three years and credits earned by 1.3 per year, reduced disciplinary incidents in elementary and middle schools, and raised grade 3-8 math by 0.13 SD only in year three with no ELA effect; California's 2022 grantee cohort cut chronic absence about 30 percent and suspensions about 15 percent relative to matched schools with math +0.06 SD and ELA +0.05 SD in the first year. Longitudinal studies of City Connects, the best-studied integrated-support model, show higher middle-school test scores and roughly half the odds of high school dropout for students served in elementary school. (NYC: chronic absence -7.3 points (K-8) and -8.3 points (HS), graduation +4.9 points, credits +1.3/year, math +0.13 SD (year 3 only), ELA null; California: chronic absence -30%, suspensions -15%, math +0.06 SD, ELA +0.05 SD; City Connects: dropout 9.2% vs 16.6%; Michigan caseworkers: chronic absence -8%)
490,491,492,493,494,495,496,497,498,499

Where the evidence is mixed. No randomized trial of the whole-school community schools model exists; the NYC and California estimates rest on matched-comparison designs that cannot rule out selection into the initiative, and the California window is one year. The one RCT of a core component, Communities In Schools case management (24 secondary schools, two years), found no effect on attendance, achievement, progress or behavior despite higher service receipt, improving only attitudes and relationships; MDRC's quasi-experimental study of the whole-school CIS model found attendance gains in elementary but not secondary schools. Heers et al. (2016), reviewing the literature, concluded that causal evidence for community schools as such is lacking and that extracurricular activities do not appear to raise achievement. Achievement effects where found are small (0.05 to 0.13 SD) and arrive after two to three years; ELA effects are repeatedly null. Costs run from a few hundred dollars per student for a coordinator to several thousand with wraparound services, and the Michigan material-needs program shows effects concentrated in schools with higher dosage and, uncomfortably, in wealthier and less diverse schools.

Standard. Policy defines the community school strategy by its four pillars (integrated student supports, expanded learning time, family and community engagement, collaborative leadership), requires each designated school to have a funded full-time coordinator, an annual needs assessment, a universal student support review, and a lead partner agreement, and requires annual reporting of attendance, discipline and achievement against matched comparison schools.

1. The policy defines the community school strategy by four pillars: integrated student supports, expanded learning time, family and community engagement, collaborative leadership. CORE
2. The policy requires each designated community school to have a funded full-time coordinator.
3. The policy requires each designated community school to conduct an annual needs assessment.
4. The policy requires each designated community school to conduct a universal student support review.
5. The policy requires each designated community school to have a lead partner agreement.
6. The policy requires annual reporting of attendance, discipline and achievement against matched comparison schools.

> **Policy.** The Board adopts the community school strategy, defined by four pillars: integrated student supports, expanded learning time, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership. The Board shall designate community

> schools from among schools in which 60 percent or more of students are eligible for free or reduced-price meals, English learners or in foster care, shall fund at each designated school a full-time community school coordinator employed by the district or a lead partner, and shall approve for each designated school a signed agreement with a lead partner. Each designated school shall conduct a needs and assets assessment of students, families and the neighborhood by October 31 of its first year and by October 31 each year thereafter, shall review every enrolled student at least once a year to identify academic, health, social and material needs, and shall record in the student support system the needs identified and the service connected, with a target that 90 percent of identified needs are matched to a service within 30 school days. Each designated school shall have a site leadership team including the principal, the coordinator, at least two teachers, at least two parents and a community partner that meets monthly. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by December 31 each year, for each designated school: full-time coordinator staffing, the signed lead partner agreement, the share of students with an identified need who received a service within 30 school days, and chronic absence, suspension, course-passing and state assessment results compared with the three district schools most similar in enrollment and poverty, and shall present the per-pupil cost of the strategy in the annual budget.

Indicator. For each designated community school: presence of a full-time coordinator and a signed lead-partner agreement; share of students with an identified need who received a service within 30 days (needs assessment and service log); chronic absence, suspension and course-passing rates compared with matched district schools, reported annually; per-pupil cost of the strategy.

Red flags in real manuals. community school designation with no funded coordinator position; wraparound services listed without a needs assessment or a service log; partnerships 'as resources permit' with no written agreement; no outcome reporting against comparison schools; the strategy limited to after-school programs or a single health clinic without integrated student review

Law. ESSA Title IV Part F authorizes the federal Full-Service Community Schools grant program (20 U.S.C. 7275) and Title I Section 1115 allows schoolwide programs to fund integrated supports. California's Community Schools Partnership Program (Education Code 8900 et seq.) has committed over $4 billion since 2021; New York's Foundation Aid includes a community schools set-aside; Maryland's Blueprint funds Concentration of Poverty grants requiring a coordinator and health services. Several states (for example New Mexico and Vermont) have community school statutes defining the four pillars.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through a district community schools director who supervises site coordinators and holds the lead partner agreements

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent identifies every school in which 60 percent or more of students are eligible for free or reduced-price meals, are English learners or are in foster care, and presents the eligible list to the Board.

2. The Board designates the first cohort of community schools from the eligible list and the Chief Financial Officer identifies Title I schoolwide, state community school and Title IV Part F funds for coordinator salaries.
3. The Superintendent posts and fills a full-time coordinator position for each designated school, employed by the district or a lead partner.
4. The Superintendent negotiates and brings to the Board a signed lead partner agreement for each designated school.
5. Each principal convenes a site leadership team of the principal, the coordinator, at least two teachers, at least two parents and a community partner and schedules monthly meetings.

Year one

1. Each coordinator completes the needs and assets assessment of students, families and the neighborhood by October 31 and reviews the findings with the site leadership team.
2. Each coordinator leads a review of every enrolled student at least once during the year and logs identified needs and the service connected in the student support system.
3. The research or data office identifies for each designated school the three district schools most similar in enrollment and poverty and sets up the comparison reporting.
4. The Superintendent delivers the first annual report to the Board by December 31 covering coordinator staffing, signed agreements, the 30-school-day service match rate, and attendance, suspension, course-passing and assessment results against comparison schools.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by December 31 each year on each designated school against its three comparison schools and presents the per-pupil cost of the strategy in the annual budget.
2. Each coordinator repeats the needs and assets assessment by October 31 each year and the universal student review, and the site leadership team continues to meet monthly.
3. The Board reviews the designation list annually and adds or removes schools based on eligibility and reported results.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	For each designated school: full-time coordinator in place, signed lead partner agreement, share of identified student needs matched to a service within 30 school days, and chronic absence, suspension and course-passing rates compared with the three most similar district schools.
BASELINE	Prior-year chronic absence, suspension and course-passing rates at each designated school and its three comparison schools, recorded before designation; no needs are logged before the first student review.
TARGET	**By the first December 31 report, every designated school has a full-time coordinator and a signed lead partner agreement and has matched 90 percent of identified needs to a service within 30 school days; within 1 to 3 years, chronic**

	absence and suspension rates at designated schools fall relative to their comparison schools, with a direction of improvement in course-passing rates.
BENCHMARK	Evaluated systems show chronic absence reductions of 7 to 8 percentage points (New York City) and about 30 percent with suspensions down about 15 percent (California) relative to comparison schools; achievement gains were small and slow, math +0.13 SD only in year three in New York City and +0.06 SD math and +0.05 SD ELA in the first year in California, so attendance and discipline are the earlier signals.
REPORTED	Superintendent's written report to the Board by December 31 each year, one page per designated school showing staffing, agreement status, the 30-school-day match rate, and the three-school comparison on attendance, suspension, course-passing and state assessment results, with the per-pupil cost shown in the annual budget.

– 47. Family engagement and two-way communication TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. Randomized trials show that specific, frequent, two-way teacher-to-family communication about a child's own effort, attendance and missed work raises engagement and achievement: daily teacher messages increased homework completion 40 percent, weekly one-sentence notes cut course failure 41 percent, automated missed-assignment alerts cut course failures 27 percent, and parent-school meetings in France reduced truancy and discipline sanctions by about 0.15 SD. Meta-analyses of family-school partnership programs find small to moderate positive associations with achievement (r about 0.12 for involvement overall; about 0.3 SD for structured programs), strongest for communication about schoolwork and parental expectations rather than attendance at events. (Teacher-family communication RCTs: homework completion +40%, course failure -27% to -41%, truancy and sanctions -0.15 SD; involvement meta-analyses: r = 0.12 overall, programs about +0.3 SD; achievement effects of information nudges concentrated in grades, not state tests) 500,501,502,503,504,505,506,507,508,509,510,511,512,513,514

Where the evidence is mixed. Most of the 'family engagement' literature is correlational and the strong associations in meta-analyses (Jeynes 2012, Castro 2015) partly reflect which families are already engaged; Hill and Tyson (2009) found school-based involvement (volunteering, attending events) and homework help have the weakest or even negative links to achievement in middle school, so policies that count event attendance measure the wrong thing. The causal trials show effects on grades, homework and course passing but generally not on state test scores (Bergman and Chan 2021, Avvisati et al. 2014), and they involve information about the specific child, delivered by the teacher or an automated system, not generic newsletters or parent nights. Eklund et al. (2022) found the family-school partnership category of attendance interventions had a confidence interval including zero. Take-up collapses under opt-in enrollment, and immigrant and limited-English families report the most barriers, so an unfunded two-way expectation can widen gaps rather than close them.

Standard. Policy sets a measurable district-wide expectation (not only Title I schools) of at least two individualized two-way contacts per family per year about the child's own progress, attendance and missed work, in the family's preferred language, logged in the student information system; requires default enrollment of all families in progress alerts; and requires annual public reporting of contact rates, conference participation and family survey results by school and subgroup.

1. The policy requires at least two individualized two-way contacts per family per year about the child's own progress, attendance and missed work. CORE
2. The policy applies the family contact expectation district-wide to all schools, not only Title I schools.
3. The policy requires that family contacts be made in the family's preferred language.
4. The policy requires that family contacts be logged in the student information system.
5. The policy requires default enrollment of all families in progress alerts.
6. The policy requires annual public reporting of contact rates, conference participation and family survey results by school and subgroup.

> **Policy.** Every school shall make at least two documented two-way contacts with the family of every enrolled student each school year, the first by October 31 and the second by March 31, about that student's own attendance, progress and missed work. A two-way contact is a phone call, in-person or video conference, home visit or text exchange in which the family responds; a newsletter, mass message or automated call shall not count. Each contact shall be made in the family's preferred language and shall be logged

> in the student information system with the date, mode, language and topic. The district shall enroll every family by default in weekly progress alerts covering absences, missing assignments and grades below the passing threshold, with the ability to opt out, and shall verify each family's phone number and language preference at enrollment and each August. Each school shall hold at least one scheduled conference per student per year, offered at two or more times including one outside working hours, with interpretation provided on request. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by November 30 each year, by school and subgroup, the share of students whose families received two logged two-way contacts in the prior year, conference participation, alert enrollment, and the results of an annual family survey administered in the district's top five home languages, and shall publish the report on the district website.

Indicator. Percent of students whose family received at least two documented, individualized two-way contacts (phone, text exchange, conference or home visit, logged in the student information system with date, mode, language and topic) in the year, by school and subgroup; share of families enrolled by default in the alert system and reachable by verified phone; parent-teacher conference participation rate; annual family survey response rate and results on 'the school tells me how my child is doing'.

Red flags in real manuals. family engagement defined only as volunteering, PTA, fundraising or attendance at school events; a parent and family engagement policy that applies only to Title I schools; communication expectations with no logging, no frequency and no named role; 'parents are encouraged to' language with no obligation on the school; parent portal or alert enrollment that is opt-in only; conferences offered only during the school day; home language communication 'when feasible' or 'as resources allow'

Law. ESEA Section 1116 (20 U.S.C. 6318) requires every Title I district and school to adopt a written parent and family engagement policy developed with parents, a school-parent compact, an annual meeting, and information 'in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language the parents can understand'; districts receiving more than $500,000 must reserve at least 1 percent for engagement, with 90 percent going to schools. IDEA (34 CFR 300.322 and 300.503) requires parent participation in IEP meetings and notices in the native language. Title VI and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act require meaningful communication with limited-English parents.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Family Engagement as day-to-day lead and principals accountable for school-level contact rates

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent designates the Director of Family Engagement as policy lead and names a principal and a teacher representative from each grade band to a 90-day implementation team.
2. The student information system administrator builds the two-way contact log fields (date, mode, language, topic, family response) and a per-student report, and the Director of Family Engagement trains every principal and teacher on logging within 60 days.
3. The Chief Technology Officer configures weekly progress alerts for absences, missing assignments and grades below the passing threshold, enrolls every family by default with an opt-

out, and the registrar verifies each family's phone number and language preference at enrollment.
4. The Director of Family Engagement publishes a one-page contact guide and sample scripts in the district's top five home languages and confirms interpretation is available for calls and conferences.
5. Each principal reviews the policy with staff and sets the October 31 and March 31 contact deadlines on the school calendar, with conferences offered at two or more times including one outside working hours.

Year one

1. Each principal pulls the contact log monthly and assigns follow-up to the counselor or family liaison for any student whose family has not yet responded to a two-way contact before the October 31 and March 31 deadlines.
2. The Director of Family Engagement administers the annual family survey in the district's top five home languages and reports the response rate and results by school and subgroup.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first annual report to the Board by November 30 covering two-contact rates, conference participation, alert enrollment and verified phone reach by school and subgroup, and posts it on the district website.
4. The Title I coordinator aligns the district and school parent and family engagement policies and school-parent compacts under ESEA Section 1116 with this clause and confirms the 1 percent reservation, with 90 percent passed to schools, funds liaisons and interpretation.

Ongoing

1. The registrar re-verifies every family's phone number and language preference each August and the Chief Technology Officer re-enrolls new families in alerts by default.
2. The Superintendent reports to the Board by November 30 each year and the Board reviews school and subgroup gaps in two-contact rates and conference participation before adopting the next budget.
3. The Director of Family Engagement audits a sample of logged contacts each semester to confirm they were individualized, two-way and in the family's preferred language.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Percent of enrolled students whose family received at least two logged, individualized two-way contacts in the school year (one by October 31, one by March 31), by school and subgroup; plus share of families enrolled in alerts and reachable by verified phone, conference participation rate, and family survey response rate and agreement with 'the school tells me how my child is doing'
BASELINE	Year-one contact log and the first family survey establish the baseline, since no district-wide two-way contact rate exists before the log is built
TARGET	**Every school reaches a majority of students with two logged two-way contacts in year one and raises that share each year through year three, with the gap between the lowest and highest subgroup narrowing each year; all families**

	enrolled in alerts by default with a verified phone on file by the end of each August; survey response rate and agreement with 'the school tells me how my child is doing' rising each year
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric benchmark for contact rates; the evidence is from trials of communication practices (homework completion +40 percent, course failure -27 to -41 percent, truancy and sanctions -0.15 SD), not a published target rate, so the target is directional
REPORTED	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by November 30, by school and subgroup, published on the district website, with a mid-year check at the March 31 deadline

– 48. Language access for families TIER D STAKES 3/5

Tier D: professional standard or expert consensus

Finding. Federal civil rights law (Title VI, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act and Lau v. Nichols) requires districts to communicate with limited-English parents in a language they understand, and IDEA requires native-language notices and interpreters for special education. Nationally representative data show that immigrant parents report the most barriers to school involvement and that English ability predicts how involved they are; the largest communication RCT that improved attendance (131,312 students) delivered its notices in five languages, and a vendor-funded matched study of a translated two-way messaging platform reports attendance gains concentrated among English learner and Latino families. (Compliance obligation; involvement gap by English proficiency documented in ECLS-K and PISA; translated two-way messaging platform (vendor study): absence -24% in Tulsa, larger gains for ELs; no causal estimate of translation itself) 515,516,517,518,519,520,521,522,523,524,525,526,527

Where the evidence is mixed. No randomized or quasi-experimental study isolates the effect of translating or interpreting school communication on student outcomes; the trials that used home-language messages did not report results by language, and the strongest platform evidence (TalkingPoints) is produced by the vendor from matched comparisons. Machine translation can carry errors in high-stakes documents (discipline notices, IEPs, consent forms), and Cheatham (2011) documents interpretation in special education that fails IDEA's participation and consent standards even when an interpreter is present. Federal enforcement has weakened: Executive Order 14224 (March 2025) revoked EO 13166, the Department of Justice rescinded its LEP guidance in July 2025, and the Department of Education rescinded the January 2015 Dear Colleague letter in August 2025; the statutes and Lau remain binding but complaint-driven enforcement is less predictable, so the obligation increasingly rests on district policy and state law.

Standard. Policy identifies each family's preferred language at enrollment, translates all vital documents into every language spoken by 5 percent or 1,000 families (whichever is less) and provides free qualified interpretation on request for any language, prohibits reliance on children or untrained staff as interpreters, names a district language access coordinator, and reports delivery rates by language annually.

1. The policy requires identifying each family's preferred language at enrollment.
2. The policy translates all vital documents into every language spoken by 5 percent or 1,000 families, whichever is less. CORE
3. The policy provides free qualified interpretation on request for any language.
4. The policy prohibits reliance on children or untrained staff as interpreters.
5. The policy names a district language access coordinator.
6. The policy reports delivery rates by language annually.

> **Policy.** The district shall ask every family at enrollment, and confirm each August, the language in which the family prefers to receive written and spoken communication, and shall record it in the student information system. The district shall provide free, timely and competent language assistance to every parent or guardian with limited English proficiency so that the parent can participate meaningfully in the child's education. Vital documents, including enrollment forms, handbooks and codes of conduct, discipline notices, attendance notices, special education notices and consent forms, health and emergency notices, report cards and progress reports, and notices of parent meetings,

> shall be translated in writing into every language spoken by at least 5 percent of enrolled families or 1,000 families, whichever is less, and shall be provided orally or in writing on request in any other language. A qualified interpreter shall be provided at no cost for any meeting between school staff and a limited-English parent, including conferences, discipline hearings, IEP and Section 504 meetings, within five school days of a request or sooner where a legal deadline applies, and remote interpretation shall be available for unscheduled contacts. Students, siblings, other children, and staff without demonstrated proficiency shall not be used as interpreters except in an emergency to arrange a qualified interpreter. Machine translation may be used for routine messages only when reviewed by a proficient speaker before release for any vital document. The Superintendent shall designate a language access coordinator, shall publish the district's language access plan and a list of translated documents on the district website, and shall report to the Board by October 31 each year: the number of families by preferred language, the share of required notices delivered in the family's language, interpreter requests and fulfillment times, conference and IEP participation rates of limited-English families compared with all families, and complaints received.

Indicator. Share of families with a recorded home language other than English who received each required notice category (enrollment, discipline, special education, attendance, health, emergency) in their language, from the student information system; interpreter requests fulfilled within the policy timeline; conference and IEP meeting participation rates for limited-English families compared with English-speaking families; family survey results by language.

Red flags in real manuals. translation or interpretation provided 'when feasible', 'as resources allow' or 'upon availability'; students or family members used as interpreters for discipline, special education or health matters; written translation limited to a single language regardless of enrollment; no named role responsible for language access and no complaint route; notices deemed delivered when sent in English only; fees charged for translation or interpretation

Law. Title VI (42 U.S.C. 2000d) and the EEOA (20 U.S.C. 1703(f)) remain in force and privately enforceable; Lau v. Nichols (1974) is the controlling precedent. EO 14224 (March 1, 2025) designated English the official language and revoked EO 13166; DOJ rescinded its 2002 LEP guidance (July 14, 2025) and the Department of Education rescinded the January 2015 EL and LEP-parent Dear Colleague letter (August 2025); neither action changes the statutes. ESSA Section 1116(f) requires Title I information in a language parents understand to the extent practicable; IDEA regulations (34 CFR 300.503(c), 300.322(e), 300.9) require native-language notices, interpreters at IEP meetings and consent in the native language. Many states go further: California Education Code 48985 requires translation when 15 percent of students speak a language; Illinois 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02 addresses special education interpretation; Washington's language access chapter (RCW 28A.183) sets interpreter and translation standards for schools. Districts with 5 percent or more families speaking one language are the usual enforcement trigger under former OCR practice.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through a designated district language access coordinator

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent names a language access coordinator within 30 days and announces the role to all principals and front office staff.
2. The coordinator adds a preferred-language field for written and spoken communication to the enrollment form and the student information system within 60 days.
3. The coordinator pulls a count of enrolled families by home language from the student information system and identifies every language spoken by at least 5 percent of families or 1,000 families, whichever is less.
4. The coordinator contracts with a qualified interpretation and translation vendor, including remote interpretation for unscheduled contacts, within 90 days.
5. The coordinator issues written direction to all schools that students, siblings, other children and staff without demonstrated proficiency may not be used as interpreters except in an emergency to arrange a qualified interpreter.

Year one

1. The coordinator oversees translation of every vital document category named in the clause into each qualifying language and posts the list of translated documents and the language access plan on the district website.
2. Principals confirm each family's preferred language in August and ensure it is recorded in the student information system.
3. The coordinator sets up tracking of interpreter requests, fulfillment dates and notice delivery by language in the student information system so that requests can be checked against the five school day timeline.
4. The coordinator trains front office staff, counselors, special education staff and administrators on how to request interpreters and how to route vital documents for translation.

Ongoing

1. The coordinator reports to the Board by October 31 each year on families by preferred language, share of required notices delivered in the family's language, interpreter requests and fulfillment times, conference and IEP participation of limited-English families compared with all families, and complaints received.
2. Principals reconfirm preferred language with every family each August and the coordinator updates the qualifying-language list from the new enrollment counts.
3. The coordinator reviews any machine-translated vital document with a proficient speaker before release and investigates every complaint about language access.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of families with a recorded home language other than English who received each required notice category (enrollment, discipline, special education, attendance, health, emergency) in their preferred language, share of interpreter requests fulfilled within five school days, and conference and IEP meeting participation rates of limited-English families compared with all families.

BASELINE	First-year report to the Board by October 31 establishes the baseline for each measure; before this policy most districts have no recorded preferred language and cannot report delivery by language.
TARGET	**Within 1 to 3 years, the share of required notices delivered in the family's preferred language rises each year, every interpreter request is fulfilled within five school days or sooner where a legal deadline applies, and the gap in conference and IEP participation between limited-English families and all families narrows year over year.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric benchmark for delivery rates or participation gaps; the only numeric thresholds are the 5 percent or 1,000 family translation trigger, the five school day interpreter timeline, and the October 31 reporting date. The vendor study of translated two-way messaging reports absence down 24 percent in Tulsa with larger gains for English learners, but the entry notes no causal estimate of translation itself, so that figure is not a target.
REPORTED	The language access coordinator reports to the Board by October 31 each year in a public written report, broken out by language, with interpreter fulfillment times, participation rate comparisons and complaints received.

– 49. Teacher home visits TIER C STAKES 2/5

Tier C: consistent correlational evidence

Finding. Matched-comparison studies of relationship-building teacher home visits (the Parent Teacher Home Visits model and the DC Family Engagement Partnership) consistently find that visited students are less likely to be chronically absent (21 to 24 percent lower odds or fewer absences), somewhat more likely to score proficient in reading, and have fewer disciplinary incidents, with small positive effects on grades (d about 0.12) and math (about 0.11 SD). Schools that visit at least 10 percent of families show school-wide attendance gains that reach non-visited students. (Chronic absence odds -21% (visited students) and -22% (schools visiting 10%+ of families); ELA proficiency odds +35% at school level; attendance +0.35 points and disciplinary incidents 9.3% vs 12.2% in DC; math +0.11 SD; grades d = 0.12 to 0.13) [528,529,530,531,532,533,534,535,536]

Where the evidence is mixed. No randomized trial of teacher home visits in US K-12 has been published; every outcome study uses matched or regression-adjusted comparison groups, and families who accept a visit (or teachers who volunteer to make them) likely differ from those who do not, so the estimates are upper bounds. Effects on achievement are small and inconsistent: Sheldon and Jung (2018) found ELA gains at the school level only in some districts and math gains in two of four; the DC study found math but not ELA gains; Wright et al. (2018) found higher positive-behavior points and grades but no difference in discipline points. Most evaluations were commissioned by the program or its funders. Cost is real: visits take 30 to 60 minutes of paid teacher time outside the school day per family plus training, and the model's own fidelity rules (voluntary for both sides, no targeting of 'problem' students, no agenda beyond hopes and dreams) limit who gets visited. The well-known RCT evidence on home visiting (nurse and parent-educator visits to families of infants) is a different intervention and should not be cited for teacher visits.

Standard. Policy authorizes and funds voluntary, paid, relationship-building teacher home visits following a recognized model (visits in pairs, trained staff, family's language, no targeting of 'problem' students), sets a reach target of at least 10 percent of families per school with priority on transition grades and chronically absent students who volunteer, and requires annual reporting of reach and attendance outcomes.

1. The policy authorizes and funds voluntary, paid, relationship-building teacher home visits that follow a recognized model. CORE
2. The policy requires that home visits are made in pairs by trained staff.
3. The policy requires that home visits are conducted in the family's language.
4. The policy states that home visits are not targeted at students identified as problem students.
5. The policy sets a reach target of at least 10 percent of families per school.
6. The policy prioritizes transition grades and chronically absent students who volunteer for visits.

> **Policy.** The district shall operate a voluntary teacher home visit program in every school following a recognized relationship-building model. Visits shall be made by two trained staff members, shall be voluntary for both the family and the staff, shall be scheduled at the family's convenience and in a location the family chooses, shall be conducted in the family's preferred language with a bilingual visitor or interpreter, and shall have no agenda beyond building a relationship and learning the family's hopes for the student. Staff shall be paid at their hourly rate or a Board-approved stipend for training and for each visit outside the contract day. Each school shall offer a visit to the families of all students entering kindergarten, sixth grade and ninth grade, and to the families of all

> students who were chronically absent in the prior year, and shall aim to complete visits with at least 10 percent of enrolled families each year, with a second visit offered later in the year. Students shall not be selected for visits on the basis of discipline history, and visits shall not be used to deliver warnings or enforce attendance. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 each year, by school: the number and share of families visited, visits by language, staff participation, and the chronic absence and course-passing rates of visited students compared with non-visited students in the same schools, and shall include the program in the annual budget.

Indicator. Percent of enrolled families receiving at least one relationship-building home visit per year, by school and grade band (program log in the student information system); chronic absence rate of visited versus non-visited students in the same schools, adjusted for prior-year attendance; share of visits conducted in the family's home language with a bilingual visitor or interpreter; teacher participation rate.

Red flags in real manuals. home visits assigned as a consequence for absence or misconduct, or used to serve truancy notices; visits made by a single staff member, or by attendance officers rather than teachers; no compensation for staff time outside the contract day; visits restricted to 'at-risk' lists; home visit used to check for residency or truancy evidence rather than relationship-building; no language provision for visits to limited-English families

Law. No federal or state law requires teacher home visits for general education students; some states fund them through family engagement or attendance grants, and California's Community Schools Partnership Program lists them as an allowable strategy. Residency-verification home visits are a different practice governed by state enrollment law and should not be conflated with this domain. Home visiting for infants and toddlers under MIECHV (42 U.S.C. 711) is a separate health program.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, through the Director of Family Engagement, with each principal responsible for school-level reach

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent designates a Director of Family Engagement as program lead and selects a recognized relationship-building home visit model (such as Parent Teacher Home Visits) for district-wide use.
2. The Director of Family Engagement and the Chief Financial Officer calculate the cost of training, hourly pay or stipends, and interpreter services to reach at least 10 percent of enrolled families per school and present the line item to the Board.
3. The Superintendent negotiates stipend or hourly-rate terms with the teachers' association and secures Board approval of the pay schedule for training and visits outside the contract day.
4. The Director of Family Engagement contracts for model-provider training and schedules a first cohort of volunteer teachers and staff from every school, with bilingual staff recruited in each school's major home languages.
5. The Chief Information Officer adds a home visit log to the student information system that records each visit's date, school, grade, language, staff pair, and whether the student was chronically absent in the prior year.

Year one

1. Each principal offers a visit to every family of a student entering kindergarten, sixth grade, or ninth grade and to every family of a student chronically absent in the prior year, and tracks offers and completed visits in the program log.
2. The Director of Family Engagement audits a sample of visit logs each semester to confirm that visits are made in pairs, in the family's preferred language, and are not targeted by discipline history or used to enforce attendance.
3. The Director of Research compares chronic absence and course-passing rates of visited and non-visited students in the same schools, adjusted for prior-year attendance, and the Superintendent delivers the first report to the Board by September 30.
4. The Director of Family Engagement schedules second-visit offers for visited families in the spring and reports the share accepted.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 each year, by school, on the share of families visited, visits by language, staff participation, and outcomes of visited versus non-visited students, and includes the program in the annual budget.
2. Principals of schools below the 10 percent reach target submit a recruitment plan to the Director of Family Engagement within 60 days of the annual report.
3. The Director of Family Engagement retrains staff annually and refreshes bilingual visitor and interpreter capacity to match enrollment.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Percent of enrolled families receiving at least one relationship-building home visit per year, by school and grade band, and the chronic absence rate of visited versus non-visited students in the same schools, adjusted for prior-year attendance; also share of visits in the family's home language and teacher participation rate.
BASELINE	Prior-year chronic absence rate for each school and for the kindergarten, sixth grade, and ninth grade cohorts, plus the number of families visited in the year before adoption (likely zero in most schools), recorded from the student information system before the first visits.
TARGET	**Every school reaches at least 10 percent of enrolled families with a visit within 1 to 3 years, with all transition-grade and prior-year chronically absent families offered a visit in year one; visited students show a lower chronic absence rate than comparable non-visited students in the same schools in each annual report, and no visits are logged as selected by discipline history.**
BENCHMARK	Matched-comparison studies of the Parent Teacher Home Visits model and the DC Family Engagement Partnership found 21 percent lower odds of chronic absence for visited students, 22 percent lower odds at schools visiting 10 percent or more of families, 35 percent higher odds of ELA proficiency at the school level, disciplinary incidents of 9.3 percent versus 12.2 percent, math gains of about 0.11 SD, and grade

	effects of d = 0.12 to 0.13; evidence tier C, so the Board should treat these as the direction and rough scale of expected effects rather than guaranteed results.
REPORTED	The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 each year, by school: number and share of families visited, visits by language, staff participation, offer and completion rates for transition grades and prior-year chronically absent students, and chronic absence and course-passing rates of visited versus non-visited students adjusted for prior-year attendance.

Staffing and instruction

– 50. Class size in the early grades TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. The Tennessee STAR experiment shows that classes of 13 to 17 students in K-3 raise test scores by about 4 percentile points in the first year and roughly 1 point a year after, with larger gains for Black students and students on free lunch, and the same students were 2.7 percentage points more likely to attend college. Large-scale rollouts deliver less than the experiment because they dilute teacher quality and cost a great deal per student. (STAR: +0.2 SD in K-3, college attendance +2.7 pp (+7.3 pp in the poorest third of schools); Campbell review pooled effect on reading small, on math null; California CSR gains partly offset by inexperienced teachers) [537,538,539,540,541,542,543,544,545,546]

Where the evidence is mixed. Hoxby (2000) finds no effect of class size in Connecticut and rules out even modest effects. Leuven and Lokken (2020) find no average long-run effect of class size in Norway. The Campbell systematic review (Filges et al. 2018) finds at best a small effect on reading and a non-significant negative effect on math across ten studies. Jepsen and Rivkin (2009) show that California's statewide reduction to 20 students raised achievement but the rush to hire 25,000 new teachers brought in uncertified and inexperienced staff, which dampened the gains most in high-poverty, high-minority schools. Chetty et al. (2011) find small classes raised college attendance but the effect on earnings at 27 is not statistically significant. Class size reduction is among the most expensive interventions per unit of effect; most reviews conclude money is better spent on teacher quality once classes are below the mid-20s.

Standard. The policy shall set a numeric K-3 class-size cap (not above 20 students, or 22 with a full-time aide), shall apply the cap first in the highest-poverty schools, and shall pair any class-size reduction with a certification requirement for the teachers hired to meet it.

1. The policy sets a numeric K-3 class-size cap not above 20 students, or 22 students with a full-time aide. CORE
2. The policy applies the cap to each individual class section rather than as a district-wide average.
3. The policy applies the class-size cap first in the highest-poverty schools.
4. The policy requires that teachers hired to meet a class-size reduction hold full certification.
5. The policy requires Board notice before any waiver of the K-3 class-size cap.
6. The policy requires reporting of actual K-3 class sizes against the cap.

> **Policy.** Kindergarten through grade 3 general education classes shall not exceed 20 students, or 22 students when a full-time instructional aide is assigned to the class for the entire day. Where staffing or space does not permit every school to meet the cap in a given year, the Superintendent shall meet it first in the schools with the highest share of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals. Teachers hired to meet this cap shall hold full state certification for the grade taught. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 31 each year, by school, the average and maximum class size for each grade K-3, the number of sections exceeding the cap and the reason for each, and the

> share of K-3 teachers without full certification. Any section exceeding the cap after October 31 shall require written Board approval.

Indicator. Average and maximum section size in K-3 by school each October (student information system); share of K-3 sections above the cap; share of new K-3 teachers without full certification; K-3 reading and math benchmark growth by school.

Red flags in real manuals. class size caps only as averages across the district rather than per section; caps expressed as 'goals' or 'targets' with no reporting; caps that may be waived by the principal without Board notice; no cap for kindergarten or grade 1 while upper grades have one; class size reduction funded by hiring uncertified or emergency-permit teachers; combination classes used to circumvent the cap

Law. Florida's 2002 constitutional amendment (Art. IX s.1) caps core classes at 18 in K-3, 22 in grades 4-8 and 25 in 9-12. California's 1996 K-3 Class Size Reduction program funded classes of 20 or fewer; most states have no statutory cap but set caps or averages through collective bargaining or accreditation standards. Many state caps are averages or include waivers, so a district policy that is stricter than state law is meaningful.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Chief Financial Officer for staffing and budget and the Director of Human Resources for certification

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent pulls October enrollment from the student information system and publishes the average and maximum K-3 section size for every school, flagging each section above 20 students (or 22 with a full-time aide).
2. The Director of Human Resources audits every current K-3 teacher of record and reports to the Superintendent the share without full state certification, by school.
3. The Chief Financial Officer ranks schools by share of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals and costs out the teachers, aides and rooms needed to bring the highest-poverty schools under the cap first.
4. The Superintendent brings the Board a written list of every section currently above the cap with the reason for each and a schedule for closing the gap, and requests written Board approval for any section that will stay above the cap this year.

Year one

1. The Director of Human Resources posts and fills K-3 positions for the next school year only with fully certified candidates, and reports monthly to the Superintendent on the share of offers made to uncertified applicants (target zero).
2. The Superintendent assigns new sections, aides and rooms for the next school year to the highest-poverty schools first, so every K-3 section in those schools opens under the cap.
3. The Superintendent files the first full compliance report to the Board by October 31, by school and grade, covering average and maximum size, sections above the cap with reasons, and the share of K-3 teachers without full certification.
4. The Director of Assessment adds K-3 reading and math benchmark growth by school to the same October report so the Board can read class size and learning results side by side.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 31 every year and brings any section still above the cap for written Board approval, with the Board minutes recording the reason.
2. The Director of Human Resources reports each spring the share of K-3 teachers hired in the past year who hold full state certification, and the Superintendent explains any hire that does not.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of K-3 general education sections above the cap (20 students, or 22 with a full-time aide) each October, by school; share of K-3 teachers without full state certification; K-3 reading and math benchmark growth by school.
BASELINE	First October count of K-3 section sizes and K-3 teacher certification status in the student information and human resources systems, taken within 90 days of adoption.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, zero K-3 sections above the cap in the schools with the highest share of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals; within 3 years, zero sections above the cap district-wide without written Board approval, and the share of new K-3 teachers without full certification at zero. K-3 reading and math benchmark growth in the schools brought under the cap should rise relative to their own baseline over the same 3 years.**
BENCHMARK	The Tennessee STAR experiment found classes of 13 to 17 students in K-3 raised test scores about 4 percentile points in the first year (about 0.2 SD) and about 1 point a year after, with college attendance up 2.7 percentage points overall and 7.3 points in the poorest third of schools. Florida's constitution caps K-3 core classes at 18; California's 1996 program funded classes of 20 or fewer, and its gains were partly offset by inexperienced teachers, which is why the certification requirement is paired with the cap. No district should expect the full STAR effect from a cap of 20 or 22.
REPORTED	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 31, by school and grade K-3, with average and maximum class size, the number of sections above the cap and the reason for each, the share of K-3 teachers without full certification, and K-3 reading and math benchmark growth; any over-cap section after October 31 recorded in Board minutes with written approval.

– 51. Instructional coaching and professional development TIER A STAKES 3/5

Tier A: meta-analysis or several causal studies agree

Finding. A meta-analysis of 60 causal studies finds that one-on-one instructional coaching improves teaching practice by 0.49 SD and student achievement by 0.18 SD, far more than the one-off workshops that make up most district professional development, which show no achievement effect in large randomized trials. Effects shrink as programs scale (programs over 100 teachers: 0.34 SD practice, 0.10 SD achievement) and depend on coaches observing real lessons and giving specific feedback in cycles over a year. (Coaching: +0.49 SD on instructional practice, +0.18 SD on student achievement (meta-analysis of 60 causal studies); at scale +0.34 and +0.10 SD. Content-focused workshops without coaching: null on achievement in IES RCTs. STEM PD meta-analysis: +0.21 SD when PD is paired with curriculum materials.)
547,548,549,550,551,552,553,554,555,556

Where the evidence is mixed. Not all coaching works: Kraft and Blazar (2017) found large practice gains but no achievement gain in one year; Blazar and Kraft (2015) found the same program succeeded in one cohort and failed in the next when coaching dosage and school conditions changed; Kraft and Hill (2020) found web-based coaching improved observed instruction and student perceptions without a detectable achievement effect. Campbell and Malkus (2011) found math coaches had no effect in their first year and positive effects only in years two and three. Two IES randomized trials of intensive content PD (Garet et al. 2016; Jacob, Hill and Corey 2017) raised teacher knowledge but did not raise student achievement. Coaching is expensive (one coach per 10 to 20 teachers) and scaling dilutes coach quality. Studies are mostly elementary literacy and math with short follow-up.

Standard. District professional development shall be organized around sustained, content-specific coaching cycles for teachers in their first three years and for any teacher rated below effective, with coach caseloads of no more than 20 teachers, and the district shall report coaching dosage and teacher growth annually.

1. The policy organizes district professional development around sustained, content-specific coaching cycles for teachers. CORE
2. The policy provides coaching cycles to teachers in their first three years.
3. The policy provides coaching cycles to any teacher rated below effective.
4. The policy caps coach caseloads at no more than 20 teachers.
5. The policy requires the district to report coaching dosage and teacher growth annually.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall employ instructional coaches at a ratio of no more than one coach to 20 teachers served, and every teacher in the first three years of service and every teacher rated below effective on the most recent evaluation shall receive at least eight coaching cycles per year, each consisting of a classroom observation, a written feedback conference within five school days, and a follow-up observation. Coaches shall hold no evaluative role and shall not share observation notes with evaluators. Coaches shall log each cycle in the district professional development system. No more than 25 percent of district-provided professional development hours in any year shall be delivered as single-session workshops without classroom follow-up. The Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year: coaching cycles completed per teacher by school, coach caseloads, the share

> of professional development hours delivered as coaching, change in observed instructional practice scores of coached teachers, and student growth of coached teachers compared with uncoached teachers. The Board shall review coaching staffing against that report before adopting the following year's budget.

Indicator. Share of professional development hours delivered as job-embedded coaching cycles (observation, feedback, modeling) versus one-day workshops (PD calendar and coach logs); coach caseload (teachers per full-time coach); number of coaching cycles completed per teacher per year; observed instructional practice scores before and after coaching; student growth of coached teachers versus comparable uncoached teachers; teacher survey ratings of PD usefulness.

Red flags in real manuals. professional development defined as a required number of workshop or in-service hours; coaches assigned administrative or evaluative duties; coach caseloads above 30 teachers or coaches split across many schools; no coaching for new teachers; PD plan listing vendor sessions with no classroom follow-up; no reporting on PD outcomes; coaching offered only to teachers on improvement plans

Law. ESSA Section 8101(42) defines professional development as sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven and classroom-focused, and excludes one-day or short-term workshops; Title II-A funds must meet that definition. Most states set required in-service hours for license renewal (for example 150 clock hours per five years in Texas, 120 points per five years in Florida) but few specify format. Some states fund coaching directly, such as Mississippi's literacy coaches under the Literacy-Based Promotion Act.

How to implement it. Owner: Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning

First 90 days

1. The Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning inventories every current full-time instructional coach and every teacher in the first three years of service or rated below effective on the most recent evaluation, and calculates the current coach-to-teacher ratio by school against the 1 to 20 standard.
2. The Human Resources director and the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning draft a coach job description that bars any evaluative role and prohibits sharing observation notes with evaluators, and the Superintendent issues it to all principals and coaches.
3. The professional development director tags every entry on the current year's PD calendar as a coaching cycle or a single-session workshop and reports to the Superintendent the share of hours in each category against the 25 percent workshop cap.
4. The technology director adds a coaching cycle log to the district professional development system that records the observation date, the feedback conference date, and the follow-up observation date for each teacher.
5. The Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning assigns each eligible teacher to a named coach and sets a schedule that delivers eight cycles per teacher by the end of the school year, with each written feedback conference due within five school days of observation.

Year one

1. The Superintendent fills any coach vacancies needed to bring every school to a caseload of no more than 20 teachers per full-time coach, and brings a staffing request to the Board if the budget does not cover it.
2. Coaches complete and log at least eight cycles for every teacher in the first three years of service and every teacher rated below effective, and principals verify the logs each quarter.
3. The professional development director restructures the following year's PD calendar so that no more than 25 percent of district-provided hours are single-session workshops without classroom follow-up, and documents how Title II-A spending meets the ESSA Section 8101(42) definition of professional development.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning delivers the first annual report to the Board by September 30 covering cycles completed per teacher by school, coach caseloads, coaching share of PD hours, change in observed practice scores of coached teachers, and student growth of coached versus uncoached teachers.

Ongoing

1. The Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning reports to the Board by September 30 every year, and the Board reviews coaching staffing against that report before adopting the following year's budget.
2. The research or assessment office matches coached teachers with comparable uncoached teachers each year and reports the student growth comparison, and surveys teachers on PD usefulness.
3. Principals and the Human Resources director confirm annually that no coach holds an evaluative role and that observation notes have not been shared with evaluators.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of eligible teachers (first three years of service or rated below effective) receiving at least eight logged coaching cycles per year, coach caseload per full-time coach, share of PD hours delivered as single-session workshops, change in observed instructional practice scores of coached teachers, and student growth of coached teachers versus comparable uncoached teachers.
BASELINE	Current coaching cycles per eligible teacher, current coach-to-teacher ratio, current workshop share of PD hours, and current observed practice scores, all drawn from the 90-day inventory and PD calendar audit.
TARGET	**By the end of year one, every eligible teacher has eight logged cycles, no full-time coach serves more than 20 teachers, and single-session workshops are no more than 25 percent of district PD hours; by the end of year two, observed instructional practice scores of coached teachers rise over their pre-coaching scores and student growth of coached teachers is at or above that of comparable uncoached teachers, with both measures improving year over year.**
BENCHMARK	Meta-analysis of 60 causal studies: coaching raises instructional practice by 0.49 SD and student achievement by 0.18 SD (0.34 SD and 0.10 SD in programs over 100

	teachers); content-focused workshops without coaching show no achievement effect in IES randomized trials; STEM PD paired with curriculum materials shows 0.21 SD. The entry gives no numeric benchmark for the district-level indicators beyond the 1 to 20 caseload, eight cycles, five school days, and 25 percent workshop cap in the clause.
REPORTED	Annual report from the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning to the Board by September 30, disaggregated by school, reviewed by the Board before adoption of the following year's budget.

– 52. New teacher induction and mentoring TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. The one large randomized trial (Glazerman et al. 2010, 1,009 teachers in 17 districts) found that two years of comprehensive induction raised student achievement in the teachers' third year (+4 percentile points reading, +8 math; about 0.11 and 0.20 SD) but one year did not, and neither version changed retention. Nationally representative surveys and a field experiment on structured peer pairing find that first-year mentoring, common planning time and collaboration predict lower attrition and that pairing low-performing teachers with high-performing colleagues raised their students' achievement by about 0.12 SD. (Two-year comprehensive induction: +0.11 SD reading, +0.20 SD math in year 3 (RCT); retention: null in RCT, lower turnover in survey studies (comprehensive package associated with roughly half the turnover of no support). Structured peer mentoring: +0.12 SD student achievement for low-performing teachers (field experiment).) 557,558,559,560,561,562,563,564

Where the evidence is mixed. The IES randomized trial found no effect on retention after one, two or three years and no effect on observed classroom practice; its achievement effect appeared only for the two-year treatment and only in year three, and a reanalysis has questioned it. One-year induction produced nothing. Rockoff (2008) found that New York City's mentoring program had limited effects on retention except when the mentor had worked in the same school, though more mentoring hours were associated with higher achievement. The retention findings of Smith and Ingersoll (2004) and Ronfeldt and McQueen (2017) are correlational; teachers who receive more support may be in better-run schools. Induction that consists of an assigned mentor with no release time, no training and no common planning is the common form and has no evidence behind it.

Standard. Every teacher in the first two years of service shall receive a trained mentor in the same subject or grade band with scheduled release time, weekly contact in year one, common planning time, and structured observation with feedback; the district shall track retention and mentor contact and report both annually.

1. The policy guarantees every teacher in the first two years of service a trained mentor in the same subject or grade band. CORE
2. The policy provides scheduled release time for mentoring.
3. The policy requires weekly mentor contact during the teacher's first year.
4. The policy provides common planning time for mentored teachers.
5. The policy requires structured observation with feedback for mentored teachers.
6. The policy requires the district to track retention and mentor contact and report both annually.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall operate a two-year induction program for every teacher new to the profession and a one-year program for every teacher new to the district. Each inductee shall be assigned, before the first student day, a mentor who holds certification in the same subject or grade band, has at least three years of effective ratings, and has completed district mentor training of no fewer than 15 hours. Mentors shall receive a stipend and at least two release periods per month for observation and feedback; principals shall schedule common planning time for each inductee and mentor at least weekly in year one and twice monthly in year two. Mentors shall log contact hours monthly in the district system. The Director of Human Resources shall report to the Board by October 31 of each year the one-year, three-year and five-year

> retention of new hires by school and by induction participation, mean mentor contact hours per inductee, the share of inductees assigned a same-subject mentor, and results of the annual inductee survey. The Board shall review program funding against that report at its November meeting.

Indicator. One-year, three-year and five-year retention of new hires in the district and in the school (HR records), compared by induction participation and by school poverty; share of first-year and second-year teachers with an assigned trained mentor in the same subject or grade; mentor contact hours logged per new teacher per month; new teacher survey on induction quality; student growth of teachers in years 1 to 3.

Red flags in real manuals. mentor assigned 'when available' or 'as resources permit'; induction limited to a one-day orientation; no release time or stipend for mentors; mentor not required to share subject or grade; induction lasts one year only for teachers new to the profession; no retention reporting; mentor doubles as evaluator

Law. More than half of states require some form of induction or mentoring for new teachers, often tied to the move from a probationary or initial license to a professional license (for example California's two-year Teacher Induction Program for a clear credential, Connecticut's TEAM program, New York's required mentored experience for professional certification, Texas Education Code 21.458 mentoring program with state funding). ESSA Title II-A funds may be used for induction and mentoring. Requirements rarely specify mentor training, release time or same-subject matching.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Human Resources, with the Superintendent accountable to the Board

First 90 days

1. The Director of Human Resources inventories every teacher new to the profession and every teacher new to the district and confirms each has an assigned mentor who holds certification in the same subject or grade band and has at least three years of effective ratings.
2. The Superintendent designates a program coordinator who delivers the district mentor training of no fewer than 15 hours to every assigned mentor before or within the first 30 days of the student year.
3. Each principal places weekly common planning time for every year-one inductee and mentor pair, and twice-monthly time for every year-two pair, on the master schedule.
4. The Director of Human Resources opens the monthly mentor contact log in the district system and sets the mentor stipend and the two release periods per month in each mentor's assignment.
5. The Director of Human Resources pulls baseline one-year, three-year and five-year retention of new hires by school from HR records so the first October 31 report has a comparison point.

Year one

1. The program coordinator reviews the mentor contact log each month and notifies the principal and the Director of Human Resources of any inductee whose mentor has logged no contact in 30 days.

2. The Director of Human Resources administers the annual inductee survey on induction quality in the spring and tabulates results by school.
3. The Director of Human Resources reports to the Board by October 31 the retention of new hires by school and by induction participation, mean mentor contact hours per inductee, the share of inductees with a same-subject mentor, and the survey results.
4. The Board reviews program funding against that report at its November meeting and the Superintendent identifies ESSA Title II-A funds available to sustain stipends and release time.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Human Resources repeats the October 31 report each year with retention compared by school poverty and adds student growth of teachers in years 1 to 3 as data become available.
2. The Superintendent confirms each August, before the first student day, that every inductee has an assigned trained mentor in the same subject or grade band.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of first-year and second-year teachers assigned a trained same-subject or same-grade-band mentor before the first student day; mean mentor contact hours per inductee per month; one-year, three-year and five-year retention of new hires by school and by induction participation
BASELINE	Retention of new hires and mentor assignment rates as recorded in HR records for the school year before the policy takes effect; the entry gives no district baseline, so the first October 31 report establishes it
TARGET	**Within 1 year, every inductee has an assigned trained mentor before the first student day and every year-one mentor pair logs weekly contact; within 3 years, one-year and three-year retention of new hires who completed induction is higher than the pre-policy baseline and no lower than for new hires who did not participate**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric retention benchmark: the randomized trial (Glazerman et al. 2010) found no retention effect, while survey studies associate a comprehensive package with roughly half the turnover of no support; two-year comprehensive induction raised year-3 student achievement by about 0.11 SD reading and 0.20 SD math, and structured peer mentoring raised achievement by about 0.12 SD for low-performing teachers
REPORTED	Director of Human Resources to the Board by October 31 each year, with Board review of program funding at the November meeting

– 53. Teacher evaluation and feedback TIER B STAKES 2/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Well-run evaluation with trained observers and substantive feedback can improve teaching: Cincinnati teachers' students gained about 0.1 SD in math in the years after a rigorous peer evaluation, and Washington DC's IMPACT raised the performance of low-rated teachers by 0.27 SD and pushed the lowest performers out, with their replacements raising achievement. But the 2010s wave of state evaluation reforms, taken as a whole, produced precisely estimated null effects on achievement and attainment, rated fewer than 1 percent of teachers below proficient, and reduced the supply of new teachers. (Cincinnati peer evaluation: +0.11 SD math in years after evaluation. DC IMPACT: +0.27 SD teacher performance for low-rated teachers facing dismissal threat; turnover of low performers raised student achievement by 0.08 to 0.14 SD. Statewide reforms 2009 to 2017: null, ruling out effects as small as 0.015 SD on achievement and 1 percentage point on graduation or college enrollment.) [565,566,567,568,569,570,571,572,573,574,575]

Where the evidence is mixed. Bleiberg et al. (2025) find the 44-state evaluation reform wave had no average effect on achievement, graduation or college enrollment regardless of design rigor. Kraft and Gilmour (2017) found that under the new systems fewer than 1 percent of teachers were rated below proficient in most states, little different from the systems they replaced. The 575 million dollar Gates Intensive Partnerships produced no gains in achievement, graduation or access to effective teachers (Stecher et al. 2018). Kraft et al. (2020) show the reforms reduced the number of new teacher candidates without improving their quality. The IES feedback trial (Garet et al. 2017) improved one observation measure but not reading, and math gains were not sustained in year two. Steinberg and Sartain (2015) found Chicago's Danielson pilot raised reading only in higher-achieving, lower-poverty schools. Phipps and Wiseman (2021) show teachers raise their practice during scheduled observation windows, so observation scores partly measure performance for the observer. Positive effects came from a few high-capacity districts with trained observers, real consequences and compensating pay, not from rubrics alone.

Standard. Evaluation shall rest on multiple trained and calibrated observers, at least two observations per year with at least one unannounced, written feedback within five school days, and a growth plan with coaching for any teacher rated below effective; the district shall publish rating distributions and evaluator calibration results annually and shall not use a single test-based measure as more than one third of a rating.

1. The policy requires at least two observations per year by multiple trained and calibrated observers, with at least one unannounced. CORE
2. The policy requires written feedback to the teacher within five school days of an observation.
3. The policy requires a growth plan with coaching for any teacher rated below effective.
4. The policy requires the district to publish rating distributions and evaluator calibration results annually.
5. The policy limits any single test-based measure to no more than one third of a teacher's rating.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall maintain a teacher evaluation system under which every teacher is observed at least twice each year, at least once unannounced, by an evaluator who has completed district observer training and passed an annual calibration exercise against master-scored videos; evaluators who fail calibration shall not conduct observations until recertified. Each observation shall be followed by a

> written feedback conference within five school days. No single measure, including any test-based growth measure, shall account for more than one third of a summative rating. A teacher rated below effective shall receive a written growth plan within 20 school days and at least eight instructional coaching cycles during the following year from a coach who is not the evaluator. The Director of Human Resources shall report to the Board by August 31 of each year: the distribution of summative ratings by school and evaluator, evaluator calibration results, the number of observations per teacher and the share unannounced, median days from observation to feedback, the correlation between ratings and student growth, and retention by rating level. The Board shall review the system's reliability against that report every year and shall commission an external review every five years.

Indicator. Distribution of summative ratings by school and by evaluator (share below proficient, share at each level); inter-rater agreement on calibration exercises; number of observations per teacher per year and share unannounced; days from observation to written feedback; share of teachers with a written growth plan tied to the evaluation; retention of teachers by rating level; student growth by rating level (does the rating predict growth); teacher survey on feedback usefulness.

Red flags in real manuals. evaluation consisting of a single announced observation per year; no observer training or calibration requirement; no timeline for written feedback; tenured teachers evaluated only every three or more years with no interim feedback; student test scores set at 50 percent or more of the rating; no growth plan or support attached to a low rating; no reporting of rating distributions

Law. Race to the Top (2009) and ESEA flexibility waivers (2011 to 2015) drove 44 states and DC to require evaluations that include student growth; ESSA (2015) removed the federal requirement and many states have since loosened test-score weights (for example New York's 2019 repeal of mandatory state test use, Tennessee and Florida reductions). Most states still set minimum observation counts, rating categories and the link between ratings and tenure or dismissal (for example Texas T-TESS, Tennessee TEAM, Florida Statute 1012.34, Illinois PERA). Collective bargaining agreements often govern observation notice and feedback timelines.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Human Resources, with the Superintendent accountable to the Board

First 90 days

1. The Director of Human Resources inventories the current evaluation system against the clause, listing observer training status, observation counts, feedback timelines, rating weights, and any collective bargaining terms governing notice and feedback.
2. The Superintendent names an evaluation lead and selects or builds a master-scored video library for the annual evaluator calibration exercise.
3. The Director of Human Resources drafts the observer training curriculum and the calibration pass standard, and brings both to the Board for review within 90 days.
4. The Superintendent confirms with counsel that the one third cap on any single measure and the observation minimums comply with state evaluation law and the current bargaining agreement.

5. The Director of Human Resources builds the data fields needed for the August 31 report: ratings by school and evaluator, calibration results, observation counts, days to feedback, growth correlation, and retention by rating.

Year one

1. The Director of Human Resources trains every evaluator before the first observation window and runs the first calibration exercise; any evaluator who fails is removed from observations until recertified.
2. Principals complete at least two observations per teacher, at least one unannounced, with a written feedback conference within five school days of each.
3. The Superintendent assigns a coach who is not the evaluator to every teacher rated below effective, with a written growth plan within 20 school days and at least eight coaching cycles scheduled for the following year.
4. The Director of Human Resources delivers the first full report to the Board by August 31 and the Board reviews system reliability at a public meeting.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Human Resources recalibrates every evaluator annually and reports rating distributions, calibration results, and observation compliance to the Board by August 31 each year.
2. The Board reviews the reliability of the system against the annual report every year and commissions an external review every five years.
3. The Director of Human Resources surveys teachers each year on the usefulness of feedback and reports results alongside retention by rating level.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of teachers who received at least two observations with at least one unannounced, median days from observation to written feedback, share of evaluators passing calibration, share of below-effective teachers with a growth plan within 20 school days, distribution of summative ratings by school and evaluator, and correlation between ratings and student growth
BASELINE	The district's current observation counts, feedback timelines, rating distribution, and evaluator calibration status as recorded in the first 90 day inventory; the entry notes that statewide reforms rated fewer than 1 percent of teachers below proficient, so a rating distribution with nearly all teachers at or above proficient signals a system that is not discriminating
TARGET	**Within 1 year every teacher has at least two observations with at least one unannounced, median days to written feedback is five school days or fewer, every evaluator conducting observations has passed the annual calibration exercise, every teacher rated below effective has a written growth plan within 20 school days and eight coaching cycles the following year, and no single measure exceeds one third of any rating; within 3 years ratings show a positive correlation with**

	student growth and the share rated below proficient exceeds the under 1 percent pattern of the statewide reforms
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric target for the district's own outcomes. Evidence benchmarks: Cincinnati peer evaluation was followed by +0.11 SD in math; DC IMPACT raised low-rated teacher performance by 0.27 SD and low-performer turnover raised achievement by 0.08 to 0.14 SD; statewide reforms produced null effects, ruling out effects as small as 0.015 SD on achievement and 1 percentage point on graduation or college enrollment, and rated fewer than 1 percent of teachers below proficient
REPORTED	Annual report from the Director of Human Resources to the Board by August 31, covering ratings by school and evaluator, calibration results, observations per teacher and share unannounced, median days to feedback, rating to growth correlation, and retention by rating level; Board reliability review each year and an external review every five years

Technology and data

– 54. Generative AI use by students and staff TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Design determines the effect. In a field RCT with nearly 1,000 high-school math students, unrestricted GPT-4 access raised practice scores (+48%) but cut unaided exam scores by 17% relative to no access; a version with guardrails that withheld answers removed the harm. A college physics RCT found a purpose-built AI tutor produced about double the learning gain of active-learning classes in less time, and an essay-writing RCT found gains persisted a week later only when students used the model as a tutor rather than to write for them. The K-12 evidence base is still one school, one subject and a few weeks. (unrestricted chatbot: -17% on unaided exam; guardrailed tutor: harm removed; purpose-built tutor (college): about 2x learning gain; effects persist only for tutor-style use) [576,577,578,579,580,581]

Where the evidence is mixed. Only one K-12 RCT exists (Bastani et al., one Turkish high school, four sessions covering 15% of the curriculum), and the positive tutor results come from Harvard undergraduates and Middlebury undergraduates, not children. The most-cited 2025 meta-analysis reporting large positive effects of ChatGPT on learning was retracted in April 2026, so there is no reliable pooled estimate. Lehmann, Cornelius and Sting (working paper) find harm concentrated in answer-generation use and no gain from explanation use, a pattern consistent with the RCTs but not peer reviewed. Detection tools are unreliable and produce false accusations; student-facing products carry data-privacy and age-limit (13+) constraints; teacher-facing uses (lesson planning, feedback) have essentially no outcome research. Policies that ban AI outright push use off campus where no guardrails exist, while policies that mandate adoption buy unproven products.

Standard. The district shall maintain a published list of approved AI tools, each with a stated instructional purpose, a guardrail configuration that withholds direct answers during practice, a data-privacy review and an age gate, shall require every course to state in writing when and how students may use AI, shall prohibit discipline based solely on detection software, and shall report usage and unaided-assessment results to the board annually.

1. The policy requires a published list of approved AI tools, each configured to withhold direct answers during student practice. CORE
2. The policy requires each approved AI tool to have a stated instructional purpose, a data-privacy review and an age gate.
3. The policy requires every course to state in writing when and how students may use AI.
4. The policy prohibits discipline based solely on AI detection software.
5. The policy requires annual reporting of AI usage and unaided-assessment results to the board.

> **Policy.** The Superintendent shall maintain and publish a list of generative AI tools approved for student use and for staff use. No AI tool shall be placed on the list until the Chief Academic Officer and the Director of Technology certify in writing that (a) the tool serves a named instructional purpose, (b) for student practice and homework use the tool is configured to withhold direct answers and to prompt student reasoning, (c) the vendor contract meets the district's student data privacy policy, including no use of student inputs for model training, and (d) the tool is not used by students under the

> vendor's stated minimum age. Each teacher shall state in the course syllabus, by the tenth instructional day, when and how students may use AI tools for each category of assignment. No student shall be disciplined for AI use on the basis of detection software alone; a finding shall rest on the teacher's review of drafts, process evidence or an oral check. Staff shall not enter personally identifiable student information into any tool that is not on the approved list. The Chief Academic Officer shall report to the Board by October 1 each year the approved-tool list, usage by tool, unaided assessment results in courses using each tool against matched courses, and the number of AI-related integrity cases and their outcomes. The Board shall review this policy annually in light of new evidence.

Indicator. Inventory of approved AI tools with the guardrail configuration of each (answer-withholding on or off); share of courses with a written AI-use expectation on the syllabus; unaided assessment results in courses using AI tools versus matched courses; count of academic-integrity cases involving AI and how many were overturned.

Red flags in real manuals. all use of artificial intelligence by students is prohibited; AI detection scores are sufficient evidence of plagiarism; teachers may adopt any AI tool at their discretion; no minimum age or vendor-terms check for student accounts; student work or data may be used to train or improve vendor models; no requirement that tools withhold answers during practice; no annual review date despite the pace of change

Law. Executive Order 14277 (April 23, 2025) on AI education and the July 22, 2025 Department of Education Dear Colleague letter govern use of federal funds; by the end of 2025 roughly 34 state education agencies had issued K-12 AI guidance (counts vary by source), most of it non-binding. COPPA bars most consumer AI accounts for children under 13 without parental consent, and vendor terms often set 13 or 18 as the minimum age. FERPA applies to any student record entered into an AI tool. Several states (for example Tennessee SB 1711, 2024) require districts to adopt an AI use policy.

How to implement it. Owner: Chief Academic Officer, with the Director of Technology as co-owner for tool certification

First 90 days

1. The Chief Academic Officer and the Director of Technology inventory every generative AI tool currently in use by students or staff and record for each whether answer-withholding is on or off, the vendor minimum age, and whether the contract bars training on student inputs.
2. The Director of Technology drafts the written certification form covering the four conditions in the clause (named instructional purpose, answer-withholding configuration for practice and homework, data-privacy compliance including no training on student inputs, and age gate) and the Superintendent adopts it within 60 days.
3. The Superintendent publishes the first approved-tool list, limited to tools that pass certification, and notifies staff that personally identifiable student information may not be entered into any tool not on the list.

4. The Chief Academic Officer issues a syllabus template with an AI-use expectations section by assignment category and instructs principals that every course must include it by the tenth instructional day.
5. The Chief Academic Officer issues written guidance to principals that no academic-integrity finding may rest on detection software alone and that each finding must cite draft review, process evidence or an oral check.

Year one

1. Principals verify that every course syllabus in their building states when and how students may use AI tools and report the share of compliant courses to the Chief Academic Officer by the end of the first semester.
2. The Director of Technology pulls usage logs by tool and the Chief Academic Officer pairs each course using an approved tool with a matched course not using it so that unaided assessment results can be compared.
3. The Chief Academic Officer collects from each principal the count of AI-related academic-integrity cases, the evidence basis for each, and how many were overturned.
4. The Chief Academic Officer delivers the first annual report to the Board by October 1 covering the approved-tool list, usage by tool, unaided assessment comparisons and integrity-case outcomes.

Ongoing

1. The Chief Academic Officer and the Director of Technology re-certify every tool on the approved list each year and remove any whose guardrail configuration, privacy terms or age gate no longer meet the clause.
2. The Board reviews the policy annually after the October 1 report in light of new evidence, given that the K-12 evidence base is still one school, one subject and a few weeks.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Unaided assessment results in courses using each approved AI tool versus matched courses, together with the share of approved tools configured to withhold direct answers, the share of courses with a written AI-use expectation on the syllabus, and the number of AI-related integrity cases overturned.
BASELINE	First-year inventory of tools in use and their guardrail configuration, first-semester syllabus compliance count, and the first October 1 report's unaided assessment comparison and integrity-case tally.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, every tool on the approved list has answer-withholding on for student practice use, every course states an AI-use expectation by the tenth instructional day, and unaided assessment results in courses using approved tools are no lower than in matched courses, with no integrity finding resting on detection software alone; sustained in years 2 and 3.**
BENCHMARK	The field RCT found unrestricted GPT-4 access cut unaided exam scores by 17 percent relative to no access while a guardrailed version that withheld answers

	removed the harm, so the district benchmark is no unaided-assessment deficit in courses using approved tools. The entry gives no numeric benchmark for syllabus compliance or integrity-case rates; those targets are directional.
REPORTED	Chief Academic Officer reports to the Board by October 1 each year; the Board records whether the no-deficit condition was met for each tool and whether any tool was removed from the list as a result.

– 55. One-to-one devices and educational software TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Giving every student a device does not by itself raise achievement: the large randomized One Laptop per Child trial and the Swedish 1:1 rollout found no effect on test scores, and the Swedish study found losses for children of less-educated parents. Gains appear only where the device carries targeted software (computer-assisted learning, especially in math) and teachers get sustained support; the one positive US district study (Mooresville) found no short-run effect and +0.13 SD in math after several years alongside changed teaching practice. (access alone: about 0; targeted computer-assisted learning in math: positive; well-supported district program: +0.13 SD math after 4 to 5 years) [582,583,584,585,586]

Where the evidence is mixed. The 2016 meta-analysis (Zheng et al.) reports positive average effects in English, writing, math and science, but it pools only 10 mostly non-randomized studies and the authors attribute gains to programs that supported teachers as well as students. Causal studies disagree on direction: Cristia et al. (Peru RCT, 318 schools) found nothing on math or language; Hall, Lundin and Sibbmark (Sweden) found no average effect and worse math outcomes and less college-preparatory enrollment for students with less-educated parents; Hull and Duch found gains, but neighboring districts without laptops improved at similar rates and the study cannot isolate which component mattered. Escueta et al. find that fully online courses underperform in-person ones. Device programs also carry recurring cost, screen-time and data-privacy trade-offs that the achievement literature does not price.

Standard. The district shall not purchase or renew a 1:1 device program or instructional software above a set dollar threshold without a written evidence review, a named instructional purpose, a teacher training plan and a usage-and-outcome report to the board each year, and shall retire products whose usage or results do not meet the stated purpose.

1. The policy prohibits purchasing or renewing a 1:1 device program or instructional software above a set dollar threshold without a written evidence review. CORE
2. The policy requires a named instructional purpose for each device program or instructional software purchase or renewal above the threshold.
3. The policy requires a teacher training plan for each device program or instructional software purchase or renewal above the threshold.
4. The policy requires a usage-and-outcome report to the board each year for each covered device program or instructional software.
5. The policy requires retiring products whose usage or results do not meet the stated instructional purpose.

> **Policy.** Before the district purchases or renews any student device program or any instructional software license with an annual cost above $25,000, the Chief Academic Officer shall present to the Board a written review stating (a) the instructional purpose and the grades and subjects served, (b) the best available evidence of effect on student outcomes, with citations, (c) the teacher training and technical support to be provided, and (d) the usage and outcome measures that will decide renewal. The Director of Technology shall report to the Board by February 1 and August 1 each year, for every licensed product, the share of licensed students active in the prior semester, median minutes of use per active student, and total cost per active student. The Chief Academic

> Officer shall report by October 1 each year the achievement of exposed cohorts against the pre-adoption baseline, disaggregated by subgroup. Any product with fewer than 50 percent of licensed students active in two consecutive semesters shall not be renewed without a Board vote. Devices shall be configured so that instructional use, not device possession, is the measured outcome.

Indicator. For each device program and each licensed software product: an evidence summary on file before purchase; per-product usage data (share of licensed students active weekly, minutes per student) reported each semester; achievement trend by subgroup for the cohorts exposed versus the pre-adoption baseline on state assessments.

Red flags in real manuals. every student will be issued a device, with no stated instructional purpose or evaluation; software adoptions are approved by the technology department without board or academic review; no usage reporting or renewal criteria; device program funded as a one-time purchase with no refresh or support budget; screen time during the instructional day is unlimited or unmentioned; no data-privacy review tied to each product

Law. ESSA Section 8101(21) defines evidence tiers and federal Title funds used for technology require an evidence basis; E-rate and state device grants carry CIPA filtering obligations; state student-privacy laws (see student-data-privacy) govern each software contract.

How to implement it. Owner: Chief Academic Officer, with the Director of Technology responsible for usage and cost reporting

First 90 days

1. The Chief Academic Officer compiles an inventory of every current student device program and instructional software license with annual cost above $25,000, listing instructional purpose, grades and subjects served, renewal date and the training already provided.
2. The Director of Technology configures each licensed product and device fleet to log per-student weekly activity and minutes of use so that instructional use, not device possession, can be reported.
3. The Chief Academic Officer drafts the written evidence review template covering instructional purpose, best available evidence with citations, teacher training and support plan, and the usage and outcome measures that will decide renewal, and the Board adopts it.
4. The Superintendent sets the pre-adoption state assessment baseline, disaggregated by subgroup, for each cohort already exposed to an existing product so later trend reports have a fixed reference point.
5. The Director of Technology confirms with district counsel that each software contract meets state student-privacy law and CIPA filtering obligations tied to E-rate and state device grants.

Year one

1. The Director of Technology delivers the first usage and cost report to the Board by February 1 and again by August 1, stating for every licensed product the share of licensed students active in the prior semester, median minutes per active student and total cost per active student.

2. The Chief Academic Officer presents a completed written evidence review to the Board before any purchase or renewal above $25,000, citing ESSA Section 8101(21) evidence tiers where federal Title funds are used.
3. The Chief Academic Officer delivers the first achievement report by October 1 comparing exposed cohorts against the pre-adoption baseline on state assessments, disaggregated by subgroup.
4. The Chief Academic Officer flags to the Board any product below 50 percent of licensed students active in a semester and schedules the teacher training and support promised in its evidence review.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Technology reports usage and cost per product to the Board each February 1 and August 1, and any product below 50 percent active in two consecutive semesters goes to a Board vote before renewal.
2. The Chief Academic Officer reports subgroup achievement trends for exposed cohorts against baseline each October 1 and recommends retirement of products that do not meet their stated purpose.
3. The Board reviews the $25,000 threshold and the evidence review template every 1 to 3 years and adjusts them as the product inventory changes.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of licensed products above the $25,000 threshold that have a written evidence review on file before purchase or renewal, share of licensed students active weekly per product, and achievement of exposed cohorts versus the pre-adoption baseline by subgroup on state assessments.
BASELINE	Current inventory of device programs and software licenses, with per-product usage and pre-adoption state assessment results by subgroup, as compiled in the first 90 days.
TARGET	**Within year one, 100 percent of purchases and renewals above $25,000 have an evidence review on file before the Board vote; every licensed product reaches at least 50 percent of licensed students active each semester or is brought to a Board vote; by the third October 1 report, no exposed subgroup trends below its pre-adoption baseline and math achievement for exposed cohorts is moving upward.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives no numeric benchmark for access alone, which showed about zero effect; the only positive district figure is +0.13 SD in math after 4 to 5 years in a well-supported program with changed teaching practice, so that is the outer reference, not a year-one target.

REPORTED	Director of Technology to the Board each February 1 and August 1 on usage and cost per product; Chief Academic Officer to the Board each October 1 on achievement by subgroup against baseline, with both reports posted publicly.

– 56. Personal phones during the school day TIER B STAKES 3/5

Tier B: one strong causal study or consistent quasi-experiments

Finding. Banning phone possession during the school day raises test scores modestly, with the gain concentrated among lower-achieving students (England: +0.07 SD overall, about +0.14 SD for the lowest quintile). Norway's middle-school bans cut bullying for both sexes and improved girls' grades, academic-track placement and mental-health care use, with no average effect on boys; the pooled effect across five European studies is small (d = 0.16) and larger for social wellbeing than for achievement. (+0.07 SD test scores (England), +0.14 SD for low achievers; Norway girls' GPA up and bullying down; pooled d = 0.16; mental-health effects unproven) [587,588,589,590,591,592,593,594]

Where the evidence is mixed. Sweden found no effect of use bans on achievement (Kessel et al. 2020), and the difference between banning possession and banning use may explain the split. The largest UK study (SMART Schools, 30 schools, 1,227 pupils) found restrictive school policies reduced in-school phone time but were not associated with better wellbeing, sleep, or attainment, because total daily phone use was unchanged; it is cross-sectional and cannot establish causation either way. Early US evidence (NSCH 2016 to 2024, three ban states, synthetic DiD) shows no clear change in screen time or wellbeing but is underpowered. The Dutch national evaluation is school-leader self-report, not outcome data. Bans impose real costs for students with medical or accessibility needs and for families who rely on reachability, so exceptions and a communication path matter.

Standard. Students shall keep personal phones and smartwatches powered off and stored away from their person from the first bell to the last bell, with written exceptions limited to documented medical, IEP or Section 504 needs and teacher-directed instructional use, and the district shall report compliance and referral data to the board annually.

1. The policy requires students to keep personal phones powered off and stored away from their person from the first bell to the last bell. CORE
2. The policy applies the same powered-off and stored-away requirement to smartwatches.
3. The policy allows written exceptions for documented medical, IEP or Section 504 needs.
4. The policy allows teacher-directed instructional use as an exception.
5. The policy limits exceptions to those documented needs and teacher-directed instructional use and no others.
6. The policy requires the district to report compliance and referral data to the board annually.

> **Policy.** Personal electronic devices, including phones, smartwatches and earbuds, shall be powered off and stored in a location designated by the principal, away from the student, from the start of the first scheduled period through the end of the last scheduled period, including passing time and lunch. Exceptions shall be granted only (a) where required by a student's IEP, Section 504 plan or a written medical order on file with the school nurse, or (b) for a specific lesson at the written direction of the teacher. Each school shall provide a telephone through which a parent or guardian can reach a student during the day. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 1 each year the number of device violations by school and grade, the number of exemptions on file, and the results of a fall classroom walkthrough sample. Violations shall be handled

> under the progressive discipline matrix and shall not result in exclusion from instruction for a first or second offense.

Indicator. Share of classrooms observed with phones stored (walkthrough sample each semester); device-violation referrals per 100 students; student survey item on in-class distraction; achievement trend for the lowest-achieving quartile versus the district average (state assessment).

Red flags in real manuals. phones may be used during passing time, lunch or free periods; use is at the discretion of each teacher; a student may keep the phone on silent in a pocket or backpack; confiscated devices will be returned only to a parent, with no stated timeline; suspension for a first device violation; no exception language for IEP, 504 or medical needs; no way stated for a parent to reach a student during the day

Law. As of August 2025 about 35 US states had laws or state board rules restricting student phone use, and roughly 18 states plus DC required bell-to-bell restrictions (several, such as Georgia and Florida, only through grade 8); counts move each session, so check the state statute. Federal law (IDEA, Section 504, ADA) requires exceptions for devices that are part of a documented accommodation, for example glucose monitors paired to a phone.

How to implement it. Owner: Superintendent, with the Director of Student Services as day-to-day lead and each building principal responsible for site implementation.

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent confirms with district counsel whether the state statute or state board rule requires bell-to-bell restriction and at which grades, and reports the result to the Board within 30 days.
2. Each principal designates the storage location for phones, smartwatches and earbuds, installs or identifies the parent-access telephone in the main office, and posts the procedure in the student handbook within 60 days.
3. The Director of Student Services, working with the special education director and school nurses, inventories every IEP, Section 504 plan and medical order that involves a device, such as a phone-paired glucose monitor, and places a written exemption on file for each within 60 days.
4. The Superintendent sends a plain-language notice to every family and holds at least one staff training per building on the storage procedure and the progressive discipline matrix before the policy takes effect, no later than 90 days after adoption.
5. The Director of Research or Assessment adds a device-violation code to the student information system so referrals can be counted by school and grade from the first day of enforcement.

Year one

1. The Director of Student Services conducts the fall classroom walkthrough sample at every school and records the share of classrooms observed with phones stored.
2. The Director of Research or Assessment adds an in-class distraction item to the annual student survey and reports the first result alongside device-violation referrals per 100 students.
3. The Superintendent delivers the first annual report to the Board by October 1 covering violations by school and grade, exemptions on file, and walkthrough results, and flags any school where first

or second offenses resulted in exclusion from instruction.
4. The Director of Research or Assessment establishes the baseline state assessment trend for the lowest-achieving quartile versus the district average using the most recent pre-policy year.

Ongoing

1. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 1 each year on violations, exemptions, walkthrough results, the student distraction survey item, and the lowest-quartile achievement trend.
2. District counsel reviews the state statute each legislative session and advises the Board within 30 days of any change that affects the grades or hours covered.
3. The Director of Student Services conducts a walkthrough sample each semester and reviews exemption files with the special education director and school nurses at the start of each school year.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of classrooms observed with phones stored in the semester walkthrough sample; device-violation referrals per 100 students by school and grade; student survey item on in-class distraction; and the state assessment trend for the lowest-achieving quartile compared with the district average.
BASELINE	The first semester walkthrough sample, the first full semester of referral counts, the first administration of the distraction survey item, and the most recent pre-policy state assessment results for the lowest-achieving quartile and the district average.
TARGET	**Within 1 year, the share of classrooms with phones stored rises and device-violation referrals per 100 students fall from the first semester to the second; within 1 to 3 years, the student distraction item improves and the lowest-achieving quartile's state assessment trend closes toward the district average rather than widening, with no first or second offense resulting in exclusion from instruction in any year.**
BENCHMARK	The entry gives research effects, not operational targets: England's ban raised test scores about +0.07 SD overall and about +0.14 SD for the lowest quintile, Norway's bans cut bullying and raised girls' grades, and the pooled effect across five European studies is d = 0.16, larger for social wellbeing than achievement (evidence tier B). No numeric benchmark exists for walkthrough compliance, referral rates or the survey item, so the target is directional. Mental-health effects are unproven and should not be claimed.

REPORTED	The Superintendent presents the annual report to the Board by October 1 each year, disaggregated by school and grade, and the Board reviews the lowest-quartile achievement trend at the same meeting once state assessment results are available.

– 57. Student data privacy and vendor contracts TIER D STAKES 2/5

Tier D: professional standard or expert consensus

Finding. Audits find that most school-assigned apps send student data to third parties (Internet Safety Labs: 96% of apps used in a sample of 663 US schools; Human Rights Watch: 146 of 164 government-endorsed products worldwide, 89%, engaged in practices that risked children's rights), and breaches are frequent and large (99 K-12 breaches reported to the GAO sample 2016 to 2020; the December 2024 PowerSchool breach reached tens of millions of student records). There is no outcome research showing that any particular policy reduces harm; the standard rests on federal and state law and professional consensus. (not measurable as a student outcome; harm prevention standard (96% of school apps share data with third parties absent controls)) [595,596,597,598,599]

Where the evidence is mixed. No study links district privacy policy strength to measured student harm or benefit, and the audit figures count data flows, not demonstrated injury. Strict contracting raises procurement cost and can delay useful tools; blanket bans on consumer tools push use to personal accounts that the district cannot govern. Over-collection often starts with the district itself (surveillance and monitoring software), not the vendor, and that trade-off between safety monitoring and privacy has no empirical resolution.

Standard. No product that collects student data shall be used until a signed agreement is on file that limits collection to the stated educational purpose, bars sale, advertising and model training, requires deletion on request or at contract end, and sets breach notice within 72 hours, and the district shall publish the product inventory and report compliance to the board annually.

1. The policy bars use of any product that collects student data until a signed data privacy agreement is on file. CORE
2. The policy requires the agreement to limit data collection to the stated educational purpose.
3. The policy requires the agreement to bar sale of student data, advertising, and model training.
4. The policy requires the agreement to require deletion of student data on request or at contract end.
5. The policy requires the agreement to set breach notice within 72 hours.
6. The policy requires the district to publish the product inventory and report compliance to the board annually.

> **Policy.** No employee shall use, or direct students to use, any application, website or service that collects personally identifiable student information unless the Director of Technology has first placed it on the district's approved-software list. A product shall be approved only after the Director of Technology and the district's designated Privacy Officer confirm a signed data privacy agreement that (a) limits collection to data needed for the stated educational purpose, (b) prohibits sale of data, targeted advertising, profiling and use of student data to train or improve the vendor's products, (c) requires deletion or return of all student data within 60 days of a district request or contract end, (d) requires the vendor to notify the district within 72 hours of a confirmed breach, and (e) names the subcontractors who will receive data. The Director of Technology shall publish the approved-software list, with the data elements each product collects, on the district website and update it within 30 days of any change. The Privacy Officer shall

> report to the Board by September 30 each year the number of products reviewed, approved and removed, every breach and the date families were notified, and the status of parent requests to inspect or correct records under FERPA. Teachers shall receive privacy training at least once each year; completion shall be reported with the annual report.

Indicator. Share of software products in use with a signed data privacy agreement on file (target 100%); public inventory of products and data elements collected; number of breach notifications and days to notify; annual count of vendor contracts reviewed and terminated; parent data-access requests fulfilled within the statutory window.

Red flags in real manuals. teachers may use free online tools at their discretion; no vendor agreement requirement or an agreement limited to FERPA boilerplate; student data may be shared with partners for product improvement; no breach notification timeline; no named privacy officer or responsible role; no inventory of products or data elements; directory information defined broadly with opt-out buried or absent; monitoring software collects off-campus activity with no retention limit

Law. FERPA, 20 U.S.C. 1232g and 34 CFR Part 99 (school official exception governs vendor access; annual notice and directory-information opt-out required). COPPA, 15 U.S.C. 6501-6506 and 16 CFR Part 312 (FTC amended rule published 2025; schools may consent on parents' behalf only for educational purposes, not commercial use). PPRA, 20 U.S.C. 1232h (surveys). State laws: 42 states had passed student privacy statutes by 2023, for example California SOPIPA (Bus. and Prof. Code 22584), New York Education Law 2-d and 8 NYCRR Part 121 (vendor data security and privacy plan required), Illinois SOPPA (105 ILCS 85, contract and public posting requirements), Texas SB 820 (cybersecurity framework). Check the state's contract-term requirements; several mandate specific clauses and public posting of agreements.

How to implement it. Owner: Director of Technology, with the designated Privacy Officer as co-owner for agreement review and annual reporting

First 90 days

1. The Superintendent designates a Privacy Officer in writing and the Board adopts the model clause within 30 days.
2. The Director of Technology compiles a complete inventory of every application, website and service in use that collects personally identifiable student information, with the data elements each collects, within 60 days.
3. The Privacy Officer checks every inventoried product against the five required agreement terms (purpose limit, no sale or advertising or model training, 60-day deletion, 72-hour breach notice, named subcontractors) and flags each as compliant, needs amendment, or no agreement.
4. The Director of Technology publishes the first approved-software list on the district website within 90 days and tells staff that any product not on the list may not be assigned to students.
5. The Director of Technology and Privacy Officer send amendment requests to every vendor whose agreement lacks one or more required terms, with a 90-day deadline to sign.

Year one

1. The Director of Technology removes from the approved list and blocks any product whose vendor has not signed a compliant agreement by the 90-day deadline.
2. The Privacy Officer delivers annual privacy training to all teachers and records completion for the annual report.
3. The Privacy Officer builds a breach log recording each confirmed incident, the date the vendor notified the district, and the date families were notified.
4. The Privacy Officer delivers the first annual report to the Board by September 30 covering products reviewed, approved and removed, every breach and family notice date, and the status of FERPA inspect-and-correct requests.

Ongoing

1. The Director of Technology updates the public approved-software list within 30 days of any addition, removal or change in data elements collected.
2. The Privacy Officer reports to the Board each September 30 and reviews every agreement at renewal against the five required terms and any new state contract requirements.
3. The Privacy Officer confirms each year that all teachers completed privacy training and reports completion with the annual report.

How you know it worked.

MEASURE	Share of software products in use that collect student PII with a signed data privacy agreement on file containing all five required terms, plus days from confirmed breach to family notification and share of FERPA parent requests fulfilled within the statutory window
BASELINE	Taken from the inventory completed in the first 60 days: number of products in use, and the share with a fully compliant agreement on file; audits cited in the finding suggest that absent controls most products (96% in the Internet Safety Labs sample) share data with third parties
TARGET	**100% of products in use have a compliant signed agreement by the end of year one and at every September 30 report thereafter; every confirmed breach is reported by the vendor within 72 hours; the public list is updated within 30 days of each change; 100% of teachers complete annual training**
BENCHMARK	No outcome research sets a numeric harm-reduction benchmark; the standard rests on FERPA, COPPA, PPRA and state statutes (42 states by 2023, for example New York Education Law 2-d, Illinois SOPPA, California SOPIPA), and the indicator itself sets the 100% compliance target
REPORTED	Privacy Officer presents to the Board by September 30 each year, with the public approved-software list and breach log posted on the district website

The board dashboard

One line per domain: the measure the Board watches and the target that counts as success. This is the page a district prints after adopting the manual.

DOMAIN	MEASURE	TARGET	REPORTED
Access to extracurricular activities, athletics and the arts	Share of students in each school participating in at least one school-sponsored activity, disaggregated by free-and-reduced-lunch status, race and grade, drawn from student information system activity rosters; share of waiver-eligible students who actually received a waiver; share of elementary students receiving weekly arts instruction.	**Within 1 year, 100% of free-and-reduced-lunch, foster and homeless students carry an active waiver flag and 100% of elementary schools provide 60 minutes per week each of visual art and music; within 3 years, the gap in participation rates between free-and-reduced-lunch and non-free-and-reduced-lunch students narrows each year from the baseline, with no subgroup's rate falling.**	Superintendent reports to the board by November 1 each year, in public session, with the data posted on the district website; the board's annual fee schedule review follows the report.
Access to rigorous coursework (automatic enrollment, AP, IB, dual credit)	Share of students meeting the readiness threshold who are enrolled in the corresponding advanced course the next term, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus AP, IB, and dual-credit participation and pass rates by group and opt-out counts by school.	**By the first October 15 report, every eligible student not covered by a written opt-out is enrolled in the corresponding advanced course, and by the third annual report the enrollment rate among eligible students no longer differs by race, ethnicity, or income, with advanced course completion and exam pass rates by group holding steady or rising rather than falling.**	The Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 15, published on the district website, with the eligible, enrolled, and opted-out counts and completion and exam pass rates disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, cross-checked against the state report card and College Board and IB data.
Career and technical education pathways	Share of graduates who completed a CTE program of study (two or more courses in one pathway) and earned an industry-recognized credential or 12 or more aligned college credits;	**Within 1 year every high school offers at least two qualifying programs of study and the structural elements (partner, dual-credit agreement, placement, credential preparation, fee**	Annual report to the Board by December 1 from the Director of Career and Technical Education, using Perkins V accountability data and state wage and Clearinghouse matches,

	share of concentrators with a paid work-based learning placement; concentrator graduation rate; and employment or postsecondary enrollment of the prior cohort, each by school and student group	**payment) are in place; within 3 years the share of graduates who are concentrators with a credential or 12 aligned credits, the share of concentrators with a paid placement, and the concentrator graduation rate rise above baseline in each student group, and completers of every retained program show an employment or enrollment advantage over non-completers in the prior cohort**	disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, disability status, and sex, with a close-or-redesign recommendation for any program showing no completer advantage for two consecutive years
Chronic absence response	Percent of enrolled students missing 10 percent or more of enrolled days (the state chronic absence measure in the EDFacts or state report card file), by school, grade and subgroup; the share of identified students who received a documented two-way family contact within 10 school days; and the number of truancy referrals filed, each tracked monthly and reported quarterly.	**Within 1 year every school reports the share of identified students contacted within 10 school days rising each quarter, with zero truancy referrals filed without a documented contact, plan and barrier assessment; within 1 to 3 years the chronic absence rate falls below the baseline in every school and subgroup, with a reduction in the range of 8 to 15 percent of the baseline rate consistent with the family-contact and caseworker studies.**	The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes the figures on the district website within 30 days of each report; the Board reviews the annual chronic absence rate against the baseline at the end of each school year.
District pre-kindergarten	Kindergarten entry assessment results for former district pre-K attendees versus non-attendees by subgroup, and third-grade reading proficiency, grade retention and special education	**Within 1 year, every pre-K classroom meets all five program conditions in the clause (adopted curriculum, certified lead teacher, 20 or fewer children with two adults, full day, monthly coaching). Within 1 to 3**	Superintendent reports to the Board each November 1 (enrollment, wait lists, class size, certification, kindergarten entry results by subgroup) and each August 1 (third-grade reading, retention and

	referral rates for each tracked pre-K cohort compared with the district average.	**years, former pre-K attendees score higher on the fall kindergarten entry assessment than non-attendees in every reported subgroup, and the tracked cohort shows grade retention and special education referral rates below the district average with third-grade reading proficiency at or above it, with no cohort trending worse than the district average on any of the three measures.**	special education referral for the cohort that attended four years earlier versus the district average), with results published on the district website.
Dual enrollment and early college	Share of graduates who earned at least one transferable college credit in high school and share who earned 12 or more, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus dual-credit pass rates, share of credits that transferred, early college enrollment and completion, and postsecondary enrollment of participants versus non-participants from the National Student Clearinghouse.	**Within 1 year every high school offers no-cost dual-credit courses and all eligible students receive written notice by March 1; within 3 years the share of graduates earning at least one transferable credit and the share earning 12 or more rise each year in every student group, gaps for low-income, first-generation, English learner, and disability-status students narrow, and postsecondary enrollment of dual enrollment participants exceeds that of non-participants.**	Director of College and Career Readiness to the Board by November 1 each year, posted publicly with the state report card and National Student Clearinghouse data, with the Board reviewing progress against the baseline at that meeting.
Early literacy instruction and K-3 reading screening	Share of K-3 students screened within the first 30 school days; share of flagged students beginning a documented intervention within 15 school days; percent of K-3 reading teachers and principals with completed structured-literacy training; third-grade	**Within 1 year, every K-3 student is screened within the first 30 school days and every flagged student begins a documented intervention with written parent notice within 15 school days; within 2 years of hire, every K-3 reading teacher and elementary principal**	Director of Curriculum reports to the Board each November and each June, by school and subgroup, with the third-grade state ELA results included in the June report.

	state ELA proficiency rate and subgroup gaps.	**completes the structured-literacy training; third-grade state ELA proficiency rises and subgroup gaps narrow over 1 to 3 years.**	
English learner programs and reclassification	Annual reclassification rate by years in program and program model; number and share of long-term English learners (6 or more years); ELA and math achievement of former English learners tracked for four years after reclassification; share of English learners enrolled in grade-level core courses and advanced courses; dual-language seats offered versus applicants.	**Within 180 days, zero English learners placed in a course below grade level solely on the basis of English learner status and zero reclassifications resting on a single test score; within 1 to 3 years, the share of long-term English learners (6 or more years) declines each year from baseline, the reclassification rate rises from baseline, former English learners show no decline in ELA and math achievement across the four monitored years, and every grade level with 20 or more English learners sharing a home language has a dual-language or bilingual program or a Board-reviewed reason it does not.**	The Director of Multilingual Programs reports to the Board by October 15 each year, disaggregated by school, program model, home language and years in program, and posts the report with program models and exit criteria on the district website; the Board compares each measure against the baseline year and the prior year.
Full-day kindergarten	Share of kindergarten students enrolled in a tuition-free full-day program, by building and subgroup, from the enrollment file; kindergarten daily instructional minutes compared with grade 1; end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening results by subgroup; kindergarten chronic absence rate.	**Within 1 year of adoption, every elementary attendance area offers tuition-free full-day kindergarten with daily instructional minutes equal to grade 1, every age-eligible child whose family requests it is enrolled with no waiting list, and the only half-day enrollments are those with a written family request; within 1 to 3 years, end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening results rise for every reported subgroup,**	Superintendent to the Board by October 15 each year (full-day enrollment by building and subgroup, waiting list, fall entry assessment) and by July 15 each year (end-of-year literacy and numeracy screening by subgroup, kindergarten chronic absence rate), each with the prior year's figures alongside for comparison.

		with the largest gains expected among Hispanic children and children with low entering skills, and kindergarten chronic absence does not rise.	
Gifted and advanced learner identification	Percentage of each grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened, and the representation index (share of identified students in a group divided by that group's share of enrollment) for students by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status	**100 percent of each grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened in year one, and the representation index for every student group reaches at least 0.8 within 3 years, with the identification rate for low-income, Black, Hispanic, and English learner students rising each year until that threshold is met**	Annual report by the Director of Advanced Academics to the Board by November 1, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, with the same counts filed to the state gifted data collection and the federal Civil Rights Data Collection
Grade retention and promotion	Share of retained K-3 students whose retention record shows a completed intervention plan, written parent notice at least 90 school days before year end, a good-cause exemption review where required and an individual reading plan dated before the first day of the repeated year; number of students retained in grades 6 through 8 on the basis of test scores; reading proficiency and attendance of retained students one and three years after retention compared with barely promoted peers; discipline incidents of retained students.	**By the end of year one, every retained K-3 student has a complete intervention record, parent notice, exemption review and individual reading plan, zero students in grades 6 through 8 are retained on test scores alone, and no student is retained more than once in K-3; within 1 to 3 years, retained students' reading proficiency rises relative to barely promoted peers and their attendance and discipline do not worsen relative to those peers.**	The Superintendent presents the retention report to the Board each September, with the compliance measures for the prior year's retentions and the reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier, disaggregated by grade, school, race, disability and EL status, and the Board reviews any school with incomplete records or a subgroup retention share above its enrollment share at that meeting.
Grading practices (zeros, late work,	Correlation between final course grades and end-of-course or state test scores	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of courses have a published grading plan within the first**	The Director of Assessment reports to the Board each August, by school and

minimum grades, standards-based grading)	by school and course; spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course; share of students with a D or F who passed the end-of-course exam and vice versa; count of grading appeals; share of courses with a published grading plan within ten school days.	**ten school days and all same-course sections in a school use a common scale and weights; within 1 to 3 years, the grade-to-test correlation rises and the spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course narrows in every school and course relative to the baseline, and the share of students with a D or F who passed the exam, and with an A or B who failed it, falls each year.**	course, with the first report due in the August following adoption and the baseline comparison carried forward in every later report.
High-dosage tutoring	Share of students below benchmark on the interim assessment who received tutoring at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day, by school and student group; sessions delivered versus scheduled; share of sessions with the student's assigned tutor; interim assessment growth of tutored students compared with matched non-tutored students.	**Within one year, every student identified below benchmark is enrolled and the share receiving at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day rises each reporting period, with no student group lagging the district rate; within 1 to 3 years, tutored students show growth on the interim assessment greater than matched non-tutored students in both reading and mathematics.**	Superintendent reports to the Board by December 15 and June 15 each year, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, with any school below the dosage standard named and its corrective schedule attached.
High-quality instructional materials and adoption	Share of core programs on the public inventory that have an independent quality rating and were adopted through the published process, share of classrooms using the adopted core program as primary, curriculum-specific professional development hours per teacher in adoption year, and	**Within 1 year, the full inventory is posted and every new adoption follows the published process with a semester pilot in at least two schools and at least 20 hours of professional development per teacher in the first year; within 3 years of each adoption, the share of classrooms using the core program as primary rises**	Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum reports to the Board by August 31 each year, with the inventory posted on the district website.

	achievement and growth in each subject for three years after each adoption.	**from baseline and achievement and growth in that subject improve relative to the pre-adoption year.**	
Homework	Share of students in each grade band whose reported nightly homework time exceeds the policy limit (ten minutes per grade level in grades 3 through 8, two hours in grades 9 through 12), from the annual March student and family survey; share of courses with homework weighted above ten percent of the grade; homework completion rate gap by free-lunch status.	**By the second May 31 report, no school reports average nightly time above the grade-band limit, no course weights homework above ten percent of the grade, and the share of high school students reporting more than two hours per night falls each year compared with the prior survey; the completion gap by free-lunch status narrows year over year within 1 to 3 years.**	Superintendent reports to the Board by May 31 each year with survey results by grade band and free-lunch status, homework grade weight by course, the list of schools exceeding the limit, and the correction directed at each.
Math acceleration, eighth grade algebra, and tracking	Share of students meeting the published placement criterion who are placed in the accelerated course, and share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score, each disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus the Algebra I repeat rate.	**Within 1 year, every student who meets the published criterion is placed unless a parent opts out in writing, and Algebra I is offered in grade 8 at every middle school; within 3 years, the share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score rises for every student group with no increase in the Algebra I repeat rate for any group, and the gap in criterion-meeting placement rates between student groups closes to zero.**	The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year, with every measure disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and with placement appeals and overrides listed by school.
Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS / RtI)	Share of at-risk students with Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention logged within 15 school days of screening, share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester, screening	**By the June report of year one, every school screens all K-8 students within the first 30 school days of each window, every at-risk student has intervention logged within 15 school**	Director of Student Services reports to the Board each December and June, by school and race, with the June report comparing spring outcomes of students

	participation each window, progress-monitoring frequency, and special education referral and identification rates by school and race.	**days, every Tier 2 and Tier 3 student is progress-monitored at least every two weeks, and the share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester rises each year over the first 3 years with no school showing referral or identification rates by race that diverge from its share of enrollment without a documented review.**	placed in Tier 2 or Tier 3 against students just above the cutoff to check for the negative grade 1 pattern found in the national evaluation.
Special education placement and inclusion	Share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day, 40 to 79 percent, and under 40 percent, disaggregated by school, disability category, race and English learner status; achievement and growth of students with disabilities on state tests versus peers; graduation, dropout and suspension rates of students with disabilities; share of IEPs documenting consideration of supplementary aids and services before a more restrictive placement; share of co-taught sections staffed by a certified special educator for the full period.	**Within 1 year, every reviewed IEP recommending a setting below 80 percent general education documents the supplementary aids and services considered and the supporting data, every co-taught section is staffed by a certified special educator for the full period, and every assigned teacher completes 12 hours of training; within 3 years, the share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day rises and the achievement gap, dropout rate and suspension rate for students with disabilities fall from baseline, with no decline in peer achievement.**	Director of Special Education reports to the Board by November 1 each year, by school, disability category, race and English learner status, with the Board comparing each year's figures to baseline and to the state's Indicator 5 targets.
Summer learning and extended learning time	Share of enrolled students attending 20 or more days, by building and subgroup, and the spring-to-fall interim assessment change in reading and mathematics for students attending 20 or more days compared with	**Within 1 to 3 years, the share of enrolled students attending 20 or more days rises each year in every building and subgroup, and students attending 20 or more days show a higher spring-to-fall assessment**	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 15, covering enrollment, the percentage attending 20 or more days by building and subgroup, the spring-to-fall growth comparison for attenders

	eligible students who did not enroll.	**change in reading and mathematics than eligible non-enrollees in each annual October 15 report.**	versus eligible non-enrollees, and for any extended-day or extended-year program its added minutes, content, staff and fall-to-spring growth comparison.
Bullying prevention	Annual student-reported bullying victimization prevalence on the fixed Olweus Bullying Questionnaire item, by school, grade and demographic group, plus number of reports received, number investigated within the two-school-day and ten-school-day deadlines, number substantiated, and share of students who say they would report.	**Within 3 years of the baseline administration, district-wide student-reported victimization prevalence falls by at least 15 percent from baseline, consistent with the 15 to 16 percent victimization reduction in program meta-analyses, and in every year 100 percent of logged reports show an investigation begun within two school days and an outcome documented within ten school days, with the share of students who say they would report rising each year.**	The Superintendent's annual written report to the Board by October 1, presenting prevalence by school, grade and demographic group, reports received, reports investigated within deadline, reports substantiated, and the three-year trend, with the Board recording whether the target was met in its minutes.
Corporal punishment	Number of instances of corporal punishment in the district, counted as substantiated allegations in the Superintendent's annual report and as the figure submitted to the Civil Rights Data Collection, reconciled to building discipline logs; plus presence of the written prohibition in both handbooks.	**Zero instances of corporal punishment reported in the first full school year after adoption and every year after, with the reconciled count and the CRDC submission both at zero, and the prohibition published in both handbooks each August.**	The Superintendent's written report to the Board by September 30 each year, stating substantiated allegations, action taken on each, the CRDC figure and the reconciliation to building logs, with the handbook publication dates attached.
Dress codes and uniforms	Dress code interventions, class removals and suspensions per 100 students by building, race	**Zero class removals, send-homes, suspensions or activity exclusions for dress code violations in every year**	Annual report to the Board by September 30 covering the prior school year, presented by the

	and sex, drawn from the student information system log that includes informal removals; instructional minutes lost to dress code enforcement; share of code rules that are gender-specific or require measuring a student's body; parent and student complaints about dress enforcement.	**after adoption; zero gender-specific rules and zero body-measuring rules in the district and building codes within 90 days; and no student group's dress code intervention rate exceeding twice the rate for white or male students in any building by the end of year one, holding in years two and three.**	Superintendent, with the count of rules revised or repealed and the number of complaints received, and posted publicly with the Board minutes.
Physical restraint and seclusion	Incidents of physical restraint, mechanical restraint and seclusion per 100 students, by building and by disability status, race and sex, from the district incident log reconciled to the Civil Rights Data Collection submission; injuries to students and staff; share of incidents with same-day parent notification; share of incidents involving a student with no behavior intervention plan.	**Zero seclusions, mechanical restraints, chemical restraints and prone or supine restraints from the first quarterly report onward; physical restraints per 100 students declining each year for 3 years against the baseline year; 100 percent of incidents with same-day parent notification and a written report within two school days by the end of year one; the share of restraints involving students with disabilities moving toward their share of enrollment over 3 years.**	The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes on the district website by September 30 for the prior school year the number of restraints by building, disability status, race and sex, the number of injuries, the share with same-day parent notification, and the district's Civil Rights Data Collection submission, with a note explaining any difference between the log and the submission; a zero submission from a district with special education programs is flagged for Board inquiry.
School climate measurement	Share of schools that reach a 70 percent response rate among students and staff, results published by school and demographic group by August 31, and the number of school improvement plans that name the lowest-scoring climate domain with assigned actions and budget	**In year one, every school reaches at least 70 percent of enrolled students and staff, results are published by August 31, and every school improvement plan submitted by October 1 cites its lowest-scoring climate domain; by year three, domain scores in safety, relationships, engagement**	The Director of Research and Accountability publishes results by August 31 each year and the Superintendent presents the district summary to the Board at a public meeting by October 31, with the response rate by school and the count of

		and environment show a rising three-year trend at each school, with no demographic group falling	improvement plans citing a climate finding
Social-emotional learning	Share of grades K-12 using a program with a CASEL SELect or What Works Clearinghouse moderate or strong rating; share of classrooms meeting the program's fidelity threshold on observations; climate survey scores on belonging and trusted adults by school; office discipline referrals and suspensions by school.	**Every grade K-12 using a rated program within 1 year; the share of classrooms meeting the fidelity threshold rising each year from the year-one baseline; climate survey scores on belonging and trusted adults rising and discipline referrals and suspensions falling at each school within 1 to 3 years.**	The Director of Curriculum reports to the Board by November 1 each year the program in use at each grade, the share of classrooms meeting the fidelity threshold, climate survey results on belonging and trusted adults by school, and discipline referrals and suspensions by school, and posts the report on the district website alongside the published scope and sequence.
Student searches and due process in discipline	Share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference (charge, evidence and student response) and same-day parent notice; share of expulsion hearings with timely written notice, an independent hearing officer and a written decision within five school days; number of searches logged with a written basis, by building, race and disability; number of strip searches; manifestation determinations completed within ten school days; complaints and appeals and their outcomes.	**Zero strip searches in every year; every exclusion over ten days has written notice at least five school days before the hearing and a written decision within five school days after it; every manifestation determination completed within ten school days; the share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference and same-day parent notice rises each year, with the gap between buildings and between student groups narrowing, as shown in the September 30 report within 1 to 3 years.**	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by September 30, disaggregated by building, race and disability status, with the discipline record audit results attached.
Suspension and expulsion	Out-of-school suspensions per 100 students and	**Within one year of adoption, zero out-of-school**	Monthly principal reports to the Superintendent; an

	instructional days lost, by building and by race, disability, sex and English-learner status; share of suspensions for subjective or nonviolent categories (defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, attendance); risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities; attendance and achievement of non-suspended peers in buildings that reduce suspensions.	**suspensions recorded for defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, truancy or other attendance conduct, and no single suspension exceeding five school days outside the state and federal exceptions; within 1 to 3 years, every building's risk ratio for Black students and for students with disabilities at or below 2.0, with suspensions per 100 students and days lost declining each year while attendance and achievement of non-suspended students in those buildings hold steady or improve.**	annual Superintendent report to the Board by September 30 covering the prior school year, published publicly, with the corrective plan for any building above a 2.0 risk ratio; Board review of the policy at a public meeting each October.
Tiered positive behavior supports and restorative practices	Office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students by building and student group; annual Tier 1 fidelity score on the Tiered Fidelity Inventory; share of buildings with functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; referral risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities; student and teacher climate survey results.	**Within 1 year, every building completes a fidelity assessment and has functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; within 3 years, every building scores 70 percent or higher at Tier 1, office referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students decline from baseline in every building, and no building has a referral risk ratio above 2.0 for Black students or students with disabilities.**	Superintendent reports to the Board and publishes on the district website by September 30 each year, for the prior school year, by building and by race, disability status and sex, including fidelity scores, restorative practice use and outcomes, and a corrective plan for any building over the 2.0 risk ratio threshold.
Attendance messaging to families	Share of students reaching 5 percent absence whose family received a personalized absence message in the family's preferred language within 10 school days, from the student information system messaging log; chronic	**Messaging timeliness at the 5 percent trigger rises each year from the first-year rate; verified contact information coverage rises each year from the 30-day audit; and the district chronic absence rate falls from the prior-year baseline within 1 to 3 years,**	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 31, covering the prior year, with the four measures broken out by school, subgroup, and language.

	absence rate by school and subgroup; and percent of students with a verified phone number or address on file.	**with a reduction of about 10 percent (K-12) to 15 percent (K-5) as the reference range from the evidence.**	
Community schools and integrated student supports	For each designated school: full-time coordinator in place, signed lead partner agreement, share of identified student needs matched to a service within 30 school days, and chronic absence, suspension and course-passing rates compared with the three most similar district schools.	**By the first December 31 report, every designated school has a full-time coordinator and a signed lead partner agreement and has matched 90 percent of identified needs to a service within 30 school days; within 1 to 3 years, chronic absence and suspension rates at designated schools fall relative to their comparison schools, with a direction of improvement in course-passing rates.**	Superintendent's written report to the Board by December 31 each year, one page per designated school showing staffing, agreement status, the 30-school-day match rate, and the three-school comparison on attendance, suspension, course-passing and state assessment results, with the per-pupil cost shown in the annual budget.
Family engagement and two-way communication	Percent of enrolled students whose family received at least two logged, individualized two-way contacts in the school year (one by October 31, one by March 31), by school and subgroup; plus share of families enrolled in alerts and reachable by verified phone, conference participation rate, and family survey response rate and agreement with 'the school tells me how my child is doing'	**Every school reaches a majority of students with two logged two-way contacts in year one and raises that share each year through year three, with the gap between the lowest and highest subgroup narrowing each year; all families enrolled in alerts by default with a verified phone on file by the end of each August; survey response rate and agreement with 'the school tells me how my child is doing' rising each year**	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by November 30, by school and subgroup, published on the district website, with a mid-year check at the March 31 deadline
Language access for families	Share of families with a recorded home language other than English who received each required notice category (enrollment, discipline, special education,	**Within 1 to 3 years, the share of required notices delivered in the family's preferred language rises each year, every interpreter request is fulfilled within five school**	The language access coordinator reports to the Board by October 31 each year in a public written report, broken out by language, with interpreter

	attendance, health, emergency) in their preferred language, share of interpreter requests fulfilled within five school days, and conference and IEP meeting participation rates of limited-English families compared with all families.	**days or sooner where a legal deadline applies, and the gap in conference and IEP participation between limited-English families and all families narrows year over year.**	fulfillment times, participation rate comparisons and complaints received.
Teacher home visits	Percent of enrolled families receiving at least one relationship-building home visit per year, by school and grade band, and the chronic absence rate of visited versus non-visited students in the same schools, adjusted for prior-year attendance; also share of visits in the family's home language and teacher participation rate.	**Every school reaches at least 10 percent of enrolled families with a visit within 1 to 3 years, with all transition-grade and prior-year chronically absent families offered a visit in year one; visited students show a lower chronic absence rate than comparable non-visited students in the same schools in each annual report, and no visits are logged as selected by discipline history.**	The Superintendent reports to the Board by September 30 each year, by school: number and share of families visited, visits by language, staff participation, offer and completion rates for transition grades and prior-year chronically absent students, and chronic absence and course-passing rates of visited versus non-visited students adjusted for prior-year attendance.
Classroom temperature, ventilation and indoor air	Share of classrooms with mechanical cooling, instructional hours above 78 F by building, share of occupied classroom hours with CO2 above 1,000 ppm, measured outdoor air rate per person at commissioning, illness absence by building, and number of heat-related early dismissals	**Within 1 year every classroom has a continuous CO2 monitor and no building exceeds 1,000 ppm for more than 10 percent of occupied hours in any month; within 3 years the share of classrooms without mechanical cooling and the instructional hours above 78 F fall each year, no student is taught at or above 88 F, and illness absence by building declines**	Annual report from the Director of Facilities to the Board by September 30, with monthly CO2 exceedance rates by building available to the Board on request
Lead in school drinking water	Share of drinking and cooking outlets tested within the last 3 years, share of	**100 percent of drinking and cooking outlets tested by June 30, 2027 and retested**	The Director of Facilities reports to the Board by September 30 each year,

	tested outlets at or above 5 ppb, days between a result at or above 5 ppb and outlet shutoff, number of NSF/ANSI 53 filtered bottle-filling stations per building floor, and share of families notified within 30 days, all drawn from the district's published results and the annual Board report.	**within every 3 year cycle thereafter; every outlet at or above 5 ppb out of service within 24 hours of the result; 100 percent of results posted and families notified within 30 days; at least one filtered station on every floor of every building by the end of year one; and the share of outlets at or above 5 ppb falling each cycle toward zero.**	with results posted by outlet on the district website within 30 days of receipt and the filter replacement log attached.
Physical education minutes and activity policy	Share of grade levels in each building scheduled for at least 150 minutes per week of PE (K-5) or 225 minutes per week (6-12); share of PE sections taught by a certified physical educator; observed share of PE lesson time in moderate-to-vigorous activity; count of waivers, substitutions and disciplinary withholdings.	**By the September 30 certification in year two, every grade in every building is scheduled for at least 150 minutes (K-5) or 225 minutes (6-12) of PE per week, every PE section is taught by a certified physical educator, waivers, substitutions and disciplinary withholdings are zero, and the observed share of lesson time in moderate-to-vigorous activity is at least half in each building and rising from baseline in each later year.**	Superintendent's annual PE report to the Board by December 1, built on the Director of Curriculum's September 30 certification, with minutes by grade and building, certification share, observation results, waiver and withholding counts, and a dated correction plan for any shortfall.
Recess	Share of K-5 students scheduled for at least 20 minutes of daily recess per the certified master schedules, and the count of recess removals logged in the student information system by building and reason	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of K-5 students in every elementary building have at least 20 minutes of scheduled daily recess, and all logged recess removals cite an immediate safety risk, with the count of removals declining year over year in years 1 to 3**	Superintendent reports to the Board by November 1 each year with recess minutes by building, recess removals by building and reason, and correction plans for any building below 20 minutes

School nurses and health services	Share of school buildings with a registered nurse on site every full school day, and number of days any building lacked an RN, from the district staffing roster; illness-related absence rate for students with asthma, diabetes, seizure disorders and food allergies, from the student information system; count of emergency 911 calls from schools.	**100 percent of buildings have a full-time RN on site every day students are present, with zero uncovered days, within 1 year of adoption; illness-related absence for students with chronic health conditions declines from the baseline within 2 years and does not rise thereafter.**	Coordinator of Health Services reports to the Board by October 15 each year: nursing staff by building, workload and acuity results, days each building lacked an RN on site, illness-related and chronic absence for students with chronic health conditions, 911 calls from schools, and Medicaid reimbursement received.
School-based mental health, counseling and suicide prevention	Students per school counselor, school psychologist and school social worker by building; share of students screened and share of referred students who begin services within 30 days; time to first appointment; number and share of students served by an on-site licensed clinician; student survey items on depression, suicidal ideation and attempts; suspension rate; suicide prevention fidelity checks.	**Every building at or below 250 students per counselor, 500 per school psychologist and 250 per school social worker within three years of the first March 1 plan; every school with a licensed clinician on site weekly by the end of year one; every referred student offered an initial appointment within 10 school days; share of referred students beginning services within 30 days rising each year; self-reported suicide attempts and suspension rates declining over 1 to 3 years with every program component passing fidelity checks.**	Director of Student Services to the Board by November 1 each year, with the funded staffing plan from the Superintendent by March 1 each year; the ratio, clinician access, screening and referral figures are broken out by building and the survey and suspension items are compared with the baseline year.
Seated lunch time	Seated lunch minutes per lunch period by building, measured from the time the last student in line is served to the end of the period, from the master schedule plus a cafeteria line-time observation each semester; the share of buildings	**Every building and every lunch period provides at least 20 seated minutes for lunch and 10 for breakfast by the start of the next school year, with the count of buildings below 20 minutes at zero in each annual report thereafter and fruit and**	Annual wellness report presented to the Board no later than its first regular meeting in October, showing seated lunch minutes by building and lunch period, the number of buildings not meeting 20 minutes, a dated correction

	meeting 20 seated minutes; fruit and vegetable plate-waste or production-record data from food service.	**vegetable plate waste moving down from baseline over 1 to 3 years.**	plan for each, and fruit and vegetable plate-waste or production-record data.
Universal free school meals and breakfast after the bell	Average daily breakfast and lunch participation as a share of enrollment by school, breakfast participation as a share of lunch participation by school, and share of eligible schools operating under CEP, all from monthly USDA reimbursement claims; chronic absence and out-of-school suspension rates from the state report card.	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of schools at or above the 25 percent identified student percentage threshold operate under CEP or a state universal-meals program, and every school serves breakfast after the bell; within 2 years, every school's breakfast participation reaches at least 70 percent of its lunch participation, and district lunch participation rises by at least 5 percentage points over baseline, with suspension and chronic absence rates trending down across years of adoption.**	Annual report by the Director of Nutrition Services to the Board by October 15, with CEP status by school, prior-year breakfast and lunch participation by school, the list of schools below the 70 percent breakfast-to-lunch ratio with corrective plans, and state report card chronic absence and suspension rates compared across years of adoption.
Vision screening and eyeglasses	From the school nurse's referral log and the district benchmark assessment: share of students screened each year by grade; share of referred students examined within 60 days and fitted with glasses within 90 days; share still wearing glasses at the semester classroom check; reading growth of students who received glasses versus their prior-year growth.	**By the end of year one, every student in the designated grades is screened, every student who fails screening is examined within 60 days and fitted with glasses within 90 days, and the share wearing glasses at each semester check rises from the first check onward; by the end of year two, reading growth of students who received glasses exceeds their own prior-year growth, with the largest gains among students in the lowest baseline reading quartile and students in special education.**	Coordinator of Health Services to the Board by December 15 each year, by school and by grade, with the semester wear-check results and the 60-day and 90-day delivery shares shown separately so the Board can see whether the follow-up that sustains the effect is happening.

Behavioral threat assessment	Share of assessed students who received out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement or law-enforcement referral versus the share who received counseling and a support plan, and the referral rate per 1,000 students by race, disability status and gender compared with enrollment.	**Within 1 to 3 years, the share of assessed students receiving counseling and a support plan rises each year while the share receiving out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement or law-enforcement referral falls each year; every substantive case has a written plan; team training completion is 100 percent; the referral rate by race, disability status and gender matches enrollment with no group gap; and assessed threats later carried out stay near the published level of about 1 in 100 or below.**	Superintendent to the Board by September 30 each year, as the clause requires, with a one-page comparison to the prior year and to the published CSTAG figures.
Hazing and athletics safety	Share of coaches, sponsors and student participants with current hazing training; hazing reports and substantiated cases per season by team or group; climate-survey item on initiation experiences; concussions per 1,000 athlete-exposures and share with documented written clearance before return; exertional heat illness and cardiac events per season; share of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes.	**Within 1 year, 100 percent of coaches and sponsors trained before the season, 100 percent of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes, and 100 percent of concussion returns with documented written clearance. Reported concussions and hazing reports are expected to rise in the first 1 to 2 years as identification improves; within 3 years, the recurrent-concussion rate and exertional heat illness count per season should decline from the year-one baseline, consistent with the 2.6-year post-law decline and the roughly 0.45 incidence rate ratio seen for heat rules.**	Athletic Director to the Board by July 31 each year, with the Superintendent presenting the climate-survey initiation item and any substantiated hazing cases in the same report.

Lockdown and active shooter drills	Share of drills that are announced and procedure-only; share of observed classrooms executing the lockdown procedure correctly; drill-related preparedness and anxiety items on the annual climate survey; counseling contacts in the week after each drill; parent notification compliance.	**Within one year, 100 percent of drills in which students participate are announced, procedure-only and preceded by parent notification, with zero simulation-style drills; from year one to year three, the share of classrooms executing the procedure correctly rises each year while drill-related anxiety items on the climate survey do not rise and post-drill counseling contacts do not increase.**	Annual report from the Director of Safety to the Board by June 30, with drill counts and types by school, procedural checklist results, post-drill counseling contacts, climate survey drill items and parent notification compliance.
School resource officers and school policing	Annual counts and rates per 1,000 students of school-based arrests, citations, law-enforcement referrals and uses of force, by school and by race, disability status and gender; share of referrals arising from non-criminal code-of-conduct matters; out-of-school suspension rate by school; perceived-safety items on the climate survey; complaints against officers.	**Within 1 year of adoption, the share of law-enforcement referrals arising from non-criminal code-of-conduct matters falls from baseline and continues to fall each year; within 3 years, arrest and referral rates per 1,000 students decline from baseline overall and for Black students, male students and students with disabilities, with the gap between those groups and the district rate narrowing each year, while perceived-safety items do not decline.**	The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year and publishes the report on the district website; the Board reviews it in a public meeting before voting on renewal of any officer assignment or memorandum of understanding.

Class size in the early grades	Share of K-3 general education sections above the cap (20 students, or 22 with a full-time aide) each October, by school; share of K-3 teachers without full state certification; K-3 reading and math benchmark growth by school.	**Within 1 year, zero K-3 sections above the cap in the schools with the highest share of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals; within 3 years, zero sections above the cap district-wide without written Board approval, and the share of new K-3 teachers without full certification at zero. K-3 reading and math benchmark growth in the schools brought under the cap should rise relative to their own baseline over the same 3 years.**	Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 31, by school and grade K-3, with average and maximum class size, the number of sections above the cap and the reason for each, the share of K-3 teachers without full certification, and K-3 reading and math benchmark growth; any over-cap section after October 31 recorded in Board minutes with written approval.
Instructional coaching and professional development	Share of eligible teachers (first three years of service or rated below effective) receiving at least eight logged coaching cycles per year, coach caseload per full-time coach, share of PD hours delivered as single-session workshops, change in observed instructional practice scores of coached teachers, and student growth of coached teachers versus comparable uncoached teachers.	**By the end of year one, every eligible teacher has eight logged cycles, no full-time coach serves more than 20 teachers, and single-session workshops are no more than 25 percent of district PD hours; by the end of year two, observed instructional practice scores of coached teachers rise over their pre-coaching scores and student growth of coached teachers is at or above that of comparable uncoached teachers, with both measures improving year over year.**	Annual report from the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning to the Board by September 30, disaggregated by school, reviewed by the Board before adoption of the following year's budget.
New teacher induction and mentoring	Share of first-year and second-year teachers assigned a trained same-subject or same-grade-band mentor before the first student day; mean mentor contact hours per inductee per month; one-year, three-	**Within 1 year, every inductee has an assigned trained mentor before the first student day and every year-one mentor pair logs weekly contact; within 3 years, one-year and three-year retention of new hires who**	Director of Human Resources to the Board by October 31 each year, with Board review of program funding at the November meeting

	year and five-year retention of new hires by school and by induction participation	**completed induction is higher than the pre-policy baseline and no lower than for new hires who did not participate**	
Teacher evaluation and feedback	Share of teachers who received at least two observations with at least one unannounced, median days from observation to written feedback, share of evaluators passing calibration, share of below-effective teachers with a growth plan within 20 school days, distribution of summative ratings by school and evaluator, and correlation between ratings and student growth	**Within 1 year every teacher has at least two observations with at least one unannounced, median days to written feedback is five school days or fewer, every evaluator conducting observations has passed the annual calibration exercise, every teacher rated below effective has a written growth plan within 20 school days and eight coaching cycles the following year, and no single measure exceeds one third of any rating; within 3 years ratings show a positive correlation with student growth and the share rated below proficient exceeds the under 1 percent pattern of the statewide reforms**	Annual report from the Director of Human Resources to the Board by August 31, covering ratings by school and evaluator, calibration results, observations per teacher and share unannounced, median days to feedback, rating to growth correlation, and retention by rating level; Board reliability review each year and an external review every five years
Generative AI use by students and staff	Unaided assessment results in courses using each approved AI tool versus matched courses, together with the share of approved tools configured to withhold direct answers, the share of courses with a written AI-use expectation on the syllabus, and the number of AI-related integrity cases overturned.	**Within 1 year, every tool on the approved list has answer-withholding on for student practice use, every course states an AI-use expectation by the tenth instructional day, and unaided assessment results in courses using approved tools are no lower than in matched courses, with no integrity finding resting on detection software alone; sustained in years 2 and 3.**	Chief Academic Officer reports to the Board by October 1 each year; the Board records whether the no-deficit condition was met for each tool and whether any tool was removed from the list as a result.

One-to-one devices and educational software	Share of licensed products above the $25,000 threshold that have a written evidence review on file before purchase or renewal, share of licensed students active weekly per product, and achievement of exposed cohorts versus the pre-adoption baseline by subgroup on state assessments.	**Within year one, 100 percent of purchases and renewals above $25,000 have an evidence review on file before the Board vote; every licensed product reaches at least 50 percent of licensed students active each semester or is brought to a Board vote; by the third October 1 report, no exposed subgroup trends below its pre-adoption baseline and math achievement for exposed cohorts is moving upward.**	Director of Technology to the Board each February 1 and August 1 on usage and cost per product; Chief Academic Officer to the Board each October 1 on achievement by subgroup against baseline, with both reports posted publicly.
Personal phones during the school day	Share of classrooms observed with phones stored in the semester walkthrough sample; device-violation referrals per 100 students by school and grade; student survey item on in-class distraction; and the state assessment trend for the lowest-achieving quartile compared with the district average.	**Within 1 year, the share of classrooms with phones stored rises and device-violation referrals per 100 students fall from the first semester to the second; within 1 to 3 years, the student distraction item improves and the lowest-achieving quartile's state assessment trend closes toward the district average rather than widening, with no first or second offense resulting in exclusion from instruction in any year.**	The Superintendent presents the annual report to the Board by October 1 each year, disaggregated by school and grade, and the Board reviews the lowest-quartile achievement trend at the same meeting once state assessment results are available.

Student data privacy and vendor contracts	Share of software products in use that collect student PII with a signed data privacy agreement on file containing all five required terms, plus days from confirmed breach to family notification and share of FERPA parent requests fulfilled within the statutory window	**100% of products in use have a compliant signed agreement by the end of year one and at every September 30 report thereafter; every confirmed breach is reported by the vendor within 72 hours; the public list is updated within 30 days of each change; 100% of teachers complete annual training**	Privacy Officer presents to the Board by September 30 each year, with the public approved-software list and breach log posted on the district website
Four-day school week	Achievement growth in reading and mathematics on state and interim assessments compared with the district's prior three-year average and with comparable five-day districts; total annual instructional hours per grade span; chronic absence rate; actual savings as a share of operating expenditure; fifth-day meal and supervision access for low-income students	**Total instructional hours in every grade span equal to or greater than the most recent five-day calendar in the adopted calendar; achievement growth in reading and mathematics at or above the prior three-year average in each of the three years after adoption, with no two consecutive years below it; chronic absence rate no higher than the prior three-year average**	Superintendent's written report to the Board by October 1 in each of the three school years after adoption, presented at a public meeting and posted with the original pre-adoption analysis
Remote instruction days (virtual snow days and planned remote learning)	Student attendance on remote instruction days (share logging into synchronous instruction) by school and by free-and-reduced-lunch status, compared with the prior month's in-person attendance rate; number of remote days used per year and reason for each; share of households confirmed to have a device and connectivity; minutes of live instruction per remote day.	**Within 1 year: no remote days used for planned purposes, no more than five remote days counted toward instructional time, every remote day delivering at least two hours of live instruction for secondary and one hour for elementary students, and the gap between remote-day attendance and the prior month's in-person rate narrowing each year, with the free-and-reduced-lunch**	Superintendent report to the Board within 30 days of each remote instruction day, Director of Technology certification by October 1, and an annual summary by June 30.

		gap no wider than the overall gap.	
Secondary school start time	Percentage of secondary students (grades 6 through 12) whose instructional day begins at or after 8:30 a.m., plus median school-night sleep hours reported by secondary students on the district climate survey and chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building	**100 percent of secondary students begin instruction at or after 8:30 a.m. by the start of the school year following the first March 1 report, with any named noncompliant building in compliance within one school year; median school-night sleep hours rise and chronic absence and first-period tardy rates fall in every converted building by the second annual wellness report**	The Superintendent reports to the Board by March 1 each year in the schedule report and annually in the student wellness report, with figures broken out by building

References

Every reference below was resolved against Crossref or DataCite (DOI, title, year) or fetched by URL on the date shown. Reports without a DOI are cited by URL.

1. Bowen DH, Kisida B (2023). Investigating the Causal Effects of Arts Education. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 42(3):624-647. (RCT) doi:10.1002/pam.22449 cited by 23
2. Fredricks JA, Eccles JS (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. Developmental Psychology 42(4):698-713. (longitudinal) doi:10.1037/0012-1649.42.4.698 cited by 880
3. Stevenson B (2010). Beyond the Classroom: Using Title IX to Measure the Return to High School Sports. Review of Economics and Statistics 92(2):284-301. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/rest.2010.11623 cited by 187
4. Felfe C, Lechner M, Steinmayr A (2016). Sports and Child Development. PLOS ONE 11(5):e0151729. (longitudinal) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0151729 cited by 146
5. Zdroik J, Veliz P (2016). The Influence of Pay-To-Play Fees on Participation in Interscholastic Sports: A School-Level Analysis of Michigan's Public Schools. Journal of Physical Activity and Health 13(12):1317-1324. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1123/jpah.2016-0099 cited by 21
6. C.S. Mott Children's Hospital National Poll on Children's Health (2019). Pay-to-Participate: Impact on School Activities. March 18, 2019. (cross-sectional) link
7. Farb AF, Matjasko JL (2012). Recent advances in research on school-based extracurricular activities and adolescent development. Developmental Review 32(1):1-48. (review) doi:10.1016/j.dr.2011.10.001 cited by 389

8. Austin M, Backes B, Goldhaber D, Li D, Streich F (2025). Leveling Up: An Academic Acceleration Policy to Increase Equity in Advanced High School Course Taking. American Educational Research Journal 62(1):136-179. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3102/00028312241282793 cited by 4
9. Austin M, Mbekeani P, Backes B, Chen B, Goldhaber D (2026). High School Academic Acceleration and Early Postsecondary Outcomes: Evidence from Washington State. CALDER Working Paper 341-0826. (difference-in-differences) link
10. Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2015). Middle School Math Acceleration and Equitable Access to Eighth-Grade Algebra: Evidence From the Wake County Public School System. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(1S):80S-101S. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3102/0162373715576076 cited by 48
11. Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2017). Objective course placement and college readiness: Evidence from targeted middle school math acceleration. Economics of Education Review 58:141-161. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2017.04.002 cited by 40
12. Card D, Giuliano L (2016). Universal screening increases the representation of low-income and minority students in gifted education. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113(48):13678-13683. (natural experiment) doi:10.1073/pnas.1605043113 cited by 303
13. Smith J, Hurwitz M, Avery C (2017). Giving College Credit Where It Is Due: Advanced Placement Exam Scores and College Outcomes. Journal of Labor Economics 35(1):67-147. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1086/687568 cited by 72
14. Jackson CK (2014). Do College-Preparatory Programs Improve Long-Term Outcomes? Economic Inquiry 52(1):72-99. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1111/ecin.12040 cited by 45
15. Xu D, Solanki S, Fink J (2021). College Acceleration for All? Mapping Racial Gaps in Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment Participation. American Educational Research Journal 58(5):954-992. (cross-sectional) doi:10.3102/0002831221991138 cited by 84
16. Kemple JJ, Willner CJ (2008). Career Academies: Long-Term Impacts on Labor Market Outcomes, Educational Attainment, and Transitions to Adulthood. MDRC. (RCT) link
17. Dougherty SM (2018). The Effect of Career and Technical Education on Human Capital Accumulation: Causal Evidence from Massachusetts. Education Finance and Policy 13(2):119-148. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00224 cited by 109
18. Brunner EJ, Dougherty SM, Ross SL (2023). The Effects of Career and Technical Education: Evidence from the Connecticut Technical High School System. Review of Economics and Statistics 105(4):867-882. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1162/rest_a_01098 cited by 52
19. Rosen R, Alterman E, Dixon M (2026). The P-TECH Model: Secondary and Postsecondary Findings From an Evaluation in New York City. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. (natural experiment) doi:10.3102/01623737261467381
20. Rosen R, Alterman E, Treskon L, Parise L, Dixon M, Wuest C (2023). P-TECH 9-14 Pathways to Success: Implementation, Impact, and Cost Findings from the New York City P-TECH 9-14 Schools Evaluation. MDRC. (natural experiment) link
21. Kreisman D, Stange K (2020). Vocational and Career Tech Education in American High Schools: The Value of Depth Over Breadth. Education Finance and Policy 15(1):11-44. (longitudinal) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00266 cited by 58

22. Ecton WG, Dougherty SM (2023). Heterogeneity in High School Career and Technical Education Outcomes. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 45(1):157-181. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/01623737221103842 cited by 42

23. Hemelt SW, Lenard MA, Paeplow CO (2019). Building bridges to life after high school: Contemporary career academies and student outcomes. Economics of Education Review 68:161-178. (natural experiment) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.08.005 cited by 73

24. Eklund K, Burns MK, Oyen K, DeMarchena S, McCollom EM (2022). Addressing chronic absenteeism in schools: a meta-analysis of evidence-based interventions. School Psychology Review 51(1):95-111. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1080/2372966X.2020.1789436 cited by 75

25. Li D, Singh S, Jeldi N, Chang S, Zhu M, Dailey K, Karabukayeva A, Cai C (2026). What works to keep students in school? A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce school absenteeism. Behavioral Sciences 16(5):697. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3390/bs16050697 cited by 2

26. Rogers T, Feller A (2018). Reducing student absences at scale by targeting parents' misbeliefs. Nature Human Behaviour 2(5):335-342. (RCT) doi:10.1038/s41562-018-0328-1 cited by 187

27. Robinson CD, Lee MG, Dearing E, Rogers T (2018). Reducing student absenteeism in the early grades by targeting parental beliefs. American Educational Research Journal 55(6):1163-1192. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0002831218772274 cited by 144

28. Lasky-Fink J, Robinson CD, Chang HN, Rogers T (2021). Using behavioral insights to improve school administrative communications: the case of truancy notifications. Educational Researcher 50(7):442-450. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0013189X211000749 cited by 23

29. Guryan J, Christenson S, Cureton A, Lai I, Ludwig J, Schwarz C, Shirey E, Turner MC (2021). The effect of mentoring on school attendance and academic outcomes: a randomized evaluation of the Check & Connect program. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 40(3):841-882. (RCT) doi:10.1002/pam.22264 cited by 38

30. Sokol R, Degli Esposti M, Victor BG, Kernsmith P, Medina Del Toro V, Heinze J, Portugal J, Grinnell R, Gernaat E (2025). A school-based material needs intervention for chronic absenteeism: a state-wide staggered interrupted time series analysis. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 80(3):174-181. (natural experiment) doi:10.1136/jech-2025-224567 cited by 2

31. Maynard BR, McCrea KT, Pigott TD, Kelly MS (2012). Indicated truancy interventions: effects on school attendance among chronic truant students. Campbell Systematic Reviews 8(1). (meta-analysis) doi:10.4073/csr.2012.10 cited by 63

32. Mazerolle L, Antrobus E, Bennett S, Eggins E (2017). Reducing truancy and fostering a willingness to attend school: results from a randomized trial of a police-school partnership program. Prevention Science 18(4):469-480. (RCT) doi:10.1007/s11121-017-0771-7 cited by 39

33. Gottfried MA (2014). Chronic absenteeism and its effects on students' academic and socioemotional outcomes. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk 19(2):53-75. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/10824669.2014.962696 cited by 328

34. Dee TS (2024). Higher chronic absenteeism threatens academic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 121(3):e2312249121. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1073/pnas.2312249121 cited by 109

35. Gubbels J, van der Put CE, Assink M (2019). Risk factors for school absenteeism and dropout: a meta-analytic review. Journal of Youth and Adolescence 48(9):1637-1667. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s10964-019-01072-5 cited by 597

36. Cook PJ, Dodge KA, Gifford EJ, Schulting AB (2017). A new program to prevent primary school absenteeism: results of a pilot study in five schools. Children and Youth Services Review 82:262-270. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.09.017 cited by 87

37. Heppen JB, Kurki A, Brown S (2020). Can texting parents improve attendance in elementary school? A test of an adaptive messaging strategy. NCEE 2020-006. Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. (RCT) link

38. Balfanz R, Byrnes V (2012). The importance of being in school: a report on absenteeism in the nation's public schools. Everyone Graduates Center, Johns Hopkins University. (review) link

39. Attendance Works (2024). 3 tiers of intervention: a multi-tiered system of support for attendance. (standard) link

40. Durkin K, Lipsey MW, Farran DC, Wiesen SE (2022). Effects of a statewide pre-kindergarten program on children's achievement and behavior through sixth grade. Developmental Psychology 58(3):470-484. (RCT) doi:10.1037/dev0001301 cited by 138

41. Lipsey MW, Farran DC, Durkin K (2018). Effects of the Tennessee Prekindergarten Program on children's achievement and behavior through third grade. Early Childhood Research Quarterly 45:155-176. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.03.005 cited by 186

42. Gray-Lobe G, Pathak PA, Walters CR (2023). The long-term effects of universal preschool in Boston. Quarterly Journal of Economics 138(1):363-411. (natural experiment) doi:10.1093/qje/qjac036 cited by 128

43. Weiland C, Yoshikawa H (2013). Impacts of a prekindergarten program on children's mathematics, language, literacy, executive function, and emotional skills. Child Development 84(6):2112-2130. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1111/cdev.12099 cited by 705

44. Gormley WT Jr, Phillips D, Gayer T (2008). Preschool programs can boost school readiness. Science 320(5884):1723-1724. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1126/science.1156019 cited by 259

45. Gormley WT Jr, Phillips D, Anderson S (2018). The effects of Tulsa's pre-K program on middle school student performance. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 37(1):63-87. (longitudinal) doi:10.1002/pam.22023 cited by 82

46. Amadon S, Gormley WT, Claessens A, Magnuson K, Hummel-Price D, Romm K (2022). Does early childhood education help to improve high school outcomes? Results from Tulsa. Child Development 93(4):e379-e395. (longitudinal) doi:10.1111/cdev.13752 cited by 42

47. McCoy DC, Yoshikawa H, Ziol-Guest KM, Duncan GJ, Schindler HS, Magnuson K, Yang R, Koepp A, Shonkoff JP (2017). Impacts of early childhood education on medium- and long-term educational outcomes. Educational Researcher 46(8):474-487. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0013189X17737739 cited by 287

48. Bailey D, Duncan GJ, Odgers CL, Yu W (2017). Persistence and fadeout in the impacts of child and adolescent interventions. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 10(1):7-39. (review) doi:10.1080/19345747.2016.1232459 cited by 555

49. Phillips DA, Lipsey MW, Dodge KA, et al. (2017). Puzzling it out: The current state of scientific knowledge on pre-kindergarten effects. A consensus statement. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution and Duke University. (review) link

50. Puma M, Bell S, Cook R, Heid C, et al. (2010). Head Start Impact Study: Final report. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (RCT) link

51. Edmunds JA, Unlu F, Phillips V, Glennie E, Mulhern C (2024). The Impact of Early Colleges on Postsecondary Performance and Completion. AERA Open 10. (RCT) doi:10.1177/23328584241290772 cited by 4

52. Edmunds JA, Unlu F, Furey J, Glennie E, Arshavsky N (2020). What Happens When You Combine High School and College? The Impact of the Early College Model on Postsecondary Performance and Completion. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 42(2):257-278. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0162373720912249 cited by 49

53. Edmunds JA, Unlu F, Glennie E, Bernstein L, Fesler L, Furey J, Arshavsky N (2017). Smoothing the Transition to Postsecondary Education: The Impact of the Early College Model. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 10(2):297-325. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2016.1191574 cited by 106

54. Song M, Zeiser K, Atchison D, Brodziak de los Reyes I (2021). Early College, Continued Success: Longer-Term Impact of Early College High Schools. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 14(1):116-142. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2020.1862374 cited by 68

55. Hemelt SW, Schwartz NL, Dynarski SM (2020). Dual-Credit Courses and the Road to College: Experimental Evidence from Tennessee. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 39(3):686-719. (RCT) doi:10.1002/pam.22180 cited by 36

56. An BP (2013). The Impact of Dual Enrollment on College Degree Attainment: Do Low-SES Students Benefit? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 35(1):57-75. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0162373712461933 cited by 153

57. Rosen R, Alterman E, Dixon M (2026). The P-TECH Model: Secondary and Postsecondary Findings From an Evaluation in New York City. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. (natural experiment) doi:10.3102/01623737261467381

58. Xu D, Solanki S, Fink J (2021). College Acceleration for All? Mapping Racial Gaps in Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment Participation. American Educational Research Journal 58(5):954-992. (cross-sectional) doi:10.3102/0002831221991138 cited by 84

59. What Works Clearinghouse (2017). Dual Enrollment Programs: Intervention Report. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (review) link

60. Ehri LC, Nunes SR, Stahl SA, Willows DM (2001). Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research 71(3):393-447. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/00346543071003393 cited by 938

61. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read. NIH Publication 00-4769. (review) link

62. Galuschka K, Ise E, Krick K, Schulte-Korne G (2014). Effectiveness of treatment approaches for children and adolescents with reading disabilities: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. PLoS ONE 9(2):e89900. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0089900 cited by 426

63. Suggate SP (2016). A meta-analysis of the long-term effects of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and reading comprehension interventions. Journal of Learning Disabilities 49(1):77-96. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/0022219414528540 cited by 371

64. Wanzek J, Stevens EA, Williams KJ, Scammacca N, Vaughn S, Sargent K (2018). Current evidence on the effects of intensive early reading interventions. Journal of Learning Disabilities 51(6):612-624. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/0022219418775110 cited by 189

65. January SA, Klingbeil DA (2020). Universal screening in grades K-2: A systematic review and meta-analysis of early reading curriculum-based measures. Journal of School Psychology 82:103-122. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2020.08.007 cited by 38

66. Westall J, Cummings A (2023). The effects of early literacy policies on student achievement. EdWorkingPaper 23-788, Annenberg Institute at Brown University. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.26300/w9tj-dd21

67. Novicoff S, Dee TS (2025). The achievement effects of scaling early literacy reforms. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 48(2):589-612. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3102/01623737251349178 cited by 2
68. Torgerson C, Brooks G, Gascoine L, Higgins S (2018). Phonics: reading policy and the evidence of effectiveness from a systematic 'tertiary' review. Research Papers in Education 34(2):208-238. (review) doi:10.1080/02671522.2017.1420816 cited by 86
69. Bowers JS (2020). Reconsidering the evidence that systematic phonics is more effective than alternative methods of reading instruction. Educational Psychology Review 32(3):681-705. (review) doi:10.1007/s10648-019-09515-y cited by 108
70. Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of Dual-Language Immersion Programs on Student Achievement: Evidence From Lottery Data. American Educational Research Journal 54(1_suppl):282S-306S. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0002831216634463 cited by 241
71. Bibler, A. (2021). Dual Language Education and Student Achievement. Education Finance and Policy 16(4):634-658. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00320 cited by 13
72. Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification Patterns Among Latino English Learner Students in Bilingual, Dual Immersion, and English Immersion Classrooms. American Educational Research Journal 51(5):879-912. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0002831214545110 cited by 292
73. Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of Four Instructional Programs Designed to Serve English Learners: Variation by Ethnicity and Initial English Proficiency. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(4):612-637. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0162373715573310 cited by 159
74. Robinson-Cimpian, J. P., & Thompson, K. D. (2016). The Effects of Changing Test-Based Policies for Reclassifying English Learners. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 35(2):279-305. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1002/pam.21882 cited by 49
75. Cimpian, J. R., Thompson, K. D., & Makowski, M. B. (2017). Evaluating English Learner Reclassification Policy Effects Across Districts. American Educational Research Journal 54(1_suppl):255S-278S. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3102/0002831216635796 cited by 51
76. Pope, N. G. (2016). The marginal effect of K-12 English language development programs: Evidence from Los Angeles schools. Economics of Education Review 53:311-328. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.04.009 cited by 22
77. Johnson, A. (2019). The Effects of English Learner Classification on High School Graduation and College Attendance. AERA Open 5(2). (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1177/2332858419850801 cited by 39
78. Umansky, I. M. (2016). Leveled and Exclusionary Tracking: English Learners' Access to Academic Content in Middle School. American Educational Research Journal 53(6):1792-1833. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0002831216675404 cited by 148
79. Umansky, I. M., & Dumont, H. (2021). English Learner Labeling: How English Learner Classification in Kindergarten Shapes Teacher Perceptions of Student Skills and the Moderating Role of Bilingual Instructional Settings. American Educational Research Journal 58(5):993-1031. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3102/0002831221997571 cited by 40
80. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017). Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. (review) doi:10.17226/24677 cited by 220
81. Cooper H, Allen AB, Patall EA, Dent AL (2010). Effects of full-day kindergarten on academic achievement and social development. Review of Educational Research 80(1):34-70. (meta-analysis)

doi:10.3102/0034654309359185 cited by 134

82. Hahn RA, Rammohan V, Truman BI, et al., Community Preventive Services Task Force (2014). Effects of full-day kindergarten on the long-term health prospects of children in low-income and racial/ethnic-minority populations: A Community Guide systematic review. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 46(3):312-323. (review) doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2013.12.003 cited by 21
83. Gibbs CR (2014). Experimental evidence on early intervention: The impact of full-day kindergarten. University of Virginia Batten School working paper (ERIC ED564096). (RCT) link
84. Cannon JS, Jacknowitz A, Painter G (2006). Is full better than half? Examining the longitudinal effects of full-day kindergarten attendance. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 25(2):299-321. (longitudinal) doi:10.1002/pam.20174 cited by 85
85. DeCicca P (2007). Does full-day kindergarten matter? Evidence from the first two years of schooling. Economics of Education Review 26(1):67-82. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2005.04.003 cited by 83
86. Pelletier JP, Corter JE (2019). A longitudinal comparison of learning outcomes in full-day and half-day kindergarten. Journal of Educational Research 112(2):192-210. (natural experiment) doi:10.1080/00220671.2018.1486280 cited by 19
87. Atteberry A, Bassok D, Wong VC (2019). The effects of full-day prekindergarten: Experimental evidence of impacts on children's school readiness. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 41(4):537-562. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0162373719872197 cited by 40
88. Card D, Giuliano L (2016). Universal screening increases the representation of low-income and minority students in gifted education. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113(48):13678-13683. (natural experiment) doi:10.1073/pnas.1605043113 cited by 303
89. Grissom JA, Redding C (2016). Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs. AERA Open 2(1). (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/2332858415622175 cited by 400
90. McBee MT, Peters SJ, Miller EM (2016). The Impact of the Nomination Stage on Gifted Program Identification: A Comprehensive Psychometric Analysis. Gifted Child Quarterly 60(4):258-278. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1177/0016986216656256 cited by 181
91. Peters SJ, Rambo-Hernandez K, Makel MC, Matthews MS, Plucker JA (2019). Effect of Local Norms on Racial and Ethnic Representation in Gifted Education. AERA Open 5(2). (cross-sectional) doi:10.1177/2332858419848446 cited by 97
92. Card D, Giuliano L (2016). Can Tracking Raise the Test Scores of High-Ability Minority Students? American Economic Review 106(10):2783-2816. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1257/aer.20150484 cited by 111
93. Bui SA, Craig SG, Imberman SA (2014). Is Gifted Education a Bright Idea? Assessing the Impact of Gifted and Talented Programs on Students. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 6(3):30-62. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1257/pol.6.3.30 cited by 90
94. Redding C, Grissom JA (2021). Do Students in Gifted Programs Perform Better? Linking Gifted Program Participation to Achievement and Nonachievement Outcomes. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 43(3):520-544. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/01623737211008919 cited by 39
95. Schwerdt G, West MR, Winters MA (2017). The effects of test-based retention on student outcomes over time: Regression discontinuity evidence from Florida. Journal of Public Economics 152:154-169. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2017.06.004 cited by 122

96. Hwang NY, Koedel C (2023). Helping or hurting: The effects of retention in the third grade on student outcomes. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 47(1):65-88. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3102/01623737231197639 cited by 9

97. Slungaard Mumma K, Winters MA (2023). The Effect of Retention Under Mississippi's Test-Based Promotion Policy. Working paper, Wheelock Educational Policy Center, Boston University. (regression discontinuity) link

98. Zhong J (2026). Early grade retention harms adult earnings. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 18(4):276-308. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1257/app.20230121

99. Jacob BA, Lefgren L (2009). The effect of grade retention on high school completion. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 1(3):33-58. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1257/app.1.3.33 cited by 214

00. Eren O, Depew B, Barnes S (2017). Test-based promotion policies, dropping out, and juvenile crime. Journal of Public Economics 153:9-31. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2017.07.002 cited by 64

01. Ozek U (2015). Hold back to move forward? Early grade retention and student misbehavior. Education Finance and Policy 10(3):350-377. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1162/EDFP_a_00166 cited by 43

02. Figlio D, Ozek U (2020). An extra year to learn English? Early grade retention and the human capital development of English learners. Journal of Public Economics 186:104184. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104184 cited by 27

03. Allen CS, Chen Q, Willson VL, Hughes JN (2009). Quality of research design moderates effects of grade retention on achievement: A meta-analytic, multilevel analysis. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 31(4):480-499. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0162373709352239 cited by 257

04. Jimerson SR (2001). Meta-analysis of grade retention research: Implications for practice in the 21st century. School Psychology Review 30(3):420-437. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1080/02796015.2001.12086124 cited by 599

05. Winters MA (2022). The cost of retention under a test-based promotion policy for taxpayers and students. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 45(4):688-695. (review) doi:10.3102/01623737221138041 cited by 1

06. Brookhart SM, Guskey TR, Bowers AJ, McMillan JH, Smith JK, Smith LF, Stevens MT, Welsh ME (2016). A century of grading research: Meaning and value in the most common educational measure. Review of Educational Research 86(4):803-848. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654316672069 cited by 392

07. Kramer SL, Posner B, Browman A, Lawrence N, Cardichon J (2024). The impacts of a standards-based grading system emphasizing formative assessment, feedback, and re-assessment: A mixed methods, cluster randomized control trial in ninth grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 18(1):56-87. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2023.2287594 cited by 4

08. Gershenson S, Holt SB, Tyner A (2024). Making the grade: The effect of teacher grading standards on student outcomes. Contemporary Economic Policy 42(2):305-318. (longitudinal) doi:10.1111/coep.12637 cited by 4

09. Betts JR, Grogger J (2003). The impact of grading standards on student achievement, educational attainment, and entry-level earnings. Economics of Education Review 22(4):343-352. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/S0272-7757(02)00059-6 cited by 134

10. Figlio DN, Lucas ME (2004). Do high grading standards affect student performance? Journal of Public Economics 88(9-10):1815-1834. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/S0047-2727(03)00039-2 cited by 147

11. Carey T, Carifio J (2012). The minimum grading controversy: Results of a quantitative study of seven years of grading data from an urban high school. Educational Researcher 41(6):201-208. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0013189x12453309 cited by 22

12. Carifio J, Carey T (2009). A critical examination of current minimum grading policy recommendations. The High School Journal 93(1):23-37. (review) doi:10.1353/hsj.0.0039 cited by 25
13. Reeves DB (2004). The case against the zero. Phi Delta Kappan 86(4):324-325. (standard) doi:10.1177/003172170408600418 cited by 51
14. Welsh ME, D'Agostino JV, Kaniskan B (2013). Grading as a reform effort: Do standards-based grades converge with test scores? Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice 32(2):26-36. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/emip.12009 cited by 34
15. Guskey TR, Link LJ (2019). Exploring the factors teachers consider in determining students' grades. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice 26(3):303-320. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/0969594X.2018.1555515 cited by 75
16. Hjorth-Trolle A, Rosenqvist E, Hed H (2021). Grading practices and the social gradient in GPA: Quasi-experimental evidence from Sweden. European Sociological Review 38(3):455-471. (natural experiment) doi:10.1093/esr/jcab053 cited by 6
17. Feldman J (2018). Grading for Equity: What It Is, Why It Matters, and How It Can Transform Schools and Classrooms. Corwin, Thousand Oaks CA. (standard) link
18. Nickow A, Oreopoulos P, Quan V (2024). The Promise of Tutoring for PreK-12 Learning: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence. American Educational Research Journal 61(1):74-107. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/00028312231208687 cited by 83
19. Nickow A, Oreopoulos P, Quan V (2020). The Impressive Effects of Tutoring on PreK-12 Learning: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence. NBER Working Paper 27476. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3386/w27476 cited by 171
20. Kraft MA, Schueler BE, Falken G (2026). What Impacts Should We Expect From Tutoring at Scale? Exploring Meta-Analytic Generalizability. Review of Educational Research. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/00346543261446660 cited by 6
21. Guryan J, Ludwig J, Bhatt MP, Cook PJ, Davis JMV, Dodge K, et al. (2023). Not Too Late: Improving Academic Outcomes among Adolescents. American Economic Review 113(3):738-765. (RCT) doi:10.1257/aer.20210434 cited by 77
22. Kraft MA, Falken GT (2021). A Blueprint for Scaling Tutoring and Mentoring Across Public Schools. AERA Open 7. (review) doi:10.1177/23328584211042858 cited by 69
23. Kraft MA, Edwards DS, Cannata M (2024). The Scaling Dynamics and Causal Effects of a District-Operated Tutoring Program. EdWorkingPaper 24-1030, Annenberg Institute at Brown University. (RCT) doi:10.26300/zcw7-4547 cited by 4
24. Dietrichson J, Bog M, Filges T, Klint Jorgensen AM (2017). Academic Interventions for Elementary and Middle School Students With Low Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Review of Educational Research 87(2):243-282. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0034654316687036 cited by 288
25. Koedel, C., Li, D., Polikoff, M. S., Hardaway, T., & Wrabel, S. L. (2017). Mathematics Curriculum Effects on Student Achievement in California. AERA Open 3(1). (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1177/2332858417690511 cited by 47
26. Koedel, C., & Polikoff, M. (2017). Big bang for just a few bucks: The impact of math textbooks in California. Evidence Speaks Reports 2(5). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. (review) link
27. Jackson, C. K., & Makarin, A. (2018). Can Online Off-the-Shelf Lessons Improve Student Outcomes? Evidence from a Field Experiment. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 10(3):226-254. (RCT)

doi:10.1257/pol.20170211 cited by 51

28. Agodini, R., Harris, B., Thomas, M., Murphy, R., & Gallagher, L. (2010). Achievement Effects of Four Early Elementary School Math Curricula: Findings for First and Second Graders. NCEE 2011-4001. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences. (RCT) link
29. Bhatt, R., & Koedel, C. (2012). Large-Scale Evaluations of Curricular Effectiveness: The Case of Elementary Mathematics in Indiana. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 34(4):391-412. (natural experiment) doi:10.3102/0162373712440040 cited by 35
30. Blazar, D., Heller, B., Kane, T. J., Polikoff, M., Staiger, D. O., Carrell, S., Goldhaber, D., Harris, D. N., Hitch, R., Holden, K. L., & Kurlaender, M. (2020). Curriculum Reform in the Common Core Era: Evaluating Elementary Math Textbooks Across Six U.S. States. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 39(4):966-1019. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1002/pam.22257 cited by 25
31. Taylor, J. A., Getty, S. R., Kowalski, S. M., Wilson, C. D., Carlson, J., & Van Scotter, P. (2015). An Efficacy Trial of Research-Based Curriculum Materials With Curriculum-Based Professional Development. American Educational Research Journal 52(5):984-1017. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0002831215585962 cited by 46
32. Polikoff, M. S., Campbell, S. E., Rabovsky, S., Koedel, C., Le, Q. T., Hardaway, T., & Gasparian, H. (2020). The formalized processes districts use to evaluate mathematics textbooks. Journal of Curriculum Studies 52(4):451-477. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/00220272.2020.1747116 cited by 15
33. Kaufman, J. H., Doan, S., & Fernandez, M. P. (2021). The Rise of Standards-Aligned Instructional Materials for U.S. K-12 Mathematics and English Language Arts Instruction. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. (cross-sectional) doi:10.7249/RRA134-11
34. Steiner, D. (2017). Curriculum Research: What We Know and Where We Need to Go. Washington, DC: StandardsWork, for the Knowledge Matters Campaign. (review) link
35. Cooper H, Robinson JC, Patall EA (2006). Does homework improve academic achievement? A synthesis of research, 1987-2003. Review of Educational Research 76(1):1-62. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/00346543076001001 cited by 1230
36. Fan H, Xu J, Cai Z, He J, Fan X (2017). Homework and students' achievement in math and science: A 30-year meta-analysis, 1986-2015. Educational Research Review 20:35-54. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2016.11.003 cited by 258
37. Bas G, Senturk C, Cigerci FM (2017). Homework and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. Issues in Educational Research 27(1):31-50. (meta-analysis) link
38. Trautwein U (2007). The homework-achievement relation reconsidered: Differentiating homework time, homework frequency, and homework effort. Learning and Instruction 17(3):372-388. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2007.02.009 cited by 378
39. Fernandez-Alonso R, Suarez-Alvarez J, Muniz J (2015). Adolescents' homework performance in mathematics and science: Personal factors and teaching practices. Journal of Educational Psychology 107(4):1075-1085. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/edu0000032 cited by 124
40. Eren O, Henderson DJ (2008). The impact of homework on student achievement. Econometrics Journal 11(2):326-348. (longitudinal) doi:10.1111/j.1368-423X.2008.00244.x cited by 76
41. Ronning M (2011). Who benefits from homework assignments? Economics of Education Review 30(1):55-64. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.07.001 cited by 99
42. Daw J (2012). Parental income and the fruits of labor: Variability in homework efficacy in secondary school. Research in Social Stratification and Mobility 30(3):246-264. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.rssm.2012.01.004

cited by 28

43. Galloway M, Conner J, Pope D (2013). Nonacademic effects of homework in privileged, high-performing high schools. Journal of Experimental Education 81(4):490-510. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/00220973.2012.745469 cited by 127
44. Pressman RM, Sugarman DB, Nemon ML, Desjarlais J, Owens JA, Schettini-Evans A (2015). Homework and family stress: With consideration of parents' self confidence, educational level, and cultural background. American Journal of Family Therapy 43(4):297-313. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/01926187.2015.1061407 cited by 59
45. Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2015). Middle School Math Acceleration and Equitable Access to Eighth-Grade Algebra: Evidence From the Wake County Public School System. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(1S):80S-101S. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3102/0162373715576076 cited by 48
46. Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2017). Objective course placement and college readiness: Evidence from targeted middle school math acceleration. Economics of Education Review 58:141-161. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2017.04.002 cited by 40
47. Clotfelter CT, Ladd HF, Vigdor JL (2015). The Aftermath of Accelerating Algebra: Evidence from District Policy Initiatives. Journal of Human Resources 50(1):159-188. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3368/jhr.50.1.159 cited by 14
48. Domina T, McEachin A, Penner A, Penner E (2015). Aiming High and Falling Short: California's Eighth-Grade Algebra-for-All Effort. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(3):275-295. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0162373714543685 cited by 72
49. Allensworth E, Nomi T, Montgomery N, Lee VE (2009). College Preparatory Curriculum for All: Academic Consequences of Requiring Algebra and English I for Ninth Graders in Chicago. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 31(4):367-391. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0162373709343471 cited by 170
50. Cortes KE, Goodman JS, Nomi T (2015). Intensive Math Instruction and Educational Attainment: Long-Run Impacts of Double-Dose Algebra. Journal of Human Resources 50(1):108-158. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3368/jhr.50.1.108 cited by 20
51. Dee TS, Huffaker E (2026). Accelerating Opportunity: The Effects of Instructionally Supported Detracking. American Educational Research Journal 63(2):307-350. (RCT) doi:10.3102/00028312251408539 cited by 1
52. Huffaker E, Novicoff S, Dee TS (2025). Ahead of the Game? Course-Taking Patterns Under a Math Pathways Reform. Educational Researcher 54(2):91-102. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0013189x241309642 cited by 4
53. Card D, Giuliano L (2016). Can Tracking Raise the Test Scores of High-Ability Minority Students? American Economic Review 106(10):2783-2816. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1257/aer.20150484 cited by 111
54. Balu R, Zhu P, Doolittle F, Schiller E, Jenkins J, Gersten R (2015). Evaluation of Response to Intervention Practices for Elementary School Reading. NCEE 2016-4000. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. (regression discontinuity) link
55. Gersten R, Jayanthi M, Dimino J (2017). Too much, too soon? Unanswered questions from national Response to Intervention evaluation. Exceptional Children 83(3):244-254. (review) doi:10.1177/0014402917692847 cited by 50
56. Fuchs D, Fuchs LS (2017). Critique of the national evaluation of Response to Intervention: A case for simpler frameworks. Exceptional Children 83(3):255-268. (review) doi:10.1177/0014402917693580 cited by 161

57. Gersten R, Haymond K, Newman-Gonchar R, Dimino J, Jayanthi M (2020). Meta-analysis of the impact of reading interventions for students in the primary grades. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 13(2):401-427. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1080/19345747.2019.1689591 cited by 183

58. Wanzek J, Vaughn S, Scammacca N, Gatlin B, Walker MA, Capin P (2016). Meta-analyses of the effects of Tier 2 type reading interventions in grades K-3. Educational Psychology Review 28(3):551-576. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s10648-015-9321-7 cited by 208

59. Wanzek J, Stevens EA, Williams KJ, Scammacca N, Vaughn S, Sargent K (2018). Current evidence on the effects of intensive early reading interventions. Journal of Learning Disabilities 51(6):612-624. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/0022219418775110 cited by 189

60. Al Otaiba S, Connor CM, Folsom JS, Wanzek J, Greulich L, Schatschneider C, Wagner RK (2014). To wait in Tier 1 or intervene immediately: A randomized experiment examining first-grade response to intervention in reading. Exceptional Children 81(1):11-27. (RCT) doi:10.1177/0014402914532234 cited by 129

61. January SA, Klingbeil DA (2020). Universal screening in grades K-2: A systematic review and meta-analysis of early reading curriculum-based measures. Journal of School Psychology 82:103-122. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2020.08.007 cited by 38

62. Jenkins JR, Hudson RF, Johnson ES (2007). Screening for at-risk readers in a Response to Intervention framework. School Psychology Review 36(4):582-600. (review) doi:10.1080/02796015.2007.12087919 cited by 300

63. Gersten R, Compton D, Connor CM, Dimino J, Santoro L, Linan-Thompson S, Tilly WD (2009). Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades. IES Practice Guide NCEE 2009-4045. What Works Clearinghouse. (standard) link

64. Burns MK, Appleton JJ, Stehouwer JD (2005). Meta-analytic review of responsiveness-to-intervention research: Examining field-based and research-implemented models. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment 23(4):381-394. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/073428290502300406 cited by 228

65. Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A Summary of the Evidence on Inclusive Education. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, for Instituto Alana. (review) link

66. Cole, S. M., Murphy, H. R., Frisby, M. B., Grossi, T. A., & Bolte, H. R. (2020). The Relationship of Special Education Placement and Student Academic Outcomes. The Journal of Special Education 54(4):217-227. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0022466920925033 cited by 44

67. Gilmour, A. F. (2018). Has Inclusion Gone Too Far? Weighing Its Effects on Students With Disabilities, Their Peers, and Teachers. Education Next 18(4). (review) link

68. Gilmour, A. F., Fuchs, D., & Wehby, J. H. (2019). Are Students With Disabilities Accessing the Curriculum? A Meta-Analysis of the Reading Achievement Gap Between Students With and Without Disabilities. Exceptional Children 85(3):329-346. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/0014402918795830 cited by 163

69. Ballis, B., & Heath, K. (2021). The Long-Run Impacts of Special Education. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 13(4):72-111. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1257/pol.20190603 cited by 47

70. Schwartz, A. E., Hopkins, B. G., & Stiefel, L. (2021). The Effects of Special Education on the Academic Performance of Students with Learning Disabilities. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 40(2):480-520. (longitudinal) doi:10.1002/pam.22282 cited by 99

71. Hurwitz, S., Perry, B., Cohen, E. D., & Skiba, R. (2020). Special Education and Individualized Academic Growth: A Longitudinal Assessment of Outcomes for Students With Disabilities. American Educational Research Journal 57(2):576-611. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0002831219857054 cited by 75

72. Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2002). Inferring Program Effects for Special Populations: Does Special Education Raise Achievement for Students with Disabilities? Review of Economics and Statistics 84(4):584-599. (longitudinal) doi:10.1162/003465302760556431 cited by 262

73. Krämer, S., Möller, J., & Zimmermann, F. (2021). Inclusive Education of Students With General Learning Difficulties: A Meta-Analysis. Review of Educational Research 91(3):432-478. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0034654321998072 cited by 122

74. Szumski, G., Smogorzewska, J., & Karwowski, M. (2017). Academic achievement of students without special educational needs in inclusive classrooms: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review 21:33-54. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2017.02.004 cited by 214

75. King-Sears, M. E., Stefanidis, A., Berkeley, S., & Strogilos, V. (2021). Does co-teaching improve academic achievement for students with disabilities? A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review 34:100405. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100405 cited by 59

76. Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Swanson, E., & McCulley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The empirical foundations of inclusion and co-teaching. Psychology in the Schools 49(5):498-510. (review) doi:10.1002/pits.21606 cited by 264

77. Theobald, R. J., Goldhaber, D. D., Gratz, T. M., & Holden, K. L. (2019). Career and Technical Education, Inclusion, and Postsecondary Outcomes for Students With Learning Disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities 52(2):109-119. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0022219418775121 cited by 61

78. Gilmour, A. F., & Henry, G. T. (2018). A Comparison of Teacher Quality in Math for Late Elementary and Middle School Students With and Without Disabilities. The Elementary School Journal 118(3):426-451. (longitudinal) doi:10.1086/696140 cited by 20

79. Lynch K, An L, Mancenido Z (2023). The impact of summer programs on student mathematics achievement: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research 93(2):275-315. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/00346543221105543 cited by 29

80. Kim JS, Quinn DM (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's literacy achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. Review of Educational Research 83(3):386-431. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0034654313483906 cited by 214

81. Augustine CH, McCombs JS, Pane JF, Schwartz HL, Schweig J, McEachin A, Siler-Evans K (2016). Learning from summer: Effects of voluntary summer learning programs on low-income urban youth. RAND Corporation, RR-1557-WF. (RCT) doi:10.7249/RR1557 cited by 53

82. McCombs JS, Augustine CH, Pane JF, Schweig J (2020). Every summer counts: A longitudinal analysis of outcomes from the National Summer Learning Project. RAND Corporation, RR-3201-WF. (RCT) doi:10.7249/RR3201 cited by 14

83. Figlio D, Holden KL, Ozek U (2018). Do students benefit from longer school days? Regression discontinuity evidence from Florida's additional hour of literacy instruction. Economics of Education Review 67:171-183. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.06.003 cited by 49

84. Patall EA, Cooper H, Allen AB (2010). Extending the school day or school year: A systematic review of research (1985-2009). Review of Educational Research 80(3):401-436. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654310377086 cited by 198

85. Kidron Y, Lindsay J (2014). The effects of increased learning time on student academic and nonacademic outcomes: Findings from a meta-analytic review. REL 2014-015. Washington, DC: Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia, Institute of Education Sciences. (meta-analysis) link

86. Atteberry A, McEachin A (2021). School's out: The role of summers in understanding achievement disparities. American Educational Research Journal 58(2):239-282. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0002831220937285 cited by 95

87. von Hippel PT, Hamrock C (2019). Do test score gaps grow before, during, or between the school years? Measurement artifacts and what we can know in spite of them. Sociological Science 6:43-80. (longitudinal) doi:10.15195/v6.a3 cited by 149

88. Fitzpatrick MD, Grissmer D, Hastedt S (2011). What a difference a day makes: Estimating daily learning gains during kindergarten and first grade using a natural experiment. Economics of Education Review 30(2):269-279. (natural experiment) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.09.004 cited by 124

89. Thompson PN (2021). Is four less than five? Effects of four-day school weeks on student achievement in Oregon. Journal of Public Economics 193:104308. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104308 cited by 29

90. Morton E, Thompson PN, Kuhfeld M (2024). A multi-state, student-level analysis of the effects of the four-day school week on student achievement and growth. Economics of Education Review 100:102524. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2024.102524 cited by 9

91. Thompson PN, Ward J (2022). Only a matter of time? The role of time in school on four-day school week achievement impacts. Economics of Education Review 86:102198. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2021.102198 cited by 19

92. Kilburn MR, Phillips A, Gomez CJ, Mariano LT, Doss CJ, Troxel WM, Morton E, Estes K (2021). Does four equal five? Implementation and outcomes of the four-day school week. RAND Corporation, RR-A373-1. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.7249/RR-A373-1 cited by 9

93. Morton E (2022). Effects of 4-day school weeks on older adolescents: Examining impacts of the schedule on academic achievement, attendance, and behavior in high school. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 45(1):52-78. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3102/01623737221097420 cited by 11

94. Anderson DM, Walker MB (2015). Does shortening the school week impact student performance? Evidence from the four-day school week. Education Finance and Policy 10(3):314-349. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1162/EDFP_a_00165 cited by 107

95. Fischer S, Argyle D (2018). Juvenile crime and the four-day school week. Economics of Education Review 64:31-39. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.03.010 cited by 45

96. Thompson PN (2021). Does a day lost equal dollars saved? The effects of four-day school weeks on school district expenditures. National Tax Journal 74(1):147-183. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1086/712916 cited by 19

97. Thompson PN, Gunter KB, Schuna JM Jr, Tomayko EJ (2021). Are all four-day school weeks created equal? A national assessment of four-day school week policy adoption and implementation. Education Finance and Policy 16(4):558-583. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00316 cited by 27

98. Kuhfeld M, Soland J, Lewis K (2022). Test Score Patterns Across Three COVID-19-Impacted School Years. Educational Researcher 51(7):500-506. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0013189x221109178 cited by 209

99. Goldhaber D, Kane TJ, McEachin A, Morton E, Patterson T, Staiger DO (2023). The Educational Consequences of Remote and Hybrid Instruction during the Pandemic. American Economic Review: Insights 5(3):377-392. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/aeri.20220180 cited by 49

00. Jack R, Halloran C, Okun J, Oster E (2023). Pandemic Schooling Mode and Student Test Scores: Evidence from US School Districts. American Economic Review: Insights 5(2):173-190. (natural experiment)

doi:10.1257/aeri.20210748 cited by 104

01. Kofoed MS, Gebhart L, Gilmore D, Moschitto R (2024). Zooming to Class? Experimental Evidence on College Students' Online Learning during COVID-19. American Economic Review: Insights 6(3):324-340. (RCT) doi:10.1257/aeri.20230077 cited by 127
02. Heppen JB, Sorensen N, Allensworth E, Walters K, Rickles J, Taylor SS, Michelman V (2017). The Struggle to Pass Algebra: Online vs. Face-to-Face Credit Recovery for At-Risk Urban Students. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 10(2):272-296. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2016.1168500 cited by 101
03. Marcotte DE, Hemelt SW (2008). Unscheduled School Closings and Student Performance. Education Finance and Policy 3(3):316-338. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/edfp.2008.3.3.316 cited by 223
04. Goodman J (2014). Flaking Out: Student Absences and Snow Days as Disruptions of Instructional Time. NBER Working Paper 20221. (natural experiment) doi:10.3386/w20221 cited by 180
05. Adolescent Sleep Working Group, Committee on Adolescence, Council on School Health, American Academy of Pediatrics (2014). School start times for adolescents. Pediatrics 134(3):642-649. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2014-1697 cited by 468
06. Dunster GP, de la Iglesia L, Ben-Hamo M, Nave C, Fleischer JG, Panda S, de la Iglesia HO (2018). Sleepmore in Seattle: Later school start times are associated with more sleep and better performance in high school students. Science Advances 4(12):eaau6200. (natural experiment) doi:10.1126/sciadv.aau6200 cited by 169
07. Heissel JA, Norris S (2018). Rise and shine: The effect of school start times on academic performance from childhood through puberty. Journal of Human Resources 53(4):957-992. (natural experiment) doi:10.3368/jhr.53.4.0815-7346R1 cited by 64
08. Carrell SE, Maghakian T, West JC (2011). A's from Zzzz's? The causal effect of school start time on the academic achievement of adolescents. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 3(3):62-81. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/pol.3.3.62 cited by 208
09. Bowers JM, Moyer A (2017). Effects of school start time on students' sleep duration, daytime sleepiness, and attendance: a meta-analysis. Sleep Health 3(6):423-431. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.sleh.2017.08.004 cited by 156
10. Minges KE, Redeker NS (2016). Delayed school start times and adolescent sleep: A systematic review of the experimental evidence. Sleep Medicine Reviews 28:86-95. (review) doi:10.1016/j.smrv.2015.06.002 cited by 338
11. Marx R, Tanner-Smith EE, Davison CM, et al. (2017). Later school start times for supporting the education, health, and well-being of high school students. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 7:CD009467. (review) doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009467.pub2 cited by 83
12. Wheaton AG, Chapman DP, Croft JB (2016). School start times, sleep, behavioral, health, and academic outcomes: A review of the literature. Journal of School Health 86(5):363-381. (review) doi:10.1111/josh.12388 cited by 312
13. Lenard M, Morrill M, Westall J (2020). High school start times and student achievement: Looking beyond test scores. Economics of Education Review 76:101975. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2020.101975 cited by 18
14. Groen JA, Pabilonia SW (2019). Snooze or lose: High school start times and academic achievement. Economics of Education Review 72:204-218. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.05.011 cited by 42
15. Bastian KC, Fuller SC (2018). Answering the bell: High school start times and student academic outcomes. AERA Open 4(4):1-14. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/2332858418812424 cited by 12

16. Hafner M, Stepanek M, Troxel WM (2017). Later school start times in the U.S.: An economic analysis. RAND Corporation, RR-2109. (review) doi:10.7249/RR2109 cited by 21
17. Gaffney H, Ttofi MM, Farrington DP (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of school-bullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. Aggression and Violent Behavior 45:111-133. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.001 cited by 519
18. Gaffney H, Farrington DP, Ttofi MM (2019). Examining the effectiveness of school-bullying intervention programs globally: a meta-analysis. International Journal of Bullying Prevention 1(1):14-31. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s42380-019-0007-4 cited by 313
19. Gaffney H, Ttofi MM, Farrington DP (2021). What works in anti-bullying programs? Analysis of effective intervention components. Journal of School Psychology 85:37-56. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2020.12.002 cited by 334
20. Fraguas D, Diaz-Caneja CM, Ayora M, et al. (2021). Assessment of school anti-bullying interventions: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. JAMA Pediatrics 175(1):44-55. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3541 cited by 195
21. Ttofi MM, Farrington DP (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: a systematic and meta-analytic review. Journal of Experimental Criminology 7(1):27-56. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1 cited by 1626
22. Karna A, Voeten M, Little TD, Poskiparta E, Kaljonen A, Salmivalli C (2011). A large-scale evaluation of the KiVa antibullying program: grades 4-6. Child Development 82(1):311-330. (RCT) doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01557.x cited by 731
23. Karna A, Voeten M, Little TD, Alanen E, Poskiparta E, Salmivalli C (2013). Effectiveness of the KiVa antibullying program: grades 1-3 and 7-9. Journal of Educational Psychology 105(2):535-551. (RCT) doi:10.1037/a0030417 cited by 261
24. Waasdorp TE, Bradshaw CP, Leaf PJ (2012). The impact of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on bullying and peer rejection: a randomized controlled effectiveness trial. Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine 166(2):149-156. (RCT) doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2011.755 cited by 263
25. Hatzenbuehler ML, Schwab-Reese L, Ranapurwala SI, Hertz MF, Ramirez MR (2015). Associations between antibullying policies and bullying in 25 states. JAMA Pediatrics 169(10):e152411. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.2411 cited by 157
26. Hatzenbuehler ML, Keyes KM (2013). Inclusive anti-bullying policies and reduced risk of suicide attempts in lesbian and gay youth. Journal of Adolescent Health 53(1 Suppl):S21-S26. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.08.010 cited by 340
27. Meyer IH, Luo F, Wilson BDM, Stone DM (2019). Sexual orientation enumeration in state antibullying statutes in the United States: associations with bullying, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts among youth. LGBT Health 6(1):9-14. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1089/lgbt.2018.0194 cited by 58
28. Kull RM, Greytak EA, Kosciw JG, Villenas C (2016). Effectiveness of school district antibullying policies in improving LGBT youths' school climate. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity 3(4):407-415. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/sgd0000196 cited by 92
29. Yeager DS, Fong CJ, Lee HY, Espelage DL (2015). Declines in efficacy of anti-bullying programs among older adolescents: theory and a three-level meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology 37:36-51. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2014.11.005 cited by 472

30. Modecki KL, Minchin J, Harbaugh AG, Guerra NG, Runions KC (2014). Bullying prevalence across contexts: a meta-analysis measuring cyber and traditional bullying. Journal of Adolescent Health 55(5):602-611. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.06.007 cited by 1468
31. Visser LN, van der Put CE, Assink M (2022). The association between school corporal punishment and child developmental outcomes: a meta-analytic review. Children 9(3):383. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3390/children9030383 cited by 34
32. Gershoff ET, Grogan-Kaylor A (2016). Spanking and child outcomes: old controversies and new meta-analyses. Journal of Family Psychology 30(4):453-469. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1037/fam0000191 cited by 933
33. Gershoff ET, Sattler KMP, Holden GW (2019). School corporal punishment and its associations with achievement and adjustment. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology 63:1-8. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2019.05.004 cited by 58
34. Heekes SL, Kruger CB, Lester SN, Ward CL (2022). A systematic review of corporal punishment in schools: global prevalence and correlates. Trauma, Violence, and Abuse 23(1):52-72. (review) doi:10.1177/1524838020925787 cited by 129
35. Gershoff ET (2017). School corporal punishment in global perspective: prevalence, outcomes, and efforts at intervention. Psychology, Health and Medicine 22(sup1):224-239. (review) doi:10.1080/13548506.2016.1271955 cited by 221
36. Gershoff ET, Font SA (2016). Corporal punishment in U.S. public schools: prevalence, disparities in use, and status in state and federal policy. Social Policy Report 30(1):1-26. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1002/j.2379-3988.2016.tb00086.x cited by 143
37. Font SA, Cage J (2018). Dimensions of physical punishment and their associations with children's cognitive performance and school adjustment. Child Abuse and Neglect 75:29-40. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.06.008 cited by 46
38. Elgar FJ, Donnelly PD, Michaelson V, et al. (2018). Corporal punishment bans and physical fighting in adolescents: an ecological study of 88 countries. BMJ Open 8(9):e021616. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021616 cited by 47
39. Zolotor AJ, Puzia ME (2010). Bans against corporal punishment: a systematic review of the laws, changes in attitudes and behaviours. Child Abuse Review 19(4):229-247. (review) doi:10.1002/car.1131 cited by 161
40. Allison MA, Beers N, Peterson JW, AAP Council on School Health (2023). Corporal punishment in schools. Pediatrics 152(3):e2023063284. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2023-063284 cited by 12
41. Sege RD, Siegel BS, AAP Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (2018). Effective discipline to raise healthy children. Pediatrics 142(6):e20183112. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2018-3112 cited by 203
42. US Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (2023). Corporal Punishment in Public Schools (Focus on Student Discipline, Part 4 of 5), 2017-18 Civil Rights Data Collection. (cross-sectional) link
43. US Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (2025). 2021-22 Civil Rights Data Collection: A First Look. (cross-sectional) link
44. Cardona MA (2023). Letter from the Secretary of Education to governors and chief state school officers calling for an end to corporal punishment in schools, March 24, 2023. (standard) link
45. Gentile E, Imberman SA (2012). Dressed for success? The effect of school uniforms on student achievement and behavior. Journal of Urban Economics 71(1):1-17. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.jue.2011.10.002 cited by 40

46. Brunsma DL, Rockquemore KA (1998). Effects of student uniforms on attendance, behavior problems, substance use, and academic achievement. Journal of Educational Research 92(1):53-62. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/00220679809597575 cited by 105

47. Ansari A, Shepard M, Gottfried MA (2022). School uniforms and student behavior: is there a link? Early Childhood Research Quarterly 58:278-286. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.09.012 cited by 19

48. Yeung R (2009). Are school uniforms a good fit? Results from the ECLS-K and the NELS. Educational Policy 23(6):847-874. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0895904808330170 cited by 29

49. Reidy J (2021). Reviewing school uniform through a public health lens: evidence about the impacts of school uniform on education and health. Public Health Reviews 42:1604212. (review) doi:10.3389/phrs.2021.1604212 cited by 25

50. Nathan N, McCarthy N, Hope K, et al. (2021). The impact of school uniforms on primary school student's physical activity at school: outcomes of a cluster randomized controlled trial. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity 18:17. (RCT) doi:10.1186/s12966-021-01084-0 cited by 39

51. US Government Accountability Office (2022). K-12 Education: Department of Education Should Provide Information on Equity and Safety in School Dress Codes. GAO-23-105348, October 25, 2022. (cross-sectional) link

52. Edwards TK, Marshall C (2020). Undressing policy: a critical analysis of North Carolina (USA) public school dress codes. Gender and Education 32(6):732-750. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/09540253.2018.1503234 cited by 27

53. Morris EW, Perry BL (2017). Girls behaving badly? Race, gender, and subjective evaluation in the discipline of African American girls. Sociology of Education 90(2):127-148. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0038040717694876 cited by 239

54. Baumann C, Krskova H (2016). School discipline, school uniforms and academic performance. International Journal of Educational Management 30(6):1003-1029. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1108/ijem-09-2015-0118 cited by 99

55. National Women's Law Center (2018). Dress Coded: Black Girls, Bodies, and Bias in D.C. Schools. (cross-sectional) link

56. US Government Accountability Office (2009). Seclusions and Restraints: Selected Cases of Death and Abuse at Public and Private Schools and Treatment Centers. GAO-09-719T, May 19, 2009. (review) link

57. US Government Accountability Office (2019). K-12 Education: Education Should Take Immediate Action to Address Inaccuracies in Federal Restraint and Seclusion Data. GAO-19-551R, June 18, 2019. (review) link

58. US Government Accountability Office (2020). K-12 Education: Education Needs to Address Significant Quality Issues with its Restraint and Seclusion Data. GAO-20-345, April 21, 2020. (review) link

59. US Department of Education (2012). Restraint and Seclusion: Resource Document. Washington, DC, May 15, 2012. (standard) link

60. US Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (2025). 2021-22 Civil Rights Data Collection: A First Look. (cross-sectional) link

61. Gage NA, Pico DL, Evanovich L (2022). National trends and school-level predictors of restraint and seclusion for students with disabilities. Exceptionality 30(1):1-13. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/09362835.2020.1727327 cited by 38

62. Hodgkiss B, Harding E (2023). Reducing physical restraint in educational settings: a systematic literature review. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs 23(4):265-277. (review) doi:10.1111/1471-3802.12598

cited by 6

63. Trader B, Stonemeier J, Berg T, et al. (2017). Promoting inclusion through evidence-based alternatives to restraint and seclusion. Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities 42(2):75-88. (review) doi:10.1177/1540796917698830 cited by 40

64. Kern L, George HP, Evanovich LL, Hodnett JM, Freeman J (2024). A review of U.S. policy guidance and legislation on restraint and seclusion in schools: considerations for improvement. Exceptional Children 90(4):382-397. (review) doi:10.1177/00144029241247032 cited by 12

65. Mohr WK, Petti TA, Mohr BD (2003). Adverse effects associated with physical restraint. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry 48(5):330-337. (review) doi:10.1177/070674370304800509 cited by 369

66. Scheuermann B, Peterson R, Ryan JB, Billingsley G (2016). Professional practice and ethical issues related to physical restraint and seclusion in schools. Journal of Disability Policy Studies 27(2):86-95. (standard) doi:10.1177/1044207315604366 cited by 38

67. Thapa A, Cohen J, Guffey S, Higgins-D'Alessandro A (2013). A review of school climate research. Review of Educational Research 83(3):357-385. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654313483907 cited by 2337

68. Wang MT, Degol JL (2016). School climate: a review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. Educational Psychology Review 28(2):315-352. (review) doi:10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1 cited by 1476

69. Erdem C, Kaya M (2024). The relationship between school and classroom climate, and academic achievement: a meta-analysis. School Psychology International 45(4):380-408. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/01430343231202923 cited by 57

70. Berkowitz R, Moore H, Astor RA, Benbenishty R (2017). A research synthesis of the associations between socioeconomic background, inequality, school climate, and academic achievement. Review of Educational Research 87(2):425-469. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654316669821 cited by 631

71. Aldridge JM, McChesney K (2018). The relationships between school climate and adolescent mental health and wellbeing: a systematic literature review. International Journal of Educational Research 88:121-145. (review) doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2018.01.012 cited by 565

72. Kraft MA, Marinell WH, Yee DS (2016). School organizational contexts, teacher turnover, and student achievement: evidence from panel data. American Educational Research Journal 53(5):1411-1449. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0002831216667478 cited by 329

73. Konold T, Cornell D, Jia Y, Malone M (2018). School climate, student engagement, and academic achievement: a latent variable, multilevel multi-informant examination. AERA Open 4(4). (cross-sectional) doi:10.1177/2332858418815661 cited by 162

74. Daily SM, Mann MJ, Kristjansson AL, Smith ML, Zullig KJ (2019). School climate and academic achievement in middle and high school students. Journal of School Health 89(3):173-180. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/josh.12726 cited by 137

75. Bradshaw CP, Waasdorp TE, Leaf PJ (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. Pediatrics 130(5):e1136-e1145. (RCT) doi:10.1542/peds.2012-0243 cited by 474

76. West MR, Pier L, Fricke H, Hough H, Loeb S, Meyer RH, Rice AB (2020). Trends in student social-emotional learning: evidence from the first large-scale panel student survey. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 42(2):279-303. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0162373720912236 cited by 62

77. Duckworth AL, Yeager DS (2015). Measurement matters: assessing personal qualities other than cognitive ability for educational purposes. Educational Researcher 44(4):237-251. (review) doi:10.3102/0013189X15584327 cited by 993

78. National Center for Education Statistics. ED School Climate Surveys (EDSCLS). (standard) link

79. Durlak JA, Weissberg RP, Dymnicki AB, Taylor RD, Schellinger KB (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child Development 82(1):405-432. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x cited by 8815

80. Taylor RD, Oberle E, Durlak JA, Weissberg RP (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. Child Development 88(4):1156-1171. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1111/cdev.12864 cited by 2350

81. Durlak JA, Mahoney JL, Boyle AE (2022). What we know, and what we need to find out about universal, school-based social and emotional learning programs for children and adolescents: A review of meta-analyses and directions for future research. Psychological Bulletin 148(11-12):765-782. (review) doi:10.1037/bul0000383 cited by 413

82. Cipriano C, Strambler MJ, Naples LH, et al. (2023). The state of evidence for social and emotional learning: A contemporary meta-analysis of universal school-based SEL interventions. Child Development 94(5):1181-1204. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1111/cdev.13968 cited by 638

83. Corcoran RP, Cheung ACK, Kim E, Xie C (2018). Effective universal school-based social and emotional learning programs for improving academic achievement: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 50 years of research. Educational Research Review 25:56-72. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2017.12.001 cited by 508

84. Wigelsworth M, Lendrum A, Oldfield J, Scott A, ten Bokkel I, Tate K, Emery C (2016). The impact of trial stage, developer involvement and international transferability on universal social and emotional learning programme outcomes: A meta-analysis. Cambridge Journal of Education 46(3):347-376. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1080/0305764X.2016.1195791 cited by 263

85. Humphrey N, Barlow A, Wigelsworth M, et al. (2016). A cluster randomized controlled trial of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum. Journal of School Psychology 58:73-89. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2016.07.002 cited by 84

86. Jones SM, Brown JL, Aber JL (2011). Two-year impacts of a universal school-based social-emotional and literacy intervention: An experiment in translational developmental research. Child Development 82(2):533-554. (RCT) doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01560.x cited by 351

87. Kuyken W, Ball S, Crane C, et al. (2022). Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of universal school-based mindfulness training compared with normal school provision in reducing risk of mental health problems and promoting well-being in adolescence: The MYRIAD cluster randomised controlled trial. Evidence-Based Mental Health 25(3):99-109. (RCT) doi:10.1136/ebmental-2021-300396 cited by 285

88. Harvey LJ, White FA, Hunt C, Abbott M (2023). Investigating the efficacy of a Dialectical behaviour therapy-based universal intervention on adolescent social and emotional well-being outcomes. Behaviour Research and Therapy 169:104408. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.brat.2023.104408 cited by 50

89. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). The CASEL framework and the CASEL Program Guide (SELect program ratings). (standard) link

90. Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975). Supreme Court of the United States, decided January 22, 1975. (standard) link

91. New Jersey v. T.L.O., 469 U.S. 325 (1985). Supreme Court of the United States, decided January 15, 1985. (standard) link
92. Safford Unified School District #1 v. Redding, 557 U.S. 364 (2009). Supreme Court of the United States, decided June 25, 2009. (standard) link
93. Vernonia School District 47J v. Acton, 515 U.S. 646 (1995). Supreme Court of the United States. (standard) link
94. Board of Education of Independent School District No. 92 of Pottawatomie County v. Earls, 536 U.S. 822 (2002). Supreme Court of the United States. (standard) link
95. James-Burdumy S, Goesling B, Deke J, Einspruch E (2010). The Effectiveness of Mandatory-Random Student Drug Testing. NCEE 2010-4025. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences. (RCT) link
96. Yamaguchi R, Johnston LD, O'Malley PM (2003). Relationship between student illicit drug use and school drug-testing policies. Journal of School Health 73(4):159-164. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2003.tb03596.x cited by 92
97. Goldberg L, Elliot DL, MacKinnon DP, et al. (2007). Outcomes of a prospective trial of student-athlete drug testing: the Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification (SATURN) study. Journal of Adolescent Health 41(5):421-429. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.001 cited by 55
98. Sznitman SR, Romer D (2014). Student drug testing and positive school climates: testing the relation between two school characteristics and drug use behavior in a longitudinal study. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs 75(1):65-73. (longitudinal) doi:10.15288/jsad.2014.75.65 cited by 20
99. Bacher-Hicks A, Billings SB, Deming DJ (2024). The school-to-prison pipeline: long-run impacts of school suspensions on adult crime. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 16(4):165-193. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/pol.20230052 cited by 23
00. Lacoe J, Steinberg MP (2019). Do suspensions affect student outcomes? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 41(1):34-62. (natural experiment) doi:10.3102/0162373718794897 cited by 132
01. Sorensen LC, Bushway SD, Gifford EJ (2022). Getting tough? The effects of discretionary principal discipline on student outcomes. Education Finance and Policy 17(2):255-284. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00341 cited by 55
02. Craig AC, Martin DC (2025). Discipline reform, school culture and student achievement. The Economic Journal 136(675):1029-1065. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1093/ej/ueaf081 cited by 3
03. Hinze-Pifer R, Sartain L (2018). Rethinking universal suspension for severe student behavior. Peabody Journal of Education 93(2):228-243. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435051 cited by 37
04. Pope NG, Zuo GW (2023). Suspending suspensions: the education production consequences of school suspension policies. The Economic Journal 133(653):2025-2054. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1093/ej/uead011 cited by 12
05. Lacoe J, Steinberg MP (2018). Rolling back zero tolerance: the effect of discipline policy reform on suspension usage and student outcomes. Peabody Journal of Education 93(2):207-227. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435047 cited by 64
06. Steinberg MP, Lacoe J (2018). Reforming school discipline: school-level policy implementation and the consequences for suspended students and their peers. American Journal of Education 125(1):29-77. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1086/699811 cited by 29
07. Hwang N, Domina T (2021). Peer disruption and learning: links between suspensions and the educational achievement of non-suspended students. Education Finance and Policy 16(3):443-463. (longitudinal)

doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00308 cited by 18

08. Carrell SE, Hoekstra M, Kuka E (2018). The long-run effects of disruptive peers. American Economic Review 108(11):3377-3415. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/aer.20160763 cited by 268
09. Noltemeyer AL, Ward RM, Mcloughlin C (2015). Relationship between school suspension and student outcomes: a meta-analysis. School Psychology Review 44(2):224-240. (meta-analysis) doi:10.17105/spr-14-0008.1 cited by 455
10. Rosenbaum J (2020). Educational and criminal justice outcomes 12 years after school suspension. Youth and Society 52(4):515-547. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0044118x17752208 cited by 174
11. Mittleman J (2018). A downward spiral? Childhood suspension and the path to juvenile arrest. Sociology of Education 91(3):183-204. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0038040718784603 cited by 131
12. Valdebenito S, Gaffney H, Arosemena-Burbano F, et al. (2025). School-based interventions for reducing disciplinary school exclusion: an updated systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews 21(4). (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/cl2.70063 cited by 4
13. Welsh RO, Little S (2018). The school discipline dilemma: a comprehensive review of disparities and alternative approaches. Review of Educational Research 88(5):752-794. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654318791582 cited by 442
14. American Academy of Pediatrics Council on School Health (2013). Out-of-school suspension and expulsion. Pediatrics 131(3):e1000-e1007. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2012-3932 cited by 277
15. US Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (2023). Student Discipline and School Climate in U.S. Public Schools, 2020-21 Civil Rights Data Collection. (cross-sectional) link
16. Lee A, Gage NA (2020). Updating and expanding systematic reviews and meta-analyses on the effects of school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports. Psychology in the Schools 57(5):783-804. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/pits.22336 cited by 163
17. Bradshaw CP, Mitchell MM, Leaf PJ (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 12(3):133-148. (RCT) doi:10.1177/1098300709334798 cited by 868
18. Bradshaw CP, Waasdorp TE, Leaf PJ (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. Pediatrics 130(5):e1136-e1145. (RCT) doi:10.1542/peds.2012-0243 cited by 474
19. Horner RH, Sugai G, Smolkowski K, et al. (2009). A randomized, wait-list controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 11(3):133-144. (RCT) doi:10.1177/1098300709332067 cited by 828
20. Lee J, Watson K, Yang HW (2026). Positive enough? A meta-analysis on positive behavior support for young children. Journal of Research in Childhood Education. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1080/02568543.2025.2612590
21. Augustine CH, Engberg J, Grimm GE, et al. (2018). Can Restorative Practices Improve School Climate and Curb Suspensions? An Evaluation of the Impact of Restorative Practices in a Mid-Sized Urban School District. RAND Corporation, RR-2840-DOJ. (RCT) doi:10.7249/RR2840 cited by 177
22. Acosta J, Chinman M, Ebener P, et al. (2019). Evaluation of a whole-school change intervention: findings from a two-year cluster-randomized trial of the Restorative Practices Intervention. Journal of Youth and Adolescence 48(5):876-890. (RCT) doi:10.1007/s10964-019-01013-2 cited by 166

23. Darling-Hammond S, Fronius TA, Sutherland H, et al. (2020). Effectiveness of restorative justice in US K-12 schools: a review of quantitative research. Contemporary School Psychology 24(3):295-308. (review) doi:10.1007/s40688-020-00290-0 cited by 101

24. Lodi E, Perrella L, Lepri GL, Scarpa ML, Patrizi P (2022). Use of restorative justice and restorative practices at school: a systematic literature review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 19(1):96. (review) doi:10.3390/ijerph19010096 cited by 186

25. Valdebenito S, Gaffney H, Arosemena-Burbano F, et al. (2025). School-based interventions for reducing disciplinary school exclusion: an updated systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews 21(4). (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/cl2.70063 cited by 4

26. Maynard BR, Farina A, Dell NA, Kelly MS (2019). Effects of trauma-informed approaches in schools: a systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews 15(1-2):e1018. (review) doi:10.1002/cl2.1018 cited by 265

27. Kellam SG, Brown CH, Poduska JM, et al. (2008). Effects of a universal classroom behavior management program in first and second grades on young adult behavioral, psychiatric, and social outcomes. Drug and Alcohol Dependence 95(Suppl 1):S5-S28. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2008.01.004 cited by 431

28. Cornell DG, Allen K, Fan X (2012). A randomized controlled study of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in kindergarten through grade 12. School Psychology Review 41(1):100-115. (RCT) doi:10.1080/02796015.2012.12087378 cited by 101

29. Maeng JL, Cornell DG, Huang FL (2020). Student threat assessment as an alternative to exclusionary discipline. Journal of School Violence 19(3):377-388. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/15388220.2019.1707682 cited by 33

30. Cornell D, Maeng JL, Burnette AG, Jia Y, Huang F, Konold T, Datta P, Malone M, Meyer P (2018). Student threat assessment as a standard school safety practice: results from a statewide implementation study. School Psychology Quarterly 33(2):213-222. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/spq0000220 cited by 50

31. Cornell D, Maeng J, Huang F, Shukla K, Konold T (2018). Racial/ethnic parity in disciplinary consequences using student threat assessment. School Psychology Review 47(2):183-195. (cross-sectional) doi:10.17105/SPR-2017-0030.V47-2 cited by 54

32. Maeng JL, Cornell DG, Edwards K (2024). Threat assessment and disparities in school discipline. Journal of Threat Assessment and Management 11(3):186-196. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/tam0000213 cited by 9

33. Nekvasil EK, Cornell DG (2015). Student threat assessment associated with safety in middle schools. Journal of Threat Assessment and Management 2(2):98-113. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/tam0000038 cited by 41

34. Cornell DG, Sheras PL, Gregory A, Fan X (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia Threat Assessment Guidelines versus alternative approaches. School Psychology Quarterly 24(2):119-129. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/a0016182 cited by 169

35. Burnette AG, Datta P, Cornell D (2018). The distinction between transient and substantive student threats. Journal of Threat Assessment and Management 5(1):4-20. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1037/tam0000092 cited by 30

36. US Secret Service National Threat Assessment Center (2019). Protecting America's Schools: A U.S. Secret Service Analysis of Targeted School Violence. (standard) link

37. Hoover NC, Pollard NJ (2000). Initiation Rites in American High Schools: A National Survey. Alfred University. (cross-sectional) link

38. Allan EJ, Madden M (2008). Hazing in View: College Students at Risk. University of Maine. (cross-sectional) link

39. Allan EJ, Madden M (2012). The nature and extent of college student hazing. International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health 24(1):83-90. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1515/ijamh.2012.012 cited by 111

40. Gershel JC, Katz-Sidlow RJ, Small E, Zandieh S (2003). Hazing of suburban middle school and high school athletes. Journal of Adolescent Health 32(5):333-335. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/s1054-139x(03)00021-1 cited by 44

41. Diamond AB, Callahan ST, Chain KF, Solomon GS (2016). Qualitative review of hazing in collegiate and school sports: consequences from a lack of culture, knowledge and responsiveness. British Journal of Sports Medicine 50(3):149-153. (review) doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-095603 cited by 64

42. Hakkola L, Allan EJ, Kerschner D (2019). Applying utilization-focused evaluation to high school hazing prevention: a pilot intervention. Evaluation and Program Planning 75:61-68. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2019.05.005 cited by 9

43. Yang J, Comstock RD, Yi H, Harvey HH, Xun P (2017). New and recurrent concussions in high-school athletes before and after traumatic brain injury laws, 2005-2016. American Journal of Public Health 107(12):1916-1922. (natural experiment) doi:10.2105/AJPH.2017.304056 cited by 91

44. Arakkal AT, Baron AE, Lamb MM, Fields SK, Comstock RD (2020). Evaluating the effectiveness of traumatic brain injury state laws among high school athletes. Injury Epidemiology 7:12. (natural experiment) doi:10.1186/s40621-020-00241-6 cited by 11

45. Gibson TB, Herring SA, Kutcher JS, Broglio SP (2015). Analyzing the effect of state legislation on health care utilization for children with concussion. JAMA Pediatrics 169(2):163-168. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.2320 cited by 103

46. Bompadre V, Jinguji TM, Yanez ND, Satchell EK, Gilbert K, Burton M, Conrad EU, Herring SA (2014). Washington State's Lystedt Law in concussion documentation in Seattle public high schools. Journal of Athletic Training 49(4):486-492. (natural experiment) doi:10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.30 cited by 80

47. LaRoche AA, Nelson LD, Connelly PK, Walter KD, McCrea MA (2016). Sport-related concussion reporting and state legislative effects. Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine 26(1):33-39. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1097/JSM.0000000000000192 cited by 99

48. Harvey HH (2013). Reducing traumatic brain injuries in youth sports: youth sports traumatic brain injury state laws, January 2009-December 2012. American Journal of Public Health 103(7):1249-1254. (review) doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.301107 cited by 124

49. Kerr ZY, Register-Mihalik JK, Pryor RR, Pierpoint LA, Scarneo SE, Adams WM, Kucera KL, Casa DJ, Marshall SW (2019). The association between mandated preseason heat acclimatization guidelines and exertional heat illness during preseason high school American football practices. Environmental Health Perspectives 127(4):047003. (natural experiment) doi:10.1289/EHP4163 cited by 78

50. Adams WM, Scarneo SE, Casa DJ (2017). State-level implementation of health and safety policies to prevent sudden death and catastrophic injuries within secondary school athletics. Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine 5(9):2325967117727262. (standard) doi:10.1177/2325967117727262 cited by 42

51. ElSherief M, Saha K, Gupta P, Mishra S, Seybolt J, Xie J, O'Toole M, Burd-Sharps S, De Choudhury M (2021). Impacts of school shooter drills on the psychological well-being of American K-12 school communities: a social media study. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications 8:315. (natural experiment) doi:10.1057/s41599-021-00993-6 cited by 44

52. Everytown for Gun Safety Support Fund, American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association (2020, updated 2024). The Impact of Active Shooter Drills in Schools. (review) link

53. Schildkraut J, Nickerson AB (2020). Ready to respond: effects of lockdown drills and training on school emergency preparedness. Victims and Offenders 15(5):619-638. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/15564886.2020.1749199 cited by 42

54. Schildkraut J, Nickerson AB (2022). Effects of lockdown drills on students' fear, perceived risk, and use of avoidance behaviors: a quasi-experimental study. Criminal Justice Policy Review 33(8):787-813. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/08874034221089867 cited by 20

55. Nickerson AB, Schildkraut J (2021). State anxiety prior to and after participating in lockdown drills among students in a rural high school. School Psychology Review 53(6):619-631. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/2372966X.2021.1875790 cited by 19

56. Schildkraut J, Nickerson AB, Ristoff T (2020). Locks, lights, out of sight: assessing students' perceptions of emergency preparedness across multiple lockdown drills. Journal of School Violence 19(1):93-106. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/15388220.2019.1703720 cited by 46

57. Schildkraut J, Greene-Colozzi E, Nickerson AB, Florczykowski A (2023). Can school lockdowns save lives? An assessment of drills and use in real-world events. Journal of School Violence 22(2):167-182. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1080/15388220.2022.2162533 cited by 20

58. Zhe EJ, Nickerson AB (2007). Effects of an intruder crisis drill on children's knowledge, anxiety, and perceptions of school safety. School Psychology Review 36(3):501-508. (RCT) doi:10.1080/02796015.2007.12087936 cited by 56

59. Dickson MJ, Vargo KK (2017). Training kindergarten students lockdown drill procedures using behavioral skills training. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 50(2):407-412. (longitudinal) doi:10.1002/jaba.369 cited by 54

60. Huskey MG, Connell NM (2021). Preparation or provocation? Student perceptions of active shooter drills. Criminal Justice Policy Review 32(1):3-26. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1177/0887403419900316 cited by 39

61. Moore-Petinak N, Waselewski M, Patterson BA, Chang T (2020). Active shooter drills in the United States: a national study of youth experiences and perceptions. Journal of Adolescent Health 67(4):509-513. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.06.015 cited by 43

62. Schonfeld DJ, Rossen E, Woodard D, et al., American Academy of Pediatrics Council on Injury, Violence, and Poison Prevention and Council on School Health (2020). Participation of children and adolescents in live crisis drills and exercises. Pediatrics 146(3):e2020015503. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2020-015503 cited by 30

63. National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of School Resource Officers, Safe and Sound Schools (2021). Best Practice Considerations for Armed Assailant Drills in Schools. (standard) link

64. Sorensen LC, Avila-Acosta M, Engberg JB, Bushway SD (2023). The thin blue line in schools: new evidence on school-based policing across the U.S. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 42(4):941-970. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1002/pam.22498 cited by 45

65. Gottfredson DC, Crosse S, Tang Z, Bauer EL, Harmon MA, Hagen CA, Greene AD (2020). Effects of school resource officers on school crime and responses to school crime. Criminology and Public Policy 19(3):905-940. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1111/1745-9133.12512 cited by 131

66. Weisburst EK (2019). Patrolling public schools: the impact of funding for school police on student discipline and long-term education outcomes. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 38(2):338-365. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1002/pam.22116 cited by 150

67. Owens EG (2017). Testing the school-to-prison pipeline. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 36(1):11-37. (natural experiment) doi:10.1002/pam.21954 cited by 150

68. Fisher BW, Hennessy EA (2016). School resource officers and exclusionary discipline in U.S. high schools: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Adolescent Research Review 1(3):217-233. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s40894-015-0006-8 cited by 124

69. Fisher BW, Petrosino A, Sutherland H, Guckenburg S, Fronius T, Benitez I, Earl K (2023). School-based law enforcement strategies to reduce crime, increase perceptions of safety, and improve learning outcomes in primary and secondary schools: a systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews 19(4):e1360. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/cl2.1360 cited by 25

70. Na C, Gottfredson DC (2013). Police officers in schools: effects on school crime and the processing of offending behaviors. Justice Quarterly 30(4):619-650. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/07418825.2011.615754 cited by 352

71. Devlin DN, Gottfredson DC (2018). The roles of police officers in schools: effects on the recording and reporting of crime. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice 16(2):208-223. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/1541204016680405 cited by 97

72. Peterson J, Densley J, Erickson G (2021). Presence of armed school officials and fatal and nonfatal gunshot injuries during mass school shootings, United States, 1980-2019. JAMA Network Open 4(2):e2037394. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.37394 cited by 37

73. Livingston MD, Rossheim ME, Hall KS (2019). A descriptive analysis of school and school shooter characteristics and the severity of school shootings in the United States, 1999-2018. Journal of Adolescent Health 64(6):797-799. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.12.006 cited by 73

74. Park RJ, Goodman J, Hurwitz M, Smith J (2020). Heat and learning. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 12(2):306-339. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/pol.20180612 cited by 231

75. Park RJ (2022). Hot temperature and high-stakes performance. Journal of Human Resources 57(2):400-434. (natural experiment) doi:10.3368/jhr.57.2.0618-9535R3 cited by 159

76. Park RJ, Behrer AP, Goodman J (2021). Learning is inhibited by heat exposure, both internationally and within the United States. Nature Human Behaviour 5(1):19-27. (natural experiment) doi:10.1038/s41562-020-00959-9 cited by 189

77. Graff Zivin J, Hsiang SM, Neidell M (2018). Temperature and human capital in the short and long run. Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists 5(1):77-105. (natural experiment) doi:10.1086/694177 cited by 316

78. Cho H (2017). The effects of summer heat on academic achievement: A cohort analysis. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 83:185-196. (natural experiment) doi:10.1016/j.jeem.2017.03.005 cited by 116

79. Mendell MJ, Eliseeva EA, Davies MM, et al. (2013). Association of classroom ventilation with reduced illness absence: A prospective study in California elementary schools. Indoor Air 23(6):515-528. (longitudinal) doi:10.1111/ina.12042 cited by 302

80. Haverinen-Shaughnessy U, Moschandreas DJ, Shaughnessy RJ (2011). Association between substandard classroom ventilation rates and students' academic achievement. Indoor Air 21(2):121-131. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2010.00686.x cited by 310

81. Haverinen-Shaughnessy U, Shaughnessy RJ (2015). Effects of classroom ventilation rate and temperature on students' test scores. PLOS ONE 10(8):e0136165. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136165 cited by 196

82. Petersen S, Jensen KL, Pedersen ALS, Rasmussen HS (2016). The effect of increased classroom ventilation rate indicated by reduced CO2 concentration on the performance of schoolwork by children. Indoor Air 26(3):366-379. (RCT) doi:10.1111/ina.12210 cited by 101

83. Wargocki P, Porras-Salazar JA, Contreras-Espinoza S (2019). The relationship between classroom temperature and children's performance in school. Building and Environment 157:197-204. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.04.046 cited by 191

84. Wargocki P, Porras-Salazar JA, Contreras-Espinoza S, Bahnfleth W (2020). The relationships between classroom air quality and children's performance in school. Building and Environment 173:106749. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.106749 cited by 272

85. Fisk WJ (2017). The ventilation problem in schools: Literature review. Indoor Air 27(6):1039-1051. (review) doi:10.1111/ina.12403 cited by 338

86. Gaihre S, Semple S, Miller J, Fielding S, Turner S (2014). Classroom carbon dioxide concentration, school attendance, and educational attainment. Journal of School Health 84(9):569-574. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/josh.12183 cited by 131

87. Stafford TM (2015). Indoor air quality and academic performance. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 70:34-50. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.jeem.2014.11.002 cited by 181

88. ASHRAE. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1, Ventilation and acceptable indoor air quality (classroom outdoor air rate: 10 cfm per person plus 0.12 cfm per square foot). (standard) link

89. ASHRAE (2023). ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 241, Control of infectious aerosols (equivalent clean airflow target of 20 L/s per person for classrooms in infection risk management mode). (standard) link

90. Aizer A, Currie J, Simon P, Vivier P (2018). Do low levels of blood lead reduce children's future test scores? American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 10(1):307-341. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/app.20160404 cited by 113

91. Aizer A, Currie J (2019). Lead and juvenile delinquency: New evidence from linked birth, school, and juvenile detention records. Review of Economics and Statistics 101(4):575-587. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/rest_a_00814 cited by 97

92. Gronqvist H, Nilsson JP, Robling PO (2020). Understanding how low levels of early lead exposure affect children's life trajectories. Journal of Political Economy 128(9):3376-3433. (natural experiment) doi:10.1086/708725 cited by 81

93. Billings SB, Schnepel KT (2018). Life after lead: Effects of early interventions for children exposed to lead. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 10(3):315-344. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1257/app.20160056 cited by 85

94. Sorensen LC, Fox AM, Jung H, Martin EG (2019). Lead exposure and academic achievement: Evidence from childhood lead poisoning prevention efforts. Journal of Population Economics 32(1):179-218. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1007/s00148-018-0707-y cited by 41

95. Lanphear BP, Hornung R, Khoury J, et al. (2005). Low-level environmental lead exposure and children's intellectual function: An international pooled analysis. Environmental Health Perspectives 113(7):894-899. (longitudinal) doi:10.1289/ehp.7688 cited by 2211

96. Reyes JW (2015). Lead exposure and behavior: Effects on antisocial and risky behavior among children and adolescents. Economic Inquiry 53(3):1580-1605. (natural experiment) doi:10.1111/ecin.12202 cited by 126

97. Hanna-Attisha M, LaChance J, Sadler RC, Champney Schnepp A (2016). Elevated blood lead levels in children associated with the Flint drinking water crisis: A spatial analysis of risk and public health response.

American Journal of Public Health 106(2):283-290. (cross-sectional) doi:10.2105/AJPH.2015.303003 cited by 1123

98. Trejo S, Yeomans-Maldonado G, Jacob B (2024). The effects of the Flint water crisis on the educational outcomes of school-age children. Science Advances 10(5):eadk4737. (natural experiment) doi:10.1126/sciadv.adk4737 cited by 9

99. Cradock AL, Barrett JL, Poole MK, Flax CN, Vollmer L, Hecht C (2022). Lead concentrations in US school drinking water: Testing programs, prevalence, and policy opportunities, 2016-2018. American Journal of Public Health 112(S7):S679-S689. (cross-sectional) doi:10.2105/AJPH.2022.306961 cited by 10

00. Lambrinidou Y, Triantafyllidou S, Edwards M (2010). Failing our children: Lead in U.S. school drinking water. NEW SOLUTIONS 20(1):25-47. (review) doi:10.2190/NS.022010EOV cited by 31

01. Council on Environmental Health, American Academy of Pediatrics (2016). Prevention of childhood lead toxicity. Pediatrics 138(1):e20161493. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2016-1493 cited by 301

02. US Government Accountability Office (2018). K-12 Education: Lead testing of school drinking water would benefit from improved federal guidance. GAO-18-382. (cross-sectional) link

03. US Environmental Protection Agency. 3Ts for reducing lead in drinking water in schools and child care facilities (Training, Testing, Taking Action). (standard) link

04. Garcia-Hermoso A, Ramirez-Velez R, Lubans DR, Izquierdo M (2021). Effects of physical education interventions on cognition and academic performance outcomes in children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. British Journal of Sports Medicine 55(21):1224-1232. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1136/bjsports-2021-104112 cited by 123

05. Alvarez-Bueno C, Pesce C, Cavero-Redondo I, Sanchez-Lopez M, Garrido-Miguel M, Martinez-Vizcaino V (2017). Academic achievement and physical activity: A meta-analysis. Pediatrics 140(6):e20171498. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1542/peds.2017-1498 cited by 391

06. Singh AS, Saliasi E, van den Berg V, et al. (2019). Effects of physical activity interventions on cognitive and academic performance in children and adolescents: a novel combination of a systematic review and recommendations from an expert panel. British Journal of Sports Medicine 53(10):640-647. (review) doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-098136 cited by 588

07. Donnelly JE, Hillman CH, Castelli D, et al. (2016). Physical activity, fitness, cognitive function, and academic achievement in children: A systematic review. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise 48(6):1197-1222. (review) doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000901 cited by 1866

08. Cawley J, Frisvold D, Meyerhoefer C (2013). The impact of physical education on obesity among elementary school children. Journal of Health Economics 32(4):743-755. (natural experiment) doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2013.04.006 cited by 124

09. Packham A, Street B (2019). The effects of physical education on student fitness, achievement, and behavior. Economics of Education Review 72:1-18. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.04.003 cited by 34

10. Cawley J, Meyerhoefer C, Newhouse D (2007). The impact of state physical education requirements on youth physical activity and overweight. Health Economics 16(12):1287-1301. (natural experiment) doi:10.1002/hec.1218 cited by 169

11. Lonsdale C, Rosenkranz RR, Peralta LR, Bennie A, Fahey P, Lubans DR (2013). A systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions designed to increase moderate-to-vigorous physical activity in school physical

education lessons. Preventive Medicine 56(2):152-161. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.12.004 cited by 453

12. Hollis JL, Williams AJ, Sutherland R, et al. (2016). A systematic review and meta-analysis of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity levels in elementary school physical education lessons. Preventive Medicine 86:34-54. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.11.018 cited by 260
13. SHAPE America (2015). The essential components of physical education. Reston, VA: SHAPE America. (standard) link
14. Council on School Health, American Academy of Pediatrics (2013). The crucial role of recess in school. Pediatrics 131(1):183-188. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2012-2993 cited by 225
15. Barros RM, Silver EJ, Stein REK (2009). School recess and group classroom behavior. Pediatrics 123(2):431-436. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1542/peds.2007-2825 cited by 255
16. Jarrett OS, Maxwell DM, Dickerson C, Hoge P, Davies G, Yetley A (1998). Impact of recess on classroom behavior: Group effects and individual differences. Journal of Educational Research 92(2):121-126. (natural experiment) doi:10.1080/00220679809597584 cited by 209
17. Beyler N, Bleeker M, James-Burdumy S, Fortson J, Benjamin M (2014). The impact of Playworks on students' physical activity during recess: Findings from a randomized controlled trial. Preventive Medicine 69(Suppl 1):S20-S26. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.10.011 cited by 29
18. Fortson J, James-Burdumy S, Bleeker M, Beyler N, London RA, Westrich L, Stokes-Guinan K, Castrechini S (2013). Impact and implementation findings from an experimental evaluation of Playworks: Effects on school climate, academic learning, student social skills and behavior. Mathematica Policy Research and John W. Gardner Center, Stanford University. (RCT) link
19. London RA, Westrich L, Stokes-Guinan K, McLaughlin M (2015). Playing fair: The contribution of high-functioning recess to overall school climate in low-income elementary schools. Journal of School Health 85(1):53-60. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/josh.12216 cited by 54
20. Rhea DJ, Rivchun AP (2018). The LiiNK Project: Effects of multiple recesses and character curriculum on classroom behaviors and listening skills in grades K-2 children. Frontiers in Education 3:9. (longitudinal) doi:10.3389/feduc.2018.00009 cited by 25
21. Massey WV, Thalken J, Szarabajko A, Neilson L, Geldhof J (2021). Recess quality and social and behavioral health in elementary school students. Journal of School Health 91(9):730-740. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/josh.13065 cited by 29
22. Brez C, Sheets V (2017). Classroom benefits of recess. Learning Environments Research 20(3):433-445. (natural experiment) doi:10.1007/s10984-017-9237-x cited by 29
23. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and SHAPE America (2017). Strategies for recess in schools. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services. (standard) link
24. Wang LY, Vernon-Smiley M, Gapinski MA, Desisto M, Maughan E, Sheetz A (2014). Cost-benefit study of school nursing services. JAMA Pediatrics 168(7):642-648. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.5441 cited by 120
25. Telljohann SK, Dake JA, Price JH (2004). Effect of full-time versus part-time school nurses on attendance of elementary students with asthma. Journal of School Nursing 20(6):331-334. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/10598405040200060701 cited by 54
26. Rodriguez E, Rivera DA, Perlroth D, Becker E, Wang NE, Landau M (2013). School nurses' role in asthma management, school absenteeism, and cost savings: A demonstration project. Journal of School Health

83(12):842-850. (longitudinal) doi:10.1111/josh.12102 cited by 68

27. Best NC, Oppewal S, Travers D (2018). Exploring school nurse interventions and health and education outcomes: An integrative review. Journal of School Nursing 34(1):14-27. (review) doi:10.1177/1059840517745359 cited by 115
28. Yoder CM (2020). School nurses and student academic outcomes: An integrative review. Journal of School Nursing 36(1):49-60. (review) doi:10.1177/1059840518824397 cited by 67
29. Leach SM, Hollands FM, Stone E, et al. (2022). Costs and effects of school-based licensed practical nurses on elementary student attendance and chronic absenteeism. Prevention Science 23(8):1414-1427. (longitudinal) doi:10.1007/s11121-022-01459-0 cited by 10
30. Harris K, Kneale D, Lasserson TJ, McDonald VM, Grigg J, Thomas J (2019). School-based self-management interventions for asthma in children and adolescents: A mixed methods systematic review. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 1:CD011651. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011651.pub2 cited by 160
31. Hill NJ, Hollis M (2012). Teacher time spent on student health issues and school nurse presence. Journal of School Nursing 28(3):181-186. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1177/1059840511429684 cited by 35
32. Willgerodt MA, Tanner A, McCabe E, Jameson B, Brock D (2024). Public school nurses in the United States: National School Nurse Workforce Study 2.0. Journal of School Nursing 40(5):468-481. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1177/10598405241253565 cited by 65
33. National Association of School Nurses (2025). Position statement: School nurse workload, essential staffing for safe and equitable student care. Journal of School Nursing 41(5):642-645. (standard) doi:10.1177/10598405251360761 cited by 10
34. Council on School Health, American Academy of Pediatrics (2016). Role of the school nurse in providing school health services. Pediatrics 137(6):e20160852. (standard) doi:10.1542/peds.2016-0852 cited by 225
35. Sanchez AL, Cornacchio D, Poznanski B, Golik AM, Chou T, Comer JS (2018). The effectiveness of school-based mental health services for elementary-aged children: A meta-analysis. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 57(3):153-165. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2017.11.022 cited by 298
36. Golberstein E, Zainullina I, Sojourner A, Sander MA (2024). Effects of school-based mental health services on youth outcomes. Journal of Human Resources 59(S):S256-S281. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3368/jhr.1222-12703R2 cited by 20
37. Carrell SE, Hoekstra M (2014). Are school counselors an effective education input? Economics Letters 125(1):66-69. (natural experiment) doi:10.1016/j.econlet.2014.07.020 cited by 62
38. Reback R (2010). Schools' mental health services and young children's emotions, behavior, and learning. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 29(4):698-725. (natural experiment) doi:10.1002/pam.20528 cited by 102
39. Mulhern C (2023). Beyond teachers: Estimating individual school counselors' effects on educational attainment. American Economic Review 113(11):2846-2893. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/aer.20200847 cited by 35
40. Hurwitz M, Howell J (2014). Estimating causal impacts of school counselors with regression discontinuity designs. Journal of Counseling and Development 92(3):316-327. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00159.x cited by 80

41. Kearney C, Akos P, Domina T, Young Z (2021). Student-to-school counselor ratios: A meta-analytic review of the evidence. Journal of Counseling and Development 99(4):418-428. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/jcad.12394 cited by 33

42. Wasserman D, Hoven CW, Wasserman C, et al. (2015). School-based suicide prevention programmes: The SEYLE cluster-randomised, controlled trial. Lancet 385(9977):1536-1544. (RCT) doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61213-7 cited by 782

43. Schilling EA, Aseltine RH, James A (2016). The SOS Suicide Prevention Program: Further evidence of efficacy and effectiveness. Prevention Science 17(2):157-166. (RCT) doi:10.1007/s11121-015-0594-3 cited by 212

44. Wyman PA, Brown CH, LoMurray M, et al. (2010). An outcome evaluation of the Sources of Strength suicide prevention program delivered by adolescent peer leaders in high schools. American Journal of Public Health 100(9):1653-1661. (RCT) doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.190025 cited by 537

45. Wyman PA, Cero I, Brown CH, et al. (2023). Impact of Sources of Strength on adolescent suicide deaths across three randomized trials. Injury Prevention 29(6):474-481. (RCT) doi:10.1136/ip-2023-044944 cited by 14

46. Wyman PA, Cero I, Pisani AR, et al. (2025). Impact of the Sources of Strength peer leader program on suicide attempt rates in 40 high schools: A hybrid effectiveness-implementation cluster randomized trial. School Mental Health. (RCT) doi:10.1007/s12310-025-09802-w cited by 3

47. Sekhar DL, Schaefer EW, Waxmonsky JG, et al. (2021). Screening in high schools to identify, evaluate, and lower depression among adolescents: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA Network Open 4(11):e2131836. (RCT) doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.31836 cited by 68

48. Kuyken W, Ball S, Crane C, et al. (2022). Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of universal school-based mindfulness training compared with normal school provision in reducing risk of mental health problems and promoting well-being in adolescence: The MYRIAD cluster randomised controlled trial. Evidence-Based Mental Health 25(3):99-109. (RCT) doi:10.1136/ebmental-2021-300396 cited by 285

49. Harvey LJ, White FA, Hunt C, Abbott M (2023). Investigating the efficacy of a Dialectical behaviour therapy-based universal intervention on adolescent social and emotional well-being outcomes. Behaviour Research and Therapy 169:104408. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.brat.2023.104408 cited by 50

50. Foulkes L, Stringaris A (2023). Do no harm: Can school mental health interventions cause iatrogenic harm? BJPsych Bulletin 47(6):349-351. (review) doi:10.1192/bjb.2023.9 cited by 106

51. American School Counselor Association. School counselor roles and ratios (recommended ratio 250:1; national average 372:1 in 2024-25). (standard) link

52. National Association of School Psychologists. Shortage of school psychologists (recommended ratio 1 psychologist per 500 students). (standard) link

53. Burg X, Metcalfe JJ, Ellison B, Prescott MP (2021). Effects of longer seated lunch time on food consumption and waste in elementary and middle school-age children: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA Network Open 4(6):e2114148. (RCT) doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.14148 cited by 33

54. Cohen JFW, Jahn JL, Richardson S, Cluggish SA, Parker E, Rimm EB (2016). Amount of time to eat lunch is associated with children's selection and consumption of school meal entree, fruits, vegetables, and milk. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics 116(1):123-128. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.jand.2015.07.019 cited by 116

55. Gosliner W (2014). School-level factors associated with increased fruit and vegetable consumption among students in California middle and high schools. Journal of School Health 84(9):559-568. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1111/josh.12188 cited by 63

56. Price J, Just DR (2015). Lunch, recess and nutrition: Responding to time incentives in the cafeteria. Preventive Medicine 71:27-30. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.11.016 cited by 50
57. Hunsberger M, McGinnis P, Smith J, Beamer BA, O'Malley J (2014). Elementary school children's recess schedule and dietary intake at lunch: a community-based participatory research partnership pilot study. BMC Public Health 14:156. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-156 cited by 33
58. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2011). School health guidelines to promote healthy eating and physical activity. MMWR Recommendations and Reports 60(RR-5):1-76. (standard) link
59. Schwartz AE, Rothbart MW (2020). Let them eat lunch: The impact of universal free meals on student performance. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 39(2):376-410. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1002/pam.22175 cited by 171
60. Ruffini K (2022). Universal access to free school meals and student achievement: Evidence from the Community Eligibility Provision. Journal of Human Resources 57(3):776-820. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3368/jhr.57.3.0518-9509R3 cited by 56
61. Gordon NE, Ruffini K (2021). Schoolwide free meals and student discipline: Effects of the Community Eligibility Provision. Education Finance and Policy 16(3):418-442. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00307 cited by 40
62. Gordanier J, Ozturk O, Williams B, Zhan C (2020). Free lunch for all! The effect of the Community Eligibility Provision on academic outcomes. Economics of Education Review 77:101999. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2020.101999 cited by 84
63. Spill MK, Trivedi R, Thoerig RC, et al. (2024). Universal free school meals and school and student outcomes: A systematic review. JAMA Network Open 7(8):e2424082. (review) doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.24082 cited by 53
64. Cohen JFW, Hecht AA, McLoughlin GM, Turner L, Schwartz MB (2021). Universal school meals and associations with student participation, attendance, academic performance, diet quality, food security, and body mass index: A systematic review. Nutrients 13(3):911. (review) doi:10.3390/nu13030911 cited by 381
65. Frisvold DE (2015). Nutrition and cognitive achievement: An evaluation of the School Breakfast Program. Journal of Public Economics 124:91-104. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.12.003 cited by 186
66. Imberman SA, Kugler AD (2014). The effect of providing breakfast in class on student performance. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 33(3):669-699. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1002/pam.21759 cited by 89
67. Corcoran SP, Elbel B, Schwartz AE (2016). The effect of Breakfast in the Classroom on obesity and academic performance: Evidence from New York City. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 35(3):509-532. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1002/pam.21909 cited by 68
68. Anzman-Frasca S, Djang HC, Halmo MM, Dolan PR, Economos CD (2015). Estimating impacts of a Breakfast in the Classroom program on school outcomes. JAMA Pediatrics 169(1):71-77. (longitudinal) doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.2042 cited by 78
69. Bartfeld JS, Berger L, Men F, Chen Y (2019). Access to the School Breakfast Program is associated with higher attendance and test scores among elementary school students. Journal of Nutrition 149(2):336-343. (longitudinal) doi:10.1093/jn/nxy267 cited by 53
70. Leos-Urbel J, Schwartz AE, Weinstein M, Corcoran SP (2013). Not just for poor kids: The impact of universal free school breakfast on meal participation and student outcomes. Economics of Education Review 36:88-

107. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.06.007 cited by 137

71. Neitzel AJ, Wolf B, Guo X, et al. (2021). Effect of a randomized interventional school-based vision program on academic performance of students in grades 3 to 7: A cluster randomized clinical trial. JAMA Ophthalmology 139(10):1104-1114. (RCT) doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.3544 cited by 60
72. Glewwe P, Park A, Zhao M (2016). A better vision for development: Eyeglasses and academic performance in rural primary schools in China. Journal of Development Economics 122:170-182. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.jdeveco.2016.05.007 cited by 144
73. Ma X, Zhou Z, Yi H, et al. (2014). Effect of providing free glasses on children's educational outcomes in China: Cluster randomized controlled trial. BMJ 349:g5740. (RCT) doi:10.1136/bmj.g5740 cited by 237
74. Glewwe P, West KL, Lee J (2018). The impact of providing vision screening and free eyeglasses on academic outcomes: Evidence from a randomized trial in Title I elementary schools in Florida. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 37(2):265-300. (RCT) doi:10.1002/pam.22043 cited by 165
75. Slavin RE, Collins ME, Repka MX, et al. (2018). In plain sight: Reading outcomes of providing eyeglasses to disadvantaged children. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk 23(3):250-258. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/10824669.2018.1477602 cited by 28
76. Dudovitz RN, Sim MS, Elashoff D, et al. (2020). Receipt of corrective lenses and academic performance of low-income students. Academic Pediatrics 20(4):527-533. (longitudinal) doi:10.1016/j.acap.2020.01.001 cited by 23
77. Evans JR, Morjaria P, Powell C (2018). Vision screening for correctable visual acuity deficits in school-age children and adolescents. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2:CD005023. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1002/14651858.CD005023.pub3 cited by 84
78. Rogers T, Feller A (2018). Reducing student absences at scale by targeting parents' misbeliefs. Nature Human Behaviour 2(5):335-342. (RCT) doi:10.1038/s41562-018-0328-1 cited by 187
79. Robinson CD, Lee MG, Dearing E, Rogers T (2018). Reducing student absenteeism in the early grades by targeting parental beliefs. American Educational Research Journal 55(6):1163-1192. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0002831218772274 cited by 144
80. Lasky-Fink J, Robinson CD, Chang HN, Rogers T (2021). Using behavioral insights to improve school administrative communications: the case of truancy notifications. Educational Researcher 50(7):442-450. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0013189X211000749 cited by 23
81. Heppen JB, Kurki A, Brown S (2020). Can texting parents improve attendance in elementary school? A test of an adaptive messaging strategy. NCEE 2020-006. Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. (RCT) link
82. Bergman P, Chan EW (2021). Leveraging parents through low-cost technology: the impact of high-frequency information on student achievement. Journal of Human Resources 56(1):125-158. (RCT) doi:10.3368/jhr.56.1.1118-9837R1 cited by 68
83. Kalil A, Mayer SE, Gallegos S (2021). Using behavioral insights to increase attendance at subsidized preschool programs: the Show Up to Grow Up intervention. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 163:65-79. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.11.002 cited by 44
84. Smythe-Leistico K, Page LC (2018). Connect-Text: leveraging text-message communication to mitigate chronic absenteeism and improve parental engagement in the earliest years of schooling. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk 23(1-2):139-152. (natural experiment) doi:10.1080/10824669.2018.1434658 cited by 79

85. Bergman P, Lasky-Fink J, Rogers T (2020). Simplification and defaults affect adoption and impact of technology, but decision makers do not realize it. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 158:66-79. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.04.001 cited by 35

86. Kraft MA, Rogers T (2015). The underutilized potential of teacher-to-parent communication: evidence from a field experiment. Economics of Education Review 47:49-63. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.04.001 cited by 213

87. Guryan J, Christenson S, Cureton A, Lai I, Ludwig J, Schwarz C, Shirey E, Turner MC (2021). The effect of mentoring on school attendance and academic outcomes: a randomized evaluation of the Check & Connect program. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 40(3):841-882. (RCT) doi:10.1002/pam.22264 cited by 38

88. Bird KA, Castleman BL, Denning JT, Goodman J, Lamberton C, Rosinger KO (2021). Nudging at scale: experimental evidence from FAFSA completion campaigns. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization 183:105-128. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2020.12.022 cited by 110

89. Eklund K, Burns MK, Oyen K, DeMarchena S, McCollom EM (2022). Addressing chronic absenteeism in schools: a meta-analysis of evidence-based interventions. School Psychology Review 51(1):95-111. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1080/2372966X.2020.1789436 cited by 75

90. Johnston WR, Engberg J, Opper IM, Sontag-Padilla L, Xenakis L (2020). Illustrating the promise of community schools: an assessment of the impact of the New York City Community Schools Initiative. RR-3245-NYCCEO. RAND Corporation. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.7249/RR3245 cited by 22

91. Swain W, Leung-Gagne M, Maier A, Rubinstein CF (2025). Community schools impact on student outcomes: evidence from California. Learning Policy Institute. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.54300/541.498 cited by 3

92. Heers M, Van Klaveren C, Groot W, Maassen van den Brink H (2016). Community schools: what we know and what we need to know. Review of Educational Research 86(4):1016-1051. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654315627365 cited by 93

93. Maier A, Daniel J, Oakes J, Lam L (2017). Community schools as an effective school improvement strategy: a review of the evidence. Learning Policy Institute and National Education Policy Center. (review) link

94. Walsh ME, Madaus GF, Raczek AE, Dearing E, Foley C, An C, Lee-St. John TJ, Beaton A (2014). A new model for student support in high-poverty urban elementary schools: effects on elementary and middle school academic outcomes. American Educational Research Journal 51(4):704-737. (longitudinal) doi:10.3102/0002831214541669 cited by 64

95. Lee-St. John TJ, Walsh ME, Raczek AE, Vuilleumier CE, Foley C, Heberle A, Sibley E, Dearing E (2018). The long-term impact of systemic student support in elementary school: reducing high school dropout. AERA Open 4(4). (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/2332858418799085 cited by 66

96. Dearing E, Walsh ME, Sibley E, Lee-St. John T, Foley C, Raczek AE (2016). Can community and school-based supports improve the achievement of first-generation immigrant children attending high-poverty schools? Child Development 87(3):883-897. (longitudinal) doi:10.1111/cdev.12507 cited by 44

97. Sokol R, Degli Esposti M, Victor BG, Kernsmith P, Medina Del Toro V, Heinze J, Portugal J, Grinnell R, Gernaat E (2025). A school-based material needs intervention for chronic absenteeism: a state-wide staggered interrupted time series analysis. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 80(3):174-181. (natural experiment) doi:10.1136/jech-2025-224567 cited by 2

98. Parise L, Corrin W, Granito K, Haider Z, Somers MA, Cerna O (2017). Two years of case management: final findings from the Communities In Schools random assignment evaluation. MDRC. (RCT) link

99. Biag M, Castrechini S (2016). Coordinated strategies to help the whole child: examining the contributions of full-service community schools. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk 21(3):157-173. (longitudinal) doi:10.1080/10824669.2016.1172231 cited by 54

00. Kraft MA, Dougherty SM (2013). The effect of teacher-family communication on student engagement: evidence from a randomized field experiment. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 6(3):199-222. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2012.743636 cited by 214

01. Kraft MA, Rogers T (2015). The underutilized potential of teacher-to-parent communication: evidence from a field experiment. Economics of Education Review 47:49-63. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.04.001 cited by 213

02. Bergman P (2021). Parent-child information frictions and human capital investment: evidence from a field experiment. Journal of Political Economy 129(1):286-322. (RCT) doi:10.1086/711410 cited by 218

03. Bergman P, Chan EW (2021). Leveraging parents through low-cost technology: the impact of high-frequency information on student achievement. Journal of Human Resources 56(1):125-158. (RCT) doi:10.3368/jhr.56.1.1118-9837R1 cited by 68

04. Avvisati F, Gurgand M, Guyon N, Maurin E (2014). Getting parents involved: a field experiment in deprived schools. Review of Economic Studies 81(1):57-83. (RCT) doi:10.1093/restud/rdt027 cited by 199

05. Smith TE, Sheridan SM, Kim EM, Park S, Beretvas SN (2020). The effects of family-school partnership interventions on academic and social-emotional functioning: a meta-analysis exploring what works for whom. Educational Psychology Review 32(2):511-544. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s10648-019-09509-w cited by 236

06. Castro M, Exposito-Casas E, Lopez-Martin E, Lizasoain L, Navarro-Asencio E, Gaviria JL (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: a meta-analysis. Educational Research Review 14:33-46. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2015.01.002 cited by 883

07. Hill NE, Tyson DF (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: a meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. Developmental Psychology 45(3):740-763. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1037/a0015362 cited by 2173

08. Jeynes W (2012). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of different types of parental involvement programs for urban students. Urban Education 47(4):706-742. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1177/0042085912445643 cited by 781

09. York BN, Loeb S, Doss C (2019). One step at a time: the effects of an early literacy text-messaging program for parents of preschoolers. Journal of Human Resources 54(3):537-566. (RCT) doi:10.3368/jhr.54.3.0517-8756R cited by 158

10. Doss C, Fahle EM, Loeb S, York BN (2019). More than just a nudge: supporting kindergarten parents with differentiated and personalized text messages. Journal of Human Resources 54(3):567-603. (RCT) doi:10.3368/jhr.54.3.0317-8637r cited by 86

11. Bergman P, Lasky-Fink J, Rogers T (2020). Simplification and defaults affect adoption and impact of technology, but decision makers do not realize it. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 158:66-79. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.04.001 cited by 35

12. Gubbels J, van der Put CE, Assink M (2019). Risk factors for school absenteeism and dropout: a meta-analytic review. Journal of Youth and Adolescence 48(9):1637-1667. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s10964-019-01072-5 cited by 597

13. Eklund K, Burns MK, Oyen K, DeMarchena S, McCollom EM (2022). Addressing chronic absenteeism in schools: a meta-analysis of evidence-based interventions. School Psychology Review 51(1):95-111. (meta-

analysis) doi:10.1080/2372966X.2020.1789436 cited by 75

14. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Section 1116, Parent and family engagement, 20 U.S.C. 6318 (as amended by ESSA 2015). (standard) link
15. Turney K, Kao G (2009). Barriers to school involvement: are immigrant parents disadvantaged? Journal of Educational Research 102(4):257-271. (cross-sectional) doi:10.3200/JOER.102.4.257-271 cited by 627
16. Kim Y (2009). Minority parental involvement and school barriers: moving the focus away from deficiencies of parents. Educational Research Review 4(2):80-102. (review) doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2009.02.003 cited by 289
17. Cheatham GA (2011). Language interpretation, parent participation, and young children with disabilities. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education 31(2):78-88. (review) doi:10.1177/0271121410377120 cited by 35
18. OECD (2017). PISA 2015 Results (Volume III): Students' Well-Being. OECD Publishing, Paris. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1787/9789264273856-en cited by 802
19. Lasky-Fink J, Robinson CD, Chang HN, Rogers T (2021). Using behavioral insights to improve school administrative communications: the case of truancy notifications. Educational Researcher 50(7):442-450. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0013189X211000749 cited by 23
20. TalkingPoints (2025). Boosting attendance and reducing suspensions with TalkingPoints: a two-year quasi-experimental study in a large urban district. (longitudinal) link
21. Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974). (standard) link
22. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d. (standard) link
23. Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. 1703(f). (standard) link
24. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Section 1116(f), 20 U.S.C. 6318(f). (standard) link
25. 34 CFR 300.503(c) and 300.322(e), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act regulations on prior written notice and parent participation. (standard) link
26. US Department of Education Office for Civil Rights and US Department of Justice (2015). Dear Colleague Letter: English learner students and limited English proficient parents. January 7, 2015. Rescinded August 2025 and retained online for historical purposes. (standard) link
27. US Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General (2025). Memorandum: Implementation of Executive Order 14224, Designating English as the Official Language of the United States. July 14, 2025. (standard) link
28. Sheldon SB, Jung SB (2018). Student outcomes and parent teacher home visits. Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, Johns Hopkins University, for Parent Teacher Home Visits. (longitudinal) link
29. Sheldon SB, Jung SB (2015). The Family Engagement Partnership: student outcome evaluation. Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, Johns Hopkins University, for Flamboyan Foundation and District of Columbia Public Schools. (longitudinal) link
30. McKie A, Terziev J, Gill B (2021). Impacts of home visits on students in District of Columbia Public Schools. REL 2022-128. Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic, Institute of Education Sciences. (longitudinal) link
31. Wright KB, Shields SM, Black K, Waxman HC (2018). The effects of teacher home visits on student behavior, student academic achievement, and parent involvement. School Community Journal 28(1):67-90. (longitudinal) link
32. Meyer JA, Mann MB (2006). Teachers' perceptions of the benefits of home visits for early elementary children. Early Childhood Education Journal 34(1):93-97. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1007/s10643-006-0113-z cited by 69

33. Cook PJ, Dodge KA, Gifford EJ, Schulting AB (2017). A new program to prevent primary school absenteeism: results of a pilot study in five schools. Children and Youth Services Review 82:262-270. (RCT) doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.09.017 cited by 87

34. Kraft MA, Dougherty SM (2013). The effect of teacher-family communication on student engagement: evidence from a randomized field experiment. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 6(3):199-222. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2012.743636 cited by 214

35. Smith TE, Sheridan SM, Kim EM, Park S, Beretvas SN (2020). The effects of family-school partnership interventions on academic and social-emotional functioning: a meta-analysis exploring what works for whom. Educational Psychology Review 32(2):511-544. (meta-analysis) doi:10.1007/s10648-019-09509-w cited by 236

36. Attendance Works and Parent Teacher Home Visits (2019). Parent Teacher Home Visits: improving attendance through relationship-building home visits. (standard) link

37. Krueger AB (1999). Experimental estimates of education production functions. Quarterly Journal of Economics 114(2):497-532. (RCT) doi:10.1162/003355399556052 cited by 1127

38. Chetty R, Friedman JN, Hilger N, Saez E, Schanzenbach DW, Yagan D (2011). How does your kindergarten classroom affect your earnings? Evidence from Project STAR. Quarterly Journal of Economics 126(4):1593-1660. (RCT) doi:10.1093/qje/qjr041 cited by 1519

39. Dynarski S, Hyman J, Schanzenbach DW (2013). Experimental evidence on the effect of childhood investments on postsecondary attainment and degree completion. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 32(4):692-717. (RCT) doi:10.1002/pam.21715 cited by 224

40. Jepsen C, Rivkin S (2009). Class size reduction and student achievement: The potential tradeoff between teacher quality and class size. Journal of Human Resources 44(1):223-250. (natural experiment) doi:10.3368/jhr.44.1.223 cited by 60

41. Fredriksson P, Ockert B, Oosterbeek H (2013). Long-term effects of class size. Quarterly Journal of Economics 128(1):249-285. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1093/qje/qjs048 cited by 363

42. Angrist JD, Lavy V (1999). Using Maimonides' rule to estimate the effect of class size on scholastic achievement. Quarterly Journal of Economics 114(2):533-575. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1162/003355399556061 cited by 1507

43. Filges T, Sonne-Schmidt CS, Nielsen BCV (2018). Small class sizes for improving student achievement in primary and secondary schools: A systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews 14(1):1-107. (meta-analysis) doi:10.4073/csr.2018.10 cited by 55

44. Hoxby CM (2000). The effects of class size on student achievement: New evidence from population variation. Quarterly Journal of Economics 115(4):1239-1285. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/003355300555060 cited by 951

45. Leuven E, Lokken SA (2020). Long-term impacts of class size in compulsory school. Journal of Human Resources 55(1):309-348. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.3368/jhr.55.2.0217.8574R2 cited by 33

46. Schanzenbach DW (2014). Does Class Size Matter? Policy brief. National Education Policy Center, Boulder CO. (review) link

47. Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. Review of Educational Research 88(4):547-588. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0034654318759268 cited by 1204

48. Allen, J. P., Pianta, R. C., Gregory, A., Mikami, A. Y., & Lun, J. (2011). An Interaction-Based Approach to Enhancing Secondary School Instruction and Student Achievement. Science 333(6045):1034-1037. (RCT) doi:10.1126/science.1207998 cited by 592

49. Kraft, M. A., & Blazar, D. (2017). Individualized Coaching to Improve Teacher Practice Across Grades and Subjects: New Experimental Evidence. Educational Policy 31(7):1033-1068. (RCT) doi:10.1177/0895904816631099 cited by 99

50. Blazar, D., & Kraft, M. A. (2015). Exploring Mechanisms of Effective Teacher Coaching: A Tale of Two Cohorts From a Randomized Experiment. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(4):542-566. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0162373715579487 cited by 90

51. Kraft, M. A., & Hill, H. C. (2020). Developing Ambitious Mathematics Instruction Through Web-Based Coaching: A Randomized Field Trial. American Educational Research Journal 57(6):2378-2414. (RCT) doi:10.3102/0002831220916840 cited by 54

52. Campbell, P. F., & Malkus, N. N. (2011). The Impact of Elementary Mathematics Coaches on Student Achievement. The Elementary School Journal 111(3):430-454. (RCT) doi:10.1086/657654 cited by 250

53. Lynch, K., Hill, H. C., Gonzalez, K. E., & Pollard, C. (2019). Strengthening the Research Base That Informs STEM Instructional Improvement Efforts: A Meta-Analysis. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 41(3):260-293. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0162373719849044 cited by 160

54. Garet, M. S., Heppen, J. B., Walters, K., Parkinson, J., Smith, T. M., Song, M., Garrett, R., Yang, R., & Borman, G. D. (2016). Focusing on Mathematical Knowledge: The Impact of Content-Intensive Teacher Professional Development. NCEE 2016-4010. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences. (RCT) link

55. Jacob, R., Hill, H., & Corey, D. (2017). The Impact of a Professional Development Program on Teachers' Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching, Instructional Practice, and Student Achievement. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 10(2):379-407. (RCT) doi:10.1080/19345747.2016.1273411 cited by 155

56. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective Teacher Professional Development. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. (review) doi:10.54300/122.311 cited by 4273

57. Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010). Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study. NCEE 2010-4027. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences. (RCT) link

58. Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research. Review of Educational Research 81(2):201-233. (review) doi:10.3102/0034654311403323 cited by 1508

59. Ronfeldt, M., & McQueen, K. (2017). Does New Teacher Induction Really Improve Retention? Journal of Teacher Education 68(4):394-410. (longitudinal) doi:10.1177/0022487117702583 cited by 214

60. Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What Are the Effects of Induction and Mentoring on Beginning Teacher Turnover? American Educational Research Journal 41(3):681-714. (cross-sectional) doi:10.3102/00028312041003681 cited by 1634

61. Rockoff, J. E. (2008). Does Mentoring Reduce Turnover and Improve Skills of New Employees? Evidence from Teachers in New York City. NBER Working Paper 13868. (longitudinal) doi:10.3386/w13868 cited by 92

62. Papay, J. P., Taylor, E. S., Tyler, J. H., & Laski, M. E. (2020). Learning Job Skills from Colleagues at Work: Evidence from a Field Experiment Using Teacher Performance Data. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 12(1):359-388. (RCT) doi:10.1257/pol.20170709 cited by 149

63. Helms-Lorenz, M., van de Grift, W., & Maulana, R. (2016). Longitudinal effects of induction on teaching skills and attrition rates of beginning teachers. School Effectiveness and School Improvement 27(2):178-204. (RCT) doi:10.1080/09243453.2015.1035731 cited by 120

64. Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher Turnover: Why It Matters and What We Can Do About It. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. (review) doi:10.54300/454.278 cited by 706

65. Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The Effect of Evaluation on Teacher Performance. American Economic Review 102(7):3628-3651. (natural experiment) doi:10.1257/aer.102.7.3628 cited by 405

66. Dee, T. S., & Wyckoff, J. (2015). Incentives, Selection, and Teacher Performance: Evidence from IMPACT. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 34(2):267-297. (regression discontinuity) doi:10.1002/pam.21818 cited by 332

67. Adnot, M., Dee, T., Katz, V., & Wyckoff, J. (2017). Teacher Turnover, Teacher Quality, and Student Achievement in DCPS. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 39(1):54-76. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3102/0162373716663646 cited by 226

68. Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2017). Revisiting The Widget Effect: Teacher Evaluation Reforms and the Distribution of Teacher Effectiveness. Educational Researcher 46(5):234-249. (cross-sectional) doi:10.3102/0013189X17718797 cited by 181

69. Bleiberg, J., Brunner, E., Harbatkin, E., Kraft, M. A., & Springer, M. G. (2025). Taking Teacher Evaluation to Scale: The Effect of State Reforms on Achievement and Attainment. Journal of Political Economy Microeconomics 3(3):568-610. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1086/732837 cited by 4

70. Steinberg, M. P., & Sartain, L. (2015). Does Teacher Evaluation Improve School Performance? Experimental Evidence from Chicago's Excellence in Teaching Project. Education Finance and Policy 10(4):535-572. (RCT) doi:10.1162/EDFP_a_00173 cited by 112

71. Garet, M. S., Wayne, A. J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., & Manzeske, D. (2017). The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers and Principals: Final Report. NCEE 2018-4001. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences. (RCT) link

72. Stecher, B. M., Holtzman, D. J., Garet, M. S., Hamilton, L. S., Engberg, J., Steiner, E. D., Robyn, A., Baird, M. D., Gutierrez, I. A., Peet, E. D., Brodziak de los Reyes, I., Fronberg, K., Weinberger, G., Hunter, G. P., & Chambers, J. (2018). Improving Teaching Effectiveness: Final Report. The Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching Through 2015-2016. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. (longitudinal) doi:10.7249/RR2242 cited by 43

73. Kraft, M. A., Brunner, E. J., Dougherty, S. M., & Schwegman, D. J. (2020). Teacher accountability reforms and the supply and quality of new teachers. Journal of Public Economics 188:104212. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104212 cited by 81

74. Cullen, J. B., Koedel, C., & Parsons, E. (2021). The Compositional Effect of Rigorous Teacher Evaluation on Workforce Quality. Education Finance and Policy 16(1):7-41. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00292 cited by 31

75. Phipps, A. R., & Wiseman, E. A. (2021). Enacting the Rubric: Teacher Improvements in Windows of High-Stakes Observation. Education Finance and Policy 16(2):283-312. (natural experiment) doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00295 cited by 22

76. Bastani H, Bastani O, Sungu A, Ge H, Kabakci O, Mariman R (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 122(26):e2422633122. (RCT) doi:10.1073/pnas.2422633122 cited by 313

77. Kestin G, Miller K, Klales A, Milbourne T, Ponti G (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: an RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. Scientific Reports 15. (RCT) doi:10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6 cited by 214

78. Contractor Z, Reyes G (2026). Experimental Evidence on the Learning Impact of Generative AI. arXiv:2607.08849 (also NBER / IZA DP 18792). (RCT) link

79. Lehmann M, Cornelius PB, Sting FJ (2024). AI Meets the Classroom: When Does ChatGPT Harm Learning? SSRN working paper. (RCT) doi:10.2139/ssrn.4941259 cited by 23

80. Wang J, Fan W (2026). Retraction Note: The effect of ChatGPT on students' learning performance, learning perception, and higher-order thinking: insights from a meta-analysis. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications 13. (review) doi:10.1057/s41599-026-07310-z cited by 10

81. U.S. Department of Education (2025). Dear Colleague Letter: Use of federal grant funds to support responsible AI integration in education, July 22, 2025. (standard) link

82. Zheng B, Warschauer M, Lin CH, Chang C (2016). Learning in One-to-One Laptop Environments: A Meta-Analysis and Research Synthesis. Review of Educational Research 86(4):1052-1084. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3102/0034654316628645 cited by 312

83. Hull M, Duch K (2019). One-to-One Technology and Student Outcomes: Evidence From Mooresville's Digital Conversion Initiative. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 41(1):79-97. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3102/0162373718799969 cited by 28

84. Escueta M, Nickow AJ, Oreopoulos P, Quan V (2020). Upgrading Education with Technology: Insights from Experimental Research. Journal of Economic Literature 58(4):897-996. (review) doi:10.1257/jel.20191507 cited by 205

85. Cristia J, Ibarraran P, Cueto S, Santiago A, Severin E (2017). Technology and Child Development: Evidence from the One Laptop per Child Program. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 9(3):295-320. (RCT) doi:10.1257/app.20150385 cited by 132

86. Hall C, Lundin M, Sibbmark K (2021). A laptop for every child? The impact of technology on human capital formation. Labour Economics 69:101957. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2020.101957 cited by 14

87. Beland LP, Murphy R (2016). Ill Communication: Technology, distraction and student performance. Labour Economics 41:61-76. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2016.04.004 cited by 236

88. Abrahamsson S (2026). Smartphone Bans, Student Outcomes and Mental Health. Journal of Human Resources, 0224-13403R2 (online first). (natural experiment) doi:10.3368/jhr.0224-13403r2 cited by 30

89. Kessel D, Hardardottir HL, Tyrefors B (2020). The impact of banning mobile phones in Swedish secondary schools. Economics of Education Review 77:102009. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2020.102009 cited by 60

90. Bottger T, Zierer K (2024). To Ban or Not to Ban? A Rapid Review on the Impact of Smartphone Bans in Schools on Social Well-Being and Academic Performance. Education Sciences 14(8):906. (meta-analysis) doi:10.3390/educsci14080906 cited by 60

91. Goodyear VA, Randhawa A, Adab P, et al. (2025). School phone policies and their association with mental wellbeing, phone use, and social media use (SMART Schools): a cross-sectional observational study. The Lancet Regional Health - Europe, 101211. (cross-sectional) doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2025.101211 cited by 71

92. Carrion Braakman I, Krepel A, Stronkhorst E, Klein T, de Roode J, van de Vrie M, Dirix L (2025). Monitoring landelijke afspraak mobiele telefoons en andere devices in de klas: Eindrapport, eenmeting. Kohnstamm

Instituut Rapport 1147 / Oberon, for the Dutch Ministry of Education. (cross-sectional) link

93. Pawlowski CS, Nielsen JV, Schmidt T (2021). A Ban on Smartphone Usage during Recess Increased Children's Physical Activity. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 18(4):1907. (longitudinal) doi:10.3390/ijerph18041907 cited by 12
94. Saffer H (2026). Youth Mental Health and School Smartphone Bans: Early Evidence. NBER Working Paper 35181. (difference-in-differences) doi:10.3386/w35181 cited by 1
95. Federal Trade Commission (2022). Policy Statement of the Federal Trade Commission on Education Technology and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act. Adopted May 19, 2022. (standard) link
96. Human Rights Watch (2022). How Dare They Peep into My Private Life? Children's Rights Violations by Governments that Endorsed Online Learning during the Covid-19 Pandemic. (cross-sectional) link
97. Internet Safety Labs (2022). 2022 K-12 EdTech Safety Benchmark: National Findings, Part 1. December 13, 2022. (cross-sectional) link
98. U.S. Government Accountability Office (2020). Data Security: Recent K-12 Data Breaches Show That Students Are Vulnerable to Harm. GAO-20-644. (cross-sectional) link
99. Sallay D, Future of Privacy Forum (2023). Written testimony on Massachusetts H.532 (student data privacy). (standard) link

Alignment Audit by EarthPilot. Every citation is checked against Crossref and OpenAlex before it is shown; evidence tiers and counter-evidence are printed, not hidden. Scores are a judgment with a published formula, not a measurement.