

Nashoba Regional School

District

Targeted District Review Report

April 2022



Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

75 Pleasant Street
Malden, MA 02148-4906
781-338-3000
www.doe.mass.edu

American Institutes for Research

Education Systems and Policy

201 Jones Road, Suite 100
Waltham, MA 02451
(202) 403-5000
www.air.org

Contents

Executive Summary 1

Nashoba Regional Schools: District Review Overview..... 4

Curriculum and Instruction.....8

Assessment 17

Student Support..... 23

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit ActivitiesA-1

Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures B-2

Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report C-1

Appendix D. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators.... D-1

Appendix E. Student Performance Tables..... E-1



This document was prepared by the American Institutes for Research, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner

Published October 2022

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2022 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone: 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®), to conduct a targeted review of the Nashoba Regional School District (hereafter, Nashoba) in April 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on three of the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support.

All data collection procedures for this report took place during the 2021-2022 academic year. This school year represents the third year affected by the global COVID-19 pandemic, which has had a significant impact on educational systems since March 2020. The districts reviewed during the 2021-2022 school year experienced school closures, significant illness among staff and students, shortages of instructional and noninstructional staff, transportation issues, and other challenges during the two preceding school years, and some of these challenges continued during 2021-2022 as these districts were reviewed. Site visit and report writing teams considered these factors as they collected data and wrote reports.

Nashoba's superintendent, Kirk Downing, is in his first year in the role. The district is led by a central office staff that includes the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning, director of pupil personnel services, humanities curriculum coordinator, mathematics curriculum coordinator, director of business operations, human resources manager, and director of facilities. In prior years, Nashoba also had a K-12 curriculum director, but that position is not currently filled. In addition, Nashoba has an open position for a digital learning coordinator that has been unfilled for close to two years. The Nashoba Regional High School (NRHS) principal, Kathleen Boynton, was new for the 2021-2022 school year, and most members of the high school leadership team were new to Nashoba during the past two years. The Nashoba school committee has 11 members representing the three towns associated with the district: Bolton, Lancaster, and Stow.

Curriculum and Instruction

At the time of on-site review, Nashoba had established a consensus-based process for curriculum selection and review and districtwide curricula for core content areas in the elementary and middle schools. The district had also established clear expectations for teachers to modify and adjust instruction to meet their students' needs and skill levels. The textbook and curriculum selection process at the high school, however, was less systematic and driven by subject area departments. Nashoba has room, therefore, for improvement in establishing systems to document curricula and the selection process to ensure communication and consistency districtwide.

Although Nashoba is moving toward a more student-centered and inquiry-based approach for instruction, instructional strategies are teacher dependent, with more traditional approaches present at the high school. The district has a wide variety of academic offerings to enable students to explore their interests and ambitions, including Advanced Placement (AP) courses and courses in noncore

academic areas such as music and health. Concerns have been raised, however, regarding equitable access to advanced coursework in the high school.

Five observers, focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Nashoba during the week of April 25 to April 29, 2022. The observers conducted 50 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The classroom observations were guided by the Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia.¹ These observations were guided by three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

Overall, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization at all grade spans and mixed evidence of consistent emotional support, rigorous instructional support, and student engagement across grade bands, suggesting that communication of instructional expectations is an area of growth.

Assessment

Nashoba has been developing districtwide systems for assessment and data use. Interviews with teachers, interviews with school and district leaders, and a document review indicated that Nashoba has a culture of data use, with teachers and district and school leaders regularly using a wide range of assessment data, including MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System), BAS (Benchmark Assessment System) data, and teacher-developed assessments to improve teaching, learning, and decision-making. The Renaissance Learning assessment platform was piloted this year in one elementary and one middle school in Lancaster and will be implemented districtwide next year to provide more consistent and frequent benchmark data at the elementary and middle school levels. The district has implemented systems for supporting collaborative data use, including student teacher assistance teams (STATs) at most schools and common planning times (CPTs). At the high school, however, teachers typically design assessments and use data related to course-specific skills more independently. Data on student progress are shared with families through parent-teacher conferences and platforms such as Google Classroom and PowerSchool, but establishing districtwide expectations for more frequent and actionable feedback on students' performance was cited as an area of improvement by families.

Student Support

At the time of on-site review, Nashoba was making efforts to ensure that schools equitably support students' well-being (e.g., through advisory and the high school Bridge program); offer multiple forms of support to meet students' needs; and engage families and students in planning and decision making. Social-emotional learning and issues of diversity and equity have been a focus of teachers' professional development and are highlighted in the *District Improvement Plan*. In addition, schools provide a range of opportunities for students to receive support to meet their needs. However, ensuring schools have sufficient resources for supporting student well-being, ensuring culturally

¹ For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>.

responsive instruction, and creating consistent, tiered systems of support across all schools are areas of growth.

Nashoba Regional School District: District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by the DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.² The Nashoba review focused only on the three student-centered standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. The design of the targeted district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data before conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including school committee members, teachers' association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students' families. Team members also observe classroom instruction and collect data using the Teachstone CLASS protocol. Virtual interviews and focus groups also are conducted as needed. Following the site visit, the team members code and analyze the data to develop a set of objective findings. The team lead and multiple quality assurance reviewers, including DESE staff, then review the initial draft of the report. DESE staff provides recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas of growth identified before AIR finalizes and submits the report to DESE. DESE previews and then sends the report to the district for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website.

Site Visit

The site visit to Nashoba was conducted during the week of April 25 to April 29, 2022. The site visit included approximately 18 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 80 stakeholders. The review team conducted an interview with the superintendent and focus groups with the district's teaching and learning leadership team, student support leadership team, high school principal and assistant principal, elementary and middle school principals, teacher union representatives, and family and community members. In addition, the review team conducted eight teacher and specialist focus groups with a total of seven high school teachers, five high school specialists, 10 middle school teachers, seven middle school specialists, and 12 elementary school teachers. Finally, the

² DESE's District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>.

review team conducted two student focus groups, one with high school students and one with middle school students.

The site team also conducted 50 observations of classroom instruction in six schools.³ Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

Additional information can be found in the appendices. Appendix A includes details about the site visit review activities. Appendix B provides information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures. The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report is in Appendix C. Appendix D contains additional resources to support implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators. Lastly, Appendix E contains student performance data.

District Profile

Nashoba is led by a superintendent in his first year in the role, as well as by a central office staff that includes the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning, director of pupil personnel services, humanities curriculum coordinator, mathematics curriculum coordinator, director of business operations, human resources manager, and director of facilities. In prior years, Nashoba also had a K-12 curriculum director, but that position is not currently filled. In addition, Nashoba has an open position for a digital learning coordinator that has been unfilled for close to two years. The high school principal was new for the 2021-2022 school year, and most high school leadership team members were new to Nashoba during the past two years. The Nashoba school committee has 11 members representing the three towns associated with the district: Bolton, Lancaster, and Stow.

In the 2021-2022 school year, there were 261 teachers in the district, with 3,088 students enrolled in the district’s six schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

Table 1. Nashoba Public Schools: Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2021-2022

School	Type	Grades served	Enrollment
Center School (Stow)	Elementary	preK-5	506
Florence Sawyer School (Bolton)	Elementary/Middle	preK-8	727
Hale Middle School (Stow)	Middle	6-8	278
Luther Burbank Middle School (Lancaster)	Middle	6-8	224
Mary Rowlandson Elementary (Lancaster)	Elementary	preK-5	459
Nashoba Regional High School	High	9-12	894
Totals			3,088

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

Nashoba’s student enrollment has decreased slightly in the past four years (from 3,343 in 2018 to 3,088 in 2022). In 2022, students from low-income households made up 13.4 percent of the district (state average is 43.8 percent). The district served a slightly lower percentage of students with disabilities compared with the state (17.5 percent vs. 18.9 percent), a smaller percentage of English

³ DESE exempted the early childhood center from instructional observations.

learners (ELs; 2.6 percent vs. 11 percent), and a smaller percentage of students whose first language is not English (8.7 percent vs. 23.9 percent). Additional enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high-need populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged, and ELs and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

School and Student Performance

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS is higher than the average state rate for all tested grades and subject areas. Tables 2-4 provide an overview of student performance in ELA, mathematics, and science by grade level between 2018 and 2021.

Table 2. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, 2018-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
3	220	72%	79%	68%	-4	51%	17
4	237	79%	74%	75%	-4	49%	26
5	234	73%	73%	63%	-10	47%	16
6	261	76%	70%	67%	-9	47%	20
7	243	64%	82%	67%	3	43%	24
8	257	77%	70%	58%	-19	41%	17
3-8	1,452	73%	75%	66%	-7	46%	20
10	194	—	81%	82%	—	64%	18

Note. Data sourced from Next Generation [MCAS Tests 2021 Percent of Students at Each Achievement Level for Nashoba \(07250000\) \(mass.edu\)](#) (2021).

Table 3. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, 2018-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
3	220	74%	73%	44%	-30	33%	11
4	238	70%	68%	52%	-18	33%	19
5	234	64%	69%	50%	-14	33%	17
6	261	74%	71%	54%	-20	33%	21
7	242	74%	75%	60%	-14	35%	25
8	259	77%	70%	56%	-21	32%	24
3-8	1,454	72%	71%	53%	-19	33%	20
10	197	—	80%	75%	—	52%	23

Note. Data sourced from Next Generation [MCAS Tests 2021 Percent of Students at Each Achievement Level for Nashoba \(07250000\) \(mass.edu\)](#) (2021).

Table 4. MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
5	233	69%	—	57%	-12	42%
8	229	71%	—	72%	1	41%
5 and 8	462	70%	—	64%	-6	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about competency determination (CD) requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, students in 10th grade took the Legacy MCAS science test. Data sourced from Next Generation [MCAS Tests 2021 Percent of Students at Each Achievement Level for Nashoba \(07250000\) \(mass.edu\)](#) (2021).

In addition, the district’s four- and five-year graduation rates,⁴ 96.2 percent in 2021 and 95.0 percent in 2020, respectively, are greater than the state averages⁵ of 89.8 percent and 91.0 percent.

⁴ [Cohort 2021 Graduation Rates—Nashoba \(07250000\) \(mass.edu\)](#).

⁵ [Cohort 2021 Graduation Rates—Massachusetts \(00000000\)](#).

Curriculum and Instruction

At the time of on-site review, Nashoba had established a consensus-based process for curriculum selection and review, as well as districtwide curricula for core content areas in the elementary and middle schools. The district had also established clear expectations for teachers to modify and adjust instruction to meet their students' needs and skill levels. The textbook and curriculum selection process at the high school, however, was less systematic and driven by subject area departments. Nashoba, therefore, has room for improvement in establishing systems to document curricula and the selection process to ensure communication and consistency districtwide.

Although Nashoba is moving toward a more student-centered and inquiry-based approach for instruction, instructional strategies are teacher dependent, with more traditional approaches present at the high school. The district has a wide variety of academic offerings to enable students to explore their interests and ambitions, including AP courses and courses in noncore academic areas, such as music and health. Concerns have been raised, however, regarding equitable access to advanced coursework in the high school.

Five observers, focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Nashoba during the week of April 25 to April 29, 2022. The observers conducted 50 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The classroom observations were guided by three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). Overall, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization at all grade spans and mixed evidence of consistent emotional support, rigorous instructional support, and student engagement across grade bands, suggesting that communication of instructional expectations is an area of growth. Table 5 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.

Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth, Curriculum and Instruction Standard

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Curriculum selection and use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nashoba has a consensus-based, inclusive, regular decision-making process for elementary and middle school curriculum selection and use. ■ Nashoba has established districtwide curricula within and across elementary and middle school core content areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Curricular materials aligned with definitions of high-quality instructional materials. ■ Consistent processes for selection and use of high school curricula. ■ Systemic documentation of and access to curricular materials.
Classroom instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nashoba has established clear expectations that teachers make adjustments and accommodations to practice informed by students’ learning needs, skill levels, and levels of readiness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Opportunities for engaging, rigorous instruction that promotes critical thinking. ■ Communication of districtwide instructional models and strategies. ■ Implementation of districtwide instructional models and strategies. ■ Districtwide multitiered system of supports (MTSS) guidelines. ■ Districtwide policies and expectations surrounding classroom observation and feedback.
Student access to coursework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nashoba provides a wide variety of academic offerings that encourage students to pursue rigorous learning experiences aligned with their ambitions and interests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Equitable access to advanced coursework at the high school.

Curriculum Selection and Use

Interviews, focus groups, and document reviews indicated that Nashoba has curriculum review and selection processes, as well as districtwide core content curricula, in place at the elementary and middle school levels. At the high school level, however, processes for selecting curricula are less defined, and curricula are predominately teacher developed. As identified on the Nashoba CURATE⁶ curriculum table, the Lucy Calkins Units of Study is used for K-8 ELA instruction, along with Foundations for K-5 ELA. Kathy Richardson, enVisionMATH 2.0, and Big Ideas Math are the mathematics curricula for kindergarten, Grades 1-5, and Grades 6-8, respectively; and STEMscopes is the science curriculum across Grades 1-8. All K-8 curricula were either not rated by CURATE or received a “does not meet expectations” rating (Lucy Calkins Units of Study for K-5) or “partially meets expectations” rating (Foundations). Nashoba uses several different high school mathematics curricula depending on the course (e.g., Big Ideas Math for non-honors algebra I, geometry, and algebra II); these curricula are also not rated by CURATE. For other subject areas at the high school, curricula are predominately teacher developed and therefore not rated.

⁶ CURATE: CUrriculum RATings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>.

Respondents provided similar reports of the curriculum selection and review process at the elementary and middle school levels. At the time of the visit, Nashoba was wrapping up an elementary mathematics curriculum review and selection process. District and school leaders described a “consensus-building” process that involved a committee of teachers, administrators, and mathematics specialists. The process included teacher surveys, a review of curricula from EdReports, field testing, and review of alignment to the district’s instructional vision and priorities. District leaders reported that because of turnover in district administration, this review process evolved along the way and “certainly could be refined.” According to district and school leaders, as well as documentation, the core curriculum selection and review process takes place approximately every five years for each subject area.

The curriculum selection process at the high school, however, was reported to be more teacher driven with less consistent review cycles, and the process was identified as an area of growth. For example, one district leader described, “The high school has had more autonomy in terms of determining what each course looks like, what curriculum materials are used, [and] what the scope and sequence is.” One high school teacher described the textbook selection process within a department:

All the teachers that teach that subject, we sit down and just start reading textbooks. And, like, “What do we like about this textbook? What do we like about that textbook? What are the online features? What are the assessment features? What are all the things that come with the textbook too?”

A few respondents noted that the high school had regular textbook review cycles, but these have not happened recently. Similarly, another respondent noted that at the high school, “In terms of a continuous review cycle, I’m unsure if that takes place.” Several respondents noted that having regular textbook review cycles in the high school is challenging because different subject areas require changing textbooks more or less frequently. For example, one respondent remarked, “I feel like with bio you might want to change the text more often than maybe in physics.”

As seen in the CURATE table, districtwide curricula for core subject areas have been adopted for elementary and middle schools in Nashoba. School leaders noted that the district, “because it’s a regional school district, it’s worked hard to become calibrated with its curriculum and instruction, and yet maintain the integrity and uniqueness of each setting.” Interviews revealed some challenges with consistency and coherence within and across schools, however. One district leader highlighted professional development opportunities at the end of the year where teachers from Grades 8 and 9 meet together to identify gaps and align instruction to facilitate a smooth transition for students from middle to high school. Teachers noted variable opportunities to meet across grade levels or across schools regarding coherent curriculum implementation. One middle school teacher, for example, reported, “There’s processes in place for the subject level teams to meet vertically . . . which is really great practice,” but, in contrast, an elementary teacher shared that within the same building, “the grade level up, we just don’t really know what the grade level below us is doing day-to-day.” Respondents noted less consistency in the curriculum taught within the high school. The high school has had, according to district leaders, “significant” turnover in administration in recent years, including a new principal for the 2021-2022 school year who took over for an interim principal in place from 2019, as well as turnover in other leadership positions. According to district leaders,

department heads do not have formal leadership roles with respect to evaluation, professional development, or curriculum review to ensure coherence across grade levels and departments. However, district leaders noted that the new high school leadership team is more focused on instructional leadership and is working toward expanding the department head leadership roles.

The Nashoba *Self-Assessment* and stakeholder interviews expressed the need for one place to document and organize curricular materials. Instructors said curriculum documents were housed in Rubicon Atlas and Google Classroom, but the lack of coherence would make it confusing for a new teacher. For instance, a science instructor reported,

I think if a new teacher joined today in the science department, there would be a lot of confusion on what some teachers are using and what they're not . . . where do I go, to figure out what is supposed to be taught? Is it one of eight random Google doc folders that have been created over the last several years? Is it Atlas Rubicon. . . . There was never any coherence [regarding] what should go in or when should it go in.

Teachers also explained they used Atlas predominately before COVID-19, and lack of structured time has prevented them from updating, reviewing, and evaluating materials already in Atlas. To address this, a district leader reported that the district plans to shift all curriculum documentation to Google Drive, making it accessible to all teachers, community members, and parents. However, respondents provided mixed reports of whether the systems in place can clearly document the curriculum in this format. For example, one teacher reported, "So we have everything put together in a Google Classroom, and [the grade-level teachers can] reference what was done in the previous years and then make adjustments. And so, I found that it's been very organized." In contrast, another teacher shared, "I don't think that we've been afforded the time that we need . . . to develop a plan for development and implementation of those norms [for documenting curricula]." Mixed evidence in regard to consistent documentation of curricula suggests this is an area for growth.

Classroom Instruction

Interviews, focus groups, and a document review indicated that Nashoba has been shifting over the years to more student-centered and inquiry-based instructional strategies; however, instructional approaches vary across classrooms. Resources or supports available to meet the needs of diverse learning styles within the general education setting include content materials (e.g., manipulatives, exemplars, computer-assisted instruction, leveled readers, and reference tools), environmental changes (e.g., providing multimodal presentations of materials and targeted small groups), and executive functioning supports (e.g., frequent progress monitoring and allowing for extra time). Instructional expectations are communicated through professional development, school leadership, and grade-level and content-area meetings. A districtwide model frequently reported by staff in the elementary and middle schools was the workshop classroom model, and one school leader described how this has been implemented in Nashoba:

We did a lot of work with literacy workshop models, and I think that helped push a lot of different things, which was good as far as looking at content standards, how to teach those in a workshop model. And I see aspects of that now in math. I think science we've become more hands on. . . . I think it was fairly traditional [before]. So, I think we've made some strides in that department.

Another school leader further described, “Workshop is automatically, when done well, differentiated and provides students voice and choice and ownership. Inquiry-based instruction for science lends itself to meeting the needs of all learners.”

However, teachers reported that instructional approaches are teacher dependent and vary by grade level. For example, one middle school teacher noted that instructional strategies and learning environments “really all varies on the teacher in the class,” and another teacher shared, “We have a set curriculum and set standards that we all know that we’re going to do, but the way that we teach it is all a little bit different.” Some teachers noted being appreciative of this flexibility: “One of the things I appreciate about this district is the freedom. It’s a big, big thing.” However, others reported a mixture of approaches, with some teachers relying on more traditional strategies such as lecture format. A few respondents also noted that high school classes tend to be more “teacher centered,” with more advanced classes (such as AP courses) relying on more traditional instructional practices and assessments. Students also described various methods of instruction across classes and subjects. Specifically, students said that some classes were characterized by interactive activities and group work, whereas others primarily used independent work and note taking. Students at both the middle and high school levels reported that they feel their classes generally do a good job at balancing different instructional approaches. Interview participants reported that teachers encourage student feedback on classroom instruction informally or through surveys sent to make sure that student voice is incorporated into instructional practices.

Both special education and general education teachers said that the district expects teachers to make adjustments and accommodations to instruction to best meet students’ needs, and staff reported collaborating with one another to make modifications to address students’ academic and social-emotional needs. For students who need more intensive supports, district staff and leaders described a multitiered system of support (MTSS) but also indicated that the district is in the process of improving this area. A document review indicated that no guidebook or policy exists that contains a districtwide approach to MTSS. However, interview participants described elements of Tier 2 supports, including small-group support within the classroom and utilization of pull-out therapeutic classrooms for K-8 students. The NRHS Educational Program Plan document from 2022 also described a Therapeutic Learning Center that provides a space for students to work on social-emotional skills. In addition, the Nashoba District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP) for 2020 reported that mathematics and reading specialists are available to “support classroom teachers regarding intervention and accommodation strategies for individual students.” Despite having these supports available, some families still expressed concern that the district did not have adequate resources to meet the needs of all students, regardless of whether students had individualized education programs (IEPs) or Section 504 plans, suggesting that establishing districtwide guidelines for MTSS is an area of growth. Interviews revealed that teachers are incorporating elements of social-emotional learning in Tier 1 instruction, such as Zones of Regulation or Morning Meetings. District leaders, school leaders, and teachers stated that the district was working to incorporate more social-emotional learning competencies into the curriculum and making this a priority by providing teachers with more resources to implement this work.

Observers visited Nashoba during the week of April 25 to April 29, 2022. The observers conducted 50 observations in a sample of classrooms across six schools. Observations were conducted in

Grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, ELA, and mathematics instruction. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district, using the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

In Nashoba, ratings are provided across three grade bands: K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. For each grade band, ratings are provided across the overarching domains, as well as at individual dimensions within those domains. The full report of findings from observations conducted in the district is in Appendix C, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

In summary, findings from district observations were as follows:

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for the all grade bands (average 5.8 in the K-5 grade band, 4.4 for the 6-8 grade band, and 4.7 for the 9-12 grade band).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (average 6.1 in the K-5 grade band, 6.9 in the 6-8 grade band, and 6.6 in the 9-12 grade band).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (average 3.4 in the K-5 grade band, 3.5 in the 6-8 grade band, and 4.0 in the 9-12 grade band).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were at the high end of the middle range for the 4-5 grade band (average 5.4) and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (average 4.7 and 4.7, respectively).

Data from the District Instructional Observation Report (see Appendix C) indicated variation in instructional approaches across the district's classrooms. Overall, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization at all grade spans and mixed evidence of consistent

emotional support, rigorous instructional support, and student engagement across grade bands, suggesting that communication of instructional expectations is an area of growth. Specifically, Nashoba's middle-range scores in the Instructional Learning Formats dimension (average 4.9 in the K-5 grand band, 4.4 in the 6-8 grade band, and 5.1 in the 9-12 grade band) indicate that teachers sometimes use instructional methods that facilitate active engagement and sometimes use a variety of modalities. The district scored in the lower end of the middle range for Analysis and Inquiry (average 1.8 in the 4-5 grand band, 2.9 in the 6-8 grade band, and 3.3 in the 9-12 grade band), indicating that students occasionally engage in higher order thinking, but these instances may be brief or limited in depth.

Stakeholders expressed differing views about the frequency of classroom observations and feedback, suggesting that establishing clear expectations for classroom observation and feedback is an area of growth. Some teachers described that, depending on the evaluator, they can expect informal observations once every few weeks, whereas others described only seeing evaluators when they have been previously alerted of a concern in the classroom. District leaders described a system for observing teachers and providing both formal and informal feedback and noted that Nashoba has various strategies to relay this feedback to instructional staff, such as formally through TeachPoint or informally through email. During formal observations, instructional staff described attending pre- and postconferences, during which the educator and evaluator will review what they hope to do in the lesson and then debrief afterward. According to district leaders, teachers in the district also use TeachPoint to upload documents to support how they are addressing the four standards and the student learning goals and professional goals.

Student Access to Coursework

Interviews, focus groups, and a document review indicated that Nashoba has a wide variety of educational offerings across all levels, including AP courses. Offerings include a range of learning opportunities in the arts, foreign languages, and health. Course leveling begins in eighth grade, and although students have opportunities to move among multiple levels during high school, some concerns were raised about ensuring equitable access to advanced courses.

The middle schools have two blocks per day allocated to classes such as physical education and music, and each trimester students either take health, engineering, or art, allowing students to explore a wide range of noncore courses throughout the year. In addition, middle school students reported that art and music programs are accessible both during and after school. Other afterschool clubs and activities include robotics, jazz band, gaming club, book club, and sports. Another course that students at one middle school described is a sixth-grade required course on coping strategies and executive functioning, which students described as "basically learning how to be a better student."

At the high school, students reported, and a review of the program of studies confirmed, a wide variety of courses offered. Students reported that they have a good amount of autonomy when it comes to choosing their classes and shared that NRHS has a wide range of elective course offerings, of which students can take two a year. One student reported, "I like how there's multiple different course options for electives because that's the type of thing where you have your own say on what you're interested in and what can help you in the future."

All instruction and coursework are unlevelled until eighth-grade mathematics. Students are placed into the advanced eighth-grade mathematics course based on grades, work habits, and a placement test. Teachers noted, however, that an override process exists, and parents can request their child be placed in the advanced course. In high school, students are placed into one of the following four levels for most courses: college preparatory, accelerated level, honors, and AP. The placement process begins during the spring of eighth grade. One student described the process of student-teacher conferences for the purposes of determining placement in high school courses: “Teachers give us recommendations and have an entire period where they give recommendations and sit down to pick classes on PowerSchool towards the end of the year.” Middle school students described this process as collaborative and explained that they can override recommended placements with sufficient justification. Respondents noted that eighth-grade teachers “always give an honest opinion” on what they believe is the best placement for students, but ultimately, high school course placement is up to the students. Similarly, some respondents noted that enrollment in advanced coursework is “student driven” and that students have opportunities to move between levels over the years. Nonetheless, a few respondents raised concerns about equitable access to the advanced courses. For example, one district leader noted,

I think here there’s some traditional thinking of tracking into different levels and you have to earn or prove your way into that AP level. And I would like to see that open more . . . if you would like to challenge yourself.

This district leader also added that not all students will advocate for themselves to take the more challenging courses. Similarly, another respondent shared, “If you looked at disaggregated data, I’m sure students with low [socioeconomic status] are in the lowest tracks in the high school because we do have a tracking system.” District administrators noted that further examination of students’ accessibility to advanced coursework starting in high school is needed and is therefore an area of growth.

High-school students also have the opportunity to participate in career readiness programs. According to district and high school staff, the emergency medical technician (EMT) and Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) programs are their most successful and widely used of these programs. The EMT program trains students to be fully certified EMTs by the time they graduate, and the DECA business program is a collaborative and project-oriented group that encourages students to create their own business proposals and explore what interests them in this sector. In addition, seniors have the option of enrolling in a work study or internship program, which allows them to get real-world experience under the supervision of a mentor. Taken together, the evidence suggests that opportunities at NRHS to participate in advanced coursework, electives/classes not subject to state testing, and other additional learning opportunities are made accessible to students, but unintentional tracking of students may result.

Recommendations

- The district should ensure that curricular materials are aligned with definitions of high-quality instructional materials.
- The district should develop consistent processes for the selection and use of high quality high school curricula.

- The district should ensure that curricular materials are systematically documented and readily available to implement for all teachers.
- District and school leaders should ensure all students have opportunities to experience engaging, rigorous instruction that promotes critical thinking.
- District leaders should ensure that instructional models or strategies adopted or fostered by the district are communicated districtwide and implemented with fidelity.
- The district should develop districtwide multitiered system of supports (MTSS) guidelines as standard practice for all buildings.
- Leadership should develop a districtwide policy regarding classroom observations and feedback.
- The district should further explore and address the extent to which students have equitable opportunity to participate in advanced coursework at the high school.

Assessment

Nashoba has been developing districtwide systems for assessment and data use. Interviews with teachers, interviews with school and district leaders, and a document review indicated that Nashoba has a culture of data use, with teachers and district and school leaders regularly using a wide range of assessment data, including MCAS, BAS, and teacher-developed assessment data to improve teaching, learning, and decision-making. The Renaissance Learning assessment platform was piloted this year in one elementary and one middle school in Lancaster and will be implemented districtwide next year to provide more consistent and frequent benchmark data at the elementary and middle school levels. The district has implemented systems for supporting collaborative data use, including STATs at most schools and CPTs. However, at the high school, teachers typically design assessments and use data related to course-specific skills more independently. Data on student progress are shared with families through parent-teacher conferences and platforms such as Google Classroom and PowerSchool, but establishing districtwide expectations for more frequent and actionable feedback on students' performance was cited as an area of improvement by families. Table 6 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

Table 6. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Assessment Standard

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Data and assessment systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nashoba uses multiple data sources that provide a comprehensive picture of student, school, and district performance. Nashoba is piloting benchmark assessments in reading and mathematics in elementary and middle school aligned with grade-level and subject area curriculum frameworks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data systems supporting the consistent administration of a variety of assessment methods, including common interim assessments, aligned by grade level and subject area.
Data use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nashoba has been establishing a culture of data use among district leaders, including using data to inform school improvement planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structures, including benchmark assessments and collaborative planning time, supporting the regular use of data to inform decision making at the classroom level, across all schools and grade levels.
Sharing results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nashoba communicates regularly with families evidence of the school and district's performance. Nashoba provides information to families about their students' progress toward attaining grade-level standards, for example, through standards-based report cards at the elementary level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districtwide expectations for sharing actionable and timely data with families (e.g., updating PowerSchool regularly).

Data and Assessment Systems

Nashoba administrative staff reported that the Office of Teaching and Learning collects and organizes most data throughout the district and works to make data more accessible for educators. According to one district leader, the district aims to allow staff to access “digital profiles, learning profiles, combined with any other data sets that we want to include in there, including [social-emotional learning] datasets,” for example, from the Panorama platform. Nashoba plans to implement Schoolzilla K-12 next year, as well as the online Renaissance Learning platform for benchmark assessments and data sharing. Renaissance Learning was piloted this year by the Lancaster schools and will be fully integrated districtwide during the 2022-2023 school year. To prepare for this shift, the district has made professional development surrounding the Renaissance program a priority for summer 2022 to help teachers understand how to use assessments and data to inform instruction.

Nashoba has a range of literacy, mathematics, and ELA assessments in place at the elementary and middle school levels. At the beginning of the 2021-2022 year, kindergarten classroom teachers were required by the district to assess students’ knowledge of letter sounds and letter identification. Kindergarten classroom teachers also reported assessing students on early literacy in the winter and on mathematics concepts three times a year. According to the Nashoba Assessment Schedule for 2021-2022, a district-developed mathematics benchmark assessment is required of all students K-5 three times a year, and BAS for reading is used districtwide in Grades 1-5 in the beginning of the school year, in the winter for Grades K-2, and again in the spring for kindergarten only. Lexia is administered throughout the year as a progress monitoring tool and dyslexia screener in Grades K-2. Nashoba also has systems in place to assess students who are at risk in Grades K-5, such as the Kelly Richardson Assessments in Grades K-2, and the Math Reasoning Inventory in Grades 3-5; both assessments are administered three times a year. According to the Nashoba District Assessment Inventory, ELs are evaluated through the WIDA assessment at these grade levels as well. In addition to district-aligned assessments, teachers reported that they have independently developed assessments to give to all students after each unit of study and that many teachers use strategies such as exit tickets to measure student progress in Grades K-5. At the middle school level, the Nashoba assessment inventory shows that the district has systems in place for assessing specific student groups, such as ELs with the WIDA assessment and students who are at risk with the BAS.

The district identified a need to implement aligned benchmark assessments in mathematics and ELA, and therefore, Lancaster K-8 schools have been piloting the Renaissance Learning program. Instructional staff reported that this platform and accompanying STAR assessments have been helpful for assessing students’ progress with respect to state standards. One teacher who is not part of the Renaissance pilot emphasized the need for these benchmark assessments: “I’m having a really hard time monitoring specifically in math, through COVID . . . where there are skills that they missed.” Continued districtwide implementation of these aligned assessments is identified as an area of continued growth.

Middle school teachers reported using a variety of informal check-ins to gauge the social-emotional state of their students daily. For example, one teacher reported using a model in their classroom called *Classrooms* in which students have an opportunity to share with their teacher and peers about how they are doing, as well as formal strategies such as surveys through the Pear Deck program. At

the middle and highschool level, social-emotional learning data are collected at least once a year through the Emerson Hospital Youth Behavior survey.

Staff at the high school level reported that midterm exams in 2021-2022 were not taken consistently across grade levels and subjects, and high school teachers explained that a shift to project-based learning has occurred as a way for students to show understanding and measure academic progress. Teachers reported that they have options to individually choose whether to give an assessment or assign a project but agree that alignment exists, in that academic progress and skills are measured. One teacher explained,

I don't give traditional tests and quizzes . . . but I will absolutely make sure that there's some sort of assessment in there that measures the same exact skills that that test would measure just in a different way. So, I think it's just the individual, but we're all hitting certain skills and we're all making sure that we're assessing.

High school teachers in specific content areas, such as the world languages department, reported having common midterm and final assessments or projects. In addition, some high school teachers reported using programs such as Mastery Manager to distribute and track common assessments, but limited evidence has been found to show that this assessment occurs in the content areas of mathematics or ELA in Grades 9-12.

Data Use

Interviews with teachers and district and school leaders, and a review of Nashoba's Assessment Inventory, indicated that data are used regularly to identify and address student needs. Staff districtwide reported efforts to collect and use data daily, when possible, to make adjustments to instruction. At the administrative level, district leaders emphasized the importance of using data to examine trends in student achievement and to inform curriculum and instruction districtwide.

The Office of Teaching and Learning in Nashoba plays a crucial role with data collection and use and has been working to foster data use districtwide. To make sure principals report data back to the district in an actionable way, Nashoba is implementing a summer "state of the union" meeting for school leaders to "present their learnings from the year and how they're going to queue up their school improvement plans for the next year." Data are also used to make decisions regarding curricular resources at the administrative level. One administrative staff member noted,

We use the Learn platform for all of the technology that we use and all the applications that we use in the district. So we're able to look at data just in terms of what applications, what software, what programs teachers are using and using with fidelity. So that informs what curriculum decisions we make in terms of what we purchase. So we're able to see whether the curriculum that we buy, whether it's actually being utilized by teachers. And if it's not, we can say this is, we need to go in a different direction.

Another administrative staff member described the district's informal use of instructional observation data:

Last year I did [observations] . . . and then I was able to go back to the principal and say, “About three quarters of the time students never talked to each other about mathematics.” And I was able to make an argument that discourse might need to be a focus.

The Office of Teaching and Learning also works to ensure that schools have easy access to data, to support principals’ use of data to guide schoolwide improvement, including data from MCAS, BAS, and Lexia. However, some district leaders recognize that improvements could be made to using data in more of an interconnected and comprehensive way, and Nashoba is actively working toward this goal. One district administrator stated:

We have a lot of work to do on what a comprehensive data set looks like. And how you take the foundational elements of data assessments and looking at the daily classroom work and student samples and build upon that your benchmarks, your surveying data, . . . as that data triangle of telling the story of a student.

As a result, creating systems that use data in a more comprehensive way has been identified as an area for growth in the district.

In Grades K-5, evidence suggests that teachers regularly use data to adjust instruction based on a student’s academic progress. Teachers across schools described multiple opportunities to discuss data from assessments, classroom observations, and student work across grade levels, such as through CPT or STAT meetings. CPT is sometimes used to discuss students who may be struggling academically or socially emotionally but also to discuss the strengths of students and what strategies educators feel are working well in their classrooms. At most schools, the STAT reviews data to determine which students need to be connected with services and/or individualized support for mathematics and ELA, as well as supports addressing social-emotional needs. Elementary schools have been using a workshop model of teaching that has supported the collection of more formative data, according to respondents. One district administrator, for example, described how the workshop approach is effective at informing instruction:

[Teachers] have their data from their assessments, but then they’re able to pull individual and small groups. And I feel like that gives them the opportunity there to collect that data that you’re seeing day to day. That also builds that picture. So I feel like that’s really important. And that helps when you talk about informing instruction.

Teachers also described collaborating with colleagues from a students’ previous grade level to use past data in determining supports at the beginning of each school year.

Systematic data use was reported less consistently at the middle school level. Middle school staff at one school raised concerns about how benchmark assessment data would be used. These teachers described Nashoba as a “data rich but information poor” district, noting a disconnect between data gathering and use:

If we have these interim assessments, what is, again, the actionable, specific procedure that we definitely have time to work with meaningfully, to compare those data points? And then where is the time to transform collaboratively that data into shifts in instruction and or assessment?

At the middle school level, teachers also reported using data such as classroom assessments and grades to help students in eighth grade select their high school courses.

High school teachers reported meeting and discussing some common data points, such as MCAS scores, to identify where students may need additional skill-building. In addition, teachers reported using multiple forms of assessment to measure student understanding. Some departments use common unit or midterm/final assessments. Teachers also create customized assessments to measure relevant skills for each course. For example, one high school teacher reported that although teachers generally address the state standards,

We discuss our MCAS scores. . . . But I wouldn't say that we're driven by state standards as much as we are by the skills that we assess our students need, the students in front of us. There's a lot of discussion [regarding] assessing where the kids might be weak and how we're going to target those areas.

However, one administrative staff member noted that the use of formative assessment data to inform instruction may not be an embedded practice across high school classrooms. This respondent described,

I think you see a range. I think some teachers are using formative assessment in the moment and that's across departments. You'll see more traditional quizzes, end-of-unit tests that are definitely used. I'm unclear if those are necessarily . . . informing an adjustment to instruction.

For social-emotional data, Panorama is used by high school guidance counselors, which has been reported as being successful and helpful to inform social-emotional supports for students.

Sharing Results

Nashoba uses multiple platforms to share data within the district and with families and students. For example, principals meet with staff at the beginning of the school year to review MCAS data. In addition, the district is implementing a summer "state of the union" meeting for principals to share progress on their school improvement plans. Finally, data are shared by the Office of Teaching and Learning districtwide. For example, one district leader explained, "Anything that we're sharing now, when I do my report out on MCAS, we're presenting all of the data to the community and being as transparent as we can." Data sharing through the Renaissance Learning platform has recently begun in the pilot elementary and middle schools. Data sharing will be implemented districtwide with the goal of making data more transparent to both administration and instructional staff. In addition, at all grade levels, student data are typically shared from staff member to staff member through grade-level collaboration structures and specialist meetings such as CPT or STAT meetings.

Teachers, school leaders, and parents reported multiple ways in which individual students' progress is shared with students and families. Throughout the district, teachers reported using Google Drive and Classroom to share student academic progress with families, as well as with other instructional staff, specialists, and administrators. Elementary school teachers explained that they usually will not share data on specific assessments with parents but will use standards-based report cards and conferencing to share a holistic picture of a student that includes both academic and social-

emotional learning. Teachers also reported having conversations with families about how the classroom instruction or additional supports support their students. For example, one teacher described that they have found it helpful to talk with their students individually about goal-setting for themselves and, in many cases, with the help of their parents. In Grades 6-8, teachers reported that students receive formal and informal feedback in the moment through classroom instruction and can receive actionable feedback on assignments through Google Classroom. Another way teachers can share results and give actionable feedback to students regarding data in Grades 6-12 is through teacher-student conferencing, where the teacher and student sit down and talk individually about their progress and give feedback on assignments during class periods. These strategies have provided opportunities for open communication with students about their academic progress. However, parents reported that the feedback they receive about their students' academic progress and social-emotional learning varies by teacher and across grade levels. Although one parent noted, "I've had really great feedback, specific feedback where teachers have been so prepared with examples, and they have work samples to show me," another parent shared, "I get almost no feedback except from Google Classroom."

PowerSchool is also used in Grades 9-12, and this program allows students and parents to access grades and assessment feedback in real time. High school students reported that this feedback is generally helpful as long as teachers update PowerSchool in a timely manner, and students noted that actionable feedback from teachers, with strategies for improvement, is most helpful. Reports from students and families were varied, with some noting that some teachers wait until the end of the quarter to update PowerSchool. One student described how this delay in receiving feedback from teachers can hinder academic growth:

When teachers do that, it's really hard for students to communicate with their teacher and be like, "Hey, I got a not so good grade on this. Could you tell me why?" Because by then, it's already passed and there's really nothing the teacher can do about it.

Although the district does have a Communication Plan (last updated in 2019-2020) outlining strategies to clearly and consistently communicate with parents and families, parent and student feedback indicated that establishing districtwide expectations for timely and actionable communication for parents, families, and students is an area of growth.

Recommendations

- The district should ensure data systems are in place to support the consistent administration of a variety of assessments, including common interim assessments, aligned by grade level and subject area.
- The district should continue to implement formalized structures, including benchmark assessments and collaborative planning time, to support the regular use of data to inform decision-making at the classroom level, across all schools and grade levels.
- The district should establish and communicate districtwide expectations for sharing actionable and timely data with families and students.

Student Support

At the time of on-site review, Nashoba was making efforts to ensure that schools equitably support students' well-being (e.g., through advisory and the high school Bridge program); offer multiple forms of support to meet students' needs; and engage families and students in planning and decision making. Social-emotional learning and issues of diversity and equity have been a focus of teachers' professional development and are highlighted in the *District Improvement Plan*. In addition, schools provide a range of opportunities for students to receive support to meet their needs. However, ensuring schools have sufficient resources for supporting student well-being, ensuring culturally responsive instruction, and creating consistent, tiered systems of support across all schools are areas of growth. Table 7 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in student support.

Table 7. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Student Support Standard

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Safe and supportive school climate and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nashoba prioritizes cultivating a safe and support environment for students. Nashoba is identifying and addressing issues of equity and cultural competence in the district. Students are provided opportunities for leadership and contributions to school and district decision making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources to support schools and teachers in addressing social-emotional learning and student well-being. Staff capacity to ensure that all school and classroom environments are culturally responsive and reflect students' cultures and identities. Consistently implemented districtwide expectations for positive behavioral approaches for students.
Tiered systems of support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nashoba provides supports to general education teachers to address the needs of students with diverse learning styles through a DCAP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of districtwide tiered systems of support. Clear districtwide expectations for all students, including but not limited to students with 504 plans or IEPs and ELs, to receive support across all three tiers.
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nashoba ensures that students and families have a voice in planning and decision making. Nashoba has established community partnerships and connections to resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnerships with families to support students in a way that is strengths based, culturally responsive, and collaborative.

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

Nashoba is making efforts to promote a safe and supportive environment for students. Evidence from the 2020-2021 *Views of Climate and Learning* survey across Grades 4, 5, 8, and 10 in six Nashoba schools suggests that the district fosters a safe and supportive environment, with most

scores at the district level in the “relatively strong” range. Students who rated their school’s overall climate in the “typical range” included students in 10th grade who identify as female or Hispanic, students in eighth grade who identify as Hispanic or economically disadvantaged, and middle school students with disabilities or those who identify as Asian. Nashoba’s Districtwide Instructional Observation Report supports these sentiments. Scores in the middle range for the positive climate dimension of the Teachstone CLASS protocol suggest that some teachers and students share warm and supportive relationships (averages for positive climate were 5.9 in the K-5 grade band, 4.7 in the 6-8 grade band, and 4.5 in the 9-12 grade band, on a scale of 1 to 7). Teacher sensitivity scores were higher but still indicated that teachers are sometimes, rather than consistently, aware of students’ emotional and academic needs (averages for teacher sensitivity were 5.8 in the K-5 grade band, 5.1 in the 6-8 grade band, and 5.9 in the 9-12 grade band).

Interviews, focus groups, and a document review indicated that Nashoba is moving to prioritize students’ social-emotional development. A goal identified in the district’s 2019-2022 *District Improvement Plan* was “to intentionally integrate social-emotional practices across all settings in the Nashoba school community,” and substantial professional development was provided to instructional staff using the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning framework. Teacher focus groups indicated that schools use a range of strategies to address social-emotional learning, such as morning meetings, advisory, a “successful student skills” class, or informal check-ins at the beginning of high school classes. Some staff members, however, said that the district’s efforts to address students’ social-emotional needs fall short because of the lack of resources and staff to provide support to students. One teacher remarked,

We hear as teachers ad nauseam [“social-emotional learning,” “social-emotional learning”]. But the resources provided haven’t increased. The training, yes, but it’s things that teachers. . . . Like you said, teachers have been doing this a long time, but it’s the resources that need to be changed. It’s the amount of counselors. Teachers have been pleading for more counselors, and it still continues to get dropped off the budget list.

Another focus group participant further emphasized the need for more counselors and shared, “Teachers aren’t going to be assessing kids’ safety risk. A teacher can’t do that. Or how is a teacher going to handle an eating disorder? That’s not their purview nor their training.” This mixed evidence suggests room for growth in prioritizing resources for student well-being.

As a district that serves a large percentage of students who are White (85.5 percent in 2021-2022), parents, teachers, and district leaders vocalized the need for cultural competence within and outside the classroom. In addition to training faculty on social-emotional practices, a review of professional development agendas indicated that sessions also covered topics such as LGBTQ+ inclusion, centering diverse voices in literature, and grading and reporting systems that support an equitable culture of learning. A school leader highlighted a partnership between the elementary libraries and the Rotary Club and Nashoba Social Justice Alliance to increase cultural representation in book collections. However, high school students noted room for improvement in integrating students’ cultures and backgrounds into instruction. For example, one student shared, “I do feel like there’s a deficit of focus on minority groups, and I feel like that’s something that could be improved in our school’s curriculum.” School leaders also reported that this area of focus is a work in progress. One leader said, “I would say we’re at the developing stages,” and another leader noted, “I’d like to see

us get to a point where we have a greater understanding of not only the challenges that our students have at home but [also] the strengths they bring into the classrooms.”

School and district leaders shared several examples of ways in which school decisions incorporated student voices. One district leader highlighted a collaborative effort between students and history teachers to develop book lists that cover new topics such as LGBTQ+ history and the Armenian Genocide. Also, student feedback was used in district strategic planning and the decision to designate gender-neutral bathrooms at the high school. District leaders reported that students had opportunities to present at professional development sessions on topics related to identity. Students also have some opportunities to be involved in leadership activities in their schools by being assigned classroom jobs at the elementary level or by starting extracurricular clubs and serving on leadership councils at the middle and high school levels.

Interviews and focus groups indicated that Nashoba has no uniform behavioral system implemented across schools. At one elementary school, teachers said behavioral interventions and expectations vary across classrooms and grades. Regardless, school instructors and district leaders mentioned that schools in Nashoba regularly use restorative justice approaches (such as facilitated conversations) to build relationships and to identify and address root causes of misbehavior. In addition, average instructional observation scores for the behavior management dimension of the Teachstone CLASS tool were in the high range. These scores suggest that students understand the rules for classroom behavior, and expectations are consistently reinforced by teachers. Yet, the development and implementation of consistent districtwide expectations for positive behavioral systems remain areas for growth.

Tiered Systems of Support

Nashoba provides a range of supports to meet students’ needs across the district, with some variation by school. All Nashoba students receive Tier 1 instruction and support, including access to guidance counselors and social workers; participation in the advisory program; enrichment support before, during, and after school; and supports as needed from the DCAP (see the Classroom Instruction section). Interviews, focus groups, and document reviews indicated, however, that Nashoba needs additional staffing to support multitiered systems of support. For instance, high school instructors described the Academic Support Center as a resource previously available to students, but the staff position for the center was not renewed, making the support unavailable. At the elementary level, instructional staff also reported the need for a full-time social worker for students to access.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports focus on specific goals and needs, are of greater intensity than Tier 1, and are part of a continuum of services. Across the district, Tier 2 supports target specific skills that students need to develop, for example, through small-group instruction. Tier 3 supports for mathematics, writing, and reading are provided by interventionists through pull-out and push-in efforts. According to one administrative staff member, all schools have allocated time within the schedule for supports but use different names for the time, such as “tutorial” or “enrichment.”

The Bridge program at NRHS is a new support modeled after Brookline’s BRYT: Bridge for Resilient Youth in Transition, and it serves to retransition students into learning after long leaves of absence

(such as for illness or hospitalization). One district leader highlighted that the Bridge program is “staffed with a social worker, a guidance counselor, and a teacher . . . and then, the people in the program are liaisons to the regular ed teachers.” Students are involved in the planning of which supports they can access.

Focus groups and document review indicated Nashoba uses STAT processes across most schools to refer students to varying levels of support. Nashoba’s DCAP described that STATs work to identify skill deficits, collect and analyze data, implement Response to Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, monitor student progress, and recommend students for diagnostic assessments if appropriate. A document review indicated that academic screening and language, cognitive, and physical and emotional health evaluations inform which services may be required for students (see the Data and Assessment Systems section). Instructional staff at one middle school reported not having a formal STAT and instead used grade-level meetings to discuss student progress and performance. They also vocalized concerns about the increased number of students with IEPs. One instructor remarked, “[I] feel like sometimes we jumped straight from a student concern to a special ed referral . . . and it ends up being these students don’t necessarily need an IEP.” In addition, a few respondents from the parent-caregiver focus group, raised concerns that supports for students who need additional help but do not qualify for special education services have been limited, especially with staffing shortages and disruptions through the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, one focus group participant shared, “I’ve seen . . . where the kids who need help are just not getting exactly what they need, especially if they don’t need an IEP.” Mixed evidence regarding effectively implementing tiered systems of support across the district suggests this is an area for improvement.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Interviews and focus groups indicated that Nashoba recognizes the importance of developing collaborative relationships with families, students, and the broader community across all three towns. Many opportunities for families to have a voice in planning and decision making are available. An expected benchmark listed in the 2019-2022 *Nashoba District Improvement Plan* to accomplish their goal of creating inclusive learning structures and environments is to “gather community input to inform educational programming design” at the high school as the town plans to update the high school building. One district-level stakeholder remarked that a “very diverse student and parent population [was invited] to be part of that process” of re-envisioning the high school and deciding whether the building requires remodeling or complete rebuilding. Other opportunities for family engagement include the Nashoba Parent-Teacher Organization and Nashoba Special Education Parent Advisory Council. The website for the council describes it as a “parent-led group providing support to parents & guardians of children who have an IEP or 504 Accommodation Plan,” and membership is open to all in Bolton, Lancaster, and Stow. Families reported multiple school committees, councils, and planning teams that welcome parent engagement and feedback, but some respondents noted that not enough parents participate.

Families and instructional staff remarked that frequent school-parent communication occurs in social media (Twitter) posts, newsletters, and weekly emails from the superintendent, school leaders, and guidance counselors. The *Nashoba Regional District Self-Assessment* identified these same forms of communication. One parent highlighted weekly slideshows of information sent out by the eighth-grade instructional team at their child’s school. Teacher and family focus groups also

indicated that the new superintendent provides frequent and thorough communication with parents, which is generally appreciated because it did not occur under previous district leadership. Nonetheless, several parents reported receiving “almost no communication” from the high school staff and therefore felt “very removed from the high school with the exception of a couple teachers.” Parents and guardians across the district also indicated wanting more feedback on students’ progress from teachers during parent-teacher conferences. One parent said,

In the middle school, like in sixth grade, the conferences are way too short. Like you barely say, “Hi.” And then they’re like, . . . “They’re doing okay, and okay, I’ll see you like in three months.” It wasn’t super helpful. And I also found the online format, while it was more convenient because I have a lot of kids, I don’t know, very impersonal.

This mixed evidence indicates that partnering with families to collaboratively support students is an area of growth.

Nashoba has established numerous community partnerships to assess and support student and family social-emotional, cultural, and financial needs. A unique partnership is with the local police and fire departments through the high school EMT certification program. As described by the superintendent, students receive certified training, and a police or fire department officer is always on call to accompany student EMTs. Other partnerships identified across focus groups include the Bolton Moms Group, which provides clothing for students in need; Heart Warmers of Stow for “Stow residents who are experiencing financial difficulty”; and Advocates Community Counseling and the Perkins Program, which both provide counseling services to students and their families. One district leader explained,

[Nashoba has] a list of resources, so if there’s a concern, I could pull out a resource list of four or five things that our social workers have put together that are at each school. So depending on what the identified need is, we can provide the resource of where you can get whatever it is that you need. Fuel assistance, heating electricity, like food, clothing, counseling, home-based services, big brother mentors.

The district noted that some of these partnerships grew throughout the pandemic as families’ needs increased.

As highlighted in the *Nashoba Regional District Self-Assessment*, the district intentionally engages its multicultural community by providing strong translation and interpretive services. District leaders identified partnerships with the Baystate Agency, City Gate, and Boston Public Schools to assist immigrants with language needs, especially in rarely encountered languages like Farsi and Doric. In addition, the district website can be translated into more than 15 languages.

Recommendations

- District leaders should continue to allocate resources that support social-emotional learning and student well-being where they are needed most, including training for educators to further develop skills in these areas.
- The district should continue to develop staff capacity to ensure that all school and classroom environments are culturally responsive and reflect students’ cultures and identities.

- The district should continue to establish and communicate consistent, districtwide expectations for the implementation of positive behavioral approaches in and across schools.
- District and school leaders should systematically evaluate the effectiveness of districtwide tiered systems of support.
- The district should establish clear districtwide expectations that all students, including but not limited to students with 504 plans or IEPs and ELs, receive support across all three tiers.
- District and school leaders and teachers should partner with families to support students in a way that is strengths-based, culturally responsive, and collaborative.

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Nashoba. The team conducted 50 classroom observations between April 27 and April 29, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups between April 26 and April 28, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

- Superintendent
- Other district leaders
- Teachers' association representatives
- Principals
- Teachers
- Support specialists
- Parents
- Students

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

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

Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table B1. Nashoba Regional School District: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Group	District N	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	3,088	100.0%	911,529	100.0%
African American	42	1.4%	84,970	9.3%
Asian	120	3.9%	65,813	7.2%
Hispanic	229	7.4%	210,747	23.1%
Native American	2	0.1%	2,060	0.2%
White	2,573	83.3%	507,992	55.7%
Native Hawaiian	3	0.1%	788	0.1%
Multirace, Non-Hispanic	119	3.9%	39,159	4.3%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

Table B2. Nashoba Regional School District: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by High-Need Populations

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of state
All students with high need	898	100.0%	28.9%	512,242	100.0%	55.6%
Students with disabilities	544	60.6%	17.5%	174,505	34.1%	18.9%
Low income	413	46.0%	13.4%	399,140	77.9%	43.8%
ELs and former ELs	80	8.9%	2.6%	100,231	19.6%	11.0%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high need are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 3,106; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 920,971.

Table B3. Nashoba Regional School District: Chronic Absence Rates^a by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	6.6	7.3	8.0	8.3	1.7	17.7
African American/Black	11.1	18.2	6.5	15.9	4.8	24.1
Asian	6.5	6.7	5.3	3.4	-3.1	7.2
Hispanic/Latino	11.9	13.0	9.8	21.5	9.6	29.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/ Latino	10.3	7.8	11.2	14.1	3.8	18.9
White	6.1	6.7	7.9	7.2	1.1	13.2
High need	15.6	14.8	13.3	17.0	1.4	26.3
Economically disadvantaged	21.1	20.3	16.9	24.2	3.1	30.2
ELs	13.6	17.5	8.1	32.3	18.7	29.0
Students with disabilities	17.1	14.8	13.8	15.6	-1.5	26.8

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

Table B4. Nashoba Regional School District: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2019-2021

	2019		Fiscal year 2020		Fiscal year 2021	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	\$54,163,302	\$53,330,731	\$55,222,844	\$55,047,041	\$58,010,465	\$56,944,141
By municipality	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total from local appropriations	--	--	--	--	--	--
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$5,694,125	--	\$5,172,278	--	\$6,471,520
Total expenditures	--	\$59,024,856	--	\$60,219,319	--	\$63,415,661
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid ^a	--	\$6,991,269	--	\$7,273,744	--	\$7,273,744
Required local contribution	--	\$24,892,165	--	\$25,692,699	--	\$26,177,398
Required net school spending ^b	--	\$31,883,434	--	\$32,966,443	--	\$33,451,142
Actual net school spending	--	\$42,170,769	--	\$43,908,951	--	\$45,191,371
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$10,287,335	--	\$10,942,508	--	\$11,740,229
Over/under required (%)	--	32.3%	--	33.2%	--	35.1%

Note. Data as of June 1, 2022, and sourced from fiscal year 2020 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.

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

Table B5. Nashoba Regional School District: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2019-2021

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	\$432.66	\$484.32	\$538.24
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$801.28	\$840.82	\$976.74
Teachers	\$6,718.05	\$7,071.02	\$7,428.86
Other teaching services	\$1,499.50	\$1,567.92	\$1,726.89
Professional development	\$110.84	\$186.07	\$99.95
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$396.24	\$385.67	\$571.06
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$828.49	\$824.80	\$897.60
Pupil services	\$2,050.72	\$1,870.54	\$1,955.24
Operations and maintenance	\$1,535.49	\$1,531.57	\$1,881.88
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$2,717.15	\$2,822.57	\$2,974.72
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$17,090.42	\$17,585.30	\$19,051.19

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

Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report



Nashoba Public Schools

Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

April 2022





201 Jones Road
Waltham, Massachusetts
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499
www.air.org



Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Positive Climate.....	3
Teacher Sensitivity.....	4
Regard for Student Perspectives	5
Negative Climate	6
Behavior Management	7
Productivity.....	8
Instructional Learning Formats	9
Concept Development	10
Content Understanding.....	11
Analysis and Inquiry	12
Quality of Feedback	13
Language Modeling	14
Instructional Dialogue.....	15
Student Engagement.....	16
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K-5	17
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6-8	18
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9-12	19
References	20

Introduction

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

Observers visited Nashoba Public Schools during the week of April 27, 2022. The observers conducted 50 observations in a sample of classrooms across six schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K-3 Domains and Dimensions

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Positive ClimateNegative ClimateTeacher SensitivityRegard for Student Perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Behavior ManagementProductivityInstructional Learning Formats	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Concept DevelopmentQuality of FeedbackLanguage Modeling

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Positive ClimateTeacher SensitivityRegard for Student Perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Behavior ManagementProductivityNegative Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Instructional Learning FormatsContent UnderstandingAnalysis and InquiryQuality of FeedbackInstructional Dialogue
Student Engagement		

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support or attention, was

unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students' problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average*: 4.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	12	5.9
Grades 6-8	0	1	3	3	5	5	1	18	4.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	3	7	8	1	1	20	4.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 11] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 12] + [7 \times 5]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average*: 5.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	12	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	2	3	6	5	2	18	5.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	2	4	8	6	20	5.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 12] + [6 \times 20] + [7 \times 10]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

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

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average*: 3.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	4	1	4	3	0	12	4.5
Grades 6-8	0	2	9	6	1	0	0	18	3.3
Grades 9-12	1	4	6	3	3	2	1	20	3.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 6] + [3 \times 19] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 8] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 1]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 3.7$

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

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

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

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–3

Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4–12

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 55, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.¹

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

Negative Climate District Average*: 7.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	7.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	7.0
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	20	6.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 48]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

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

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

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

¹ When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring.

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average*: 6.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	6.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	18	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	20	6.6

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: $([4 \times 1] + [5 \times 3] + [6 \times 8] + [7 \times 38]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 6.7$

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

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

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

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Productivity District Average*: 6.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	7.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	18	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	20	6.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: $([5 \times 2] + [6 \times 10] + [7 \times 38]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 6.7$

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average*: 4.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	2	2	3	5	0	12	4.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	4	3	10	1	0	18	4.4
Grades 9-12	0	1	0	2	11	5	1	20	5.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 24] + [6 \times 11] + [7 \times 1]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 4.8$

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Concept Development District Average*: 3.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	7	3.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 1]) \div 7 \text{ observations} = 3.4$

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

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

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

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

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Content Understanding District Average*: 4.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	5	3.4
Grades 6-8	0	1	6	9	0	2	0	18	3.8
Grades 9-12	0	1	1	7	5	5	1	20	4.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 3] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 17] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 1]) \div 43$ observations = 4.2

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average*: 3.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	1.8
Grades 6-8	3	3	7	3	1	1	0	18	2.9
Grades 9-12	2	4	9	1	1	1	2	20	3.3

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 7] + [2 \times 9] + [3 \times 17] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 2]) \div 43 \text{ observations} = 3.0$

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

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

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

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

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Quality of Feedback District Average*: 3.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	2	2	1	2	3	2	0	12	3.7
Grades 6-8	1	2	6	6	1	2	0	18	3.6
Grades 9-12	0	4	6	6	4	0	0	20	3.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 3] + [2 \times 8] + [3 \times 13] + [4 \times 14] + [5 \times 8] + [6 \times 4]) \div 50 \text{ observations} = 3.6$

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average*: 3.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	1	1	4	0	1	0	7	3.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 4] + [6 \times 1]) \div 7 \text{ observations} = 3.9$

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average*: 3.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	3.6
Grades 6-8	4	5	4	4	1	0	0	18	2.6
Grades 9-12	2	4	5	3	4	2	0	20	3.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 6] + [2 \times 9] + [3 \times 11] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 2]) \div 43 \text{ observations} = 3.1$

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average*: 4.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	5	5.4
Grades 6-8	0	1	0	8	4	4	1	18	4.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	7	9	3	0	20	4.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 15] + [5 \times 16] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 1]) \div 43 \text{ observations} = 4.8$

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	0	5	2	8	16	17	48	5.8
Positive Climate	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	12	5.9
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	7.0
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	12	5.8
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	0	4	1	4	3	0	12	4.5
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	2	3	3	8	20	36	6.1
Behavior Management	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	6.5
Productivity	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	7.0
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	2	2	3	5	0	12	4.9
Instructional Support Domain	5	8	6	13	6	3	0	41	3.4
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	7	3.4
Content Understanding (UE only)	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	5	3.4
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	1.8
Quality of Feedback	2	2	1	2	3	2	0	12	3.7
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	1	1	4	0	1	0	7	3.9
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	3.6
Student Engagement (UE only)	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	5	5.4

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([4 \times 1] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 3]) \div 12 \text{ observations} = 5.9$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([7 \times 12]) \div 12 \text{ observations} = 7.0$. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	3	14	12	12	10	3	54	4.4
Positive Climate	0	1	3	3	5	5	1	18	4.7
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	2	3	6	5	2	18	5.1
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	2	9	6	1	0	0	18	3.3
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	0	0	0	4	50	54	6.9
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	18	6.9
Productivity	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	18	6.9
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	7.0
Instructional Support Domain	8	11	27	25	13	6	0	90	3.5
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	4	3	10	1	0	18	4.4
Content Understanding	0	1	6	9	0	2	0	18	3.8
Analysis and Inquiry	3	3	7	3	1	1	0	18	2.9
Quality of Feedback	1	2	6	6	1	2	0	18	3.6
Instructional Dialogue	4	5	4	4	1	0	0	18	2.6
Student Engagement	0	1	0	8	4	4	1	18	4.7

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 3] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 1]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 4.7$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([7 \times 18]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	1	4	9	12	15	11	8	60	4.7
Positive Climate	0	0	3	7	8	1	1	20	4.5
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	2	4	8	6	20	5.9
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	4	6	3	3	2	1	20	3.7
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	0	0	5	13	42	60	6.6
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	20	6.6
Productivity	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	20	6.4
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	20	6.9
Instructional Support Domain	4	14	21	19	25	13	4	100	4.0
Instructional Learning Formats	0	1	0	2	11	5	1	20	5.1
Content Understanding	0	1	1	7	5	5	1	20	4.8
Analysis and Inquiry	2	4	9	1	1	1	2	20	3.3
Quality of Feedback	0	4	6	6	4	0	0	20	3.5
Instructional Dialogue	2	4	5	3	4	2	0	20	3.5
Student Engagement	0	0	1	7	9	3	0	20	4.7

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 8] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 1]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 4.5$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 18]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

References

- Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf>
- MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K–3*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Appendix D. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE's District Standards and Indicators

Table D1. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

Resource	Description
Quick Reference Guide: The Case for Curricular Coherence	This guide describes three types of curricular coherence that support student learning: vertical coherence, aligned tiers of instruction, and cross-subject coherence.
CURATE	CURATE convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate evidence on the quality and alignment of specific curricular materials and then publishes their findings for educators across the Commonwealth to consult.

Table D2. Resources to Support Assessment

Resource	Description
DESE's District Data Team Toolkit	A set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team.

Table D3. Resources to Support Student Support

Resource	Description
https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/	An MTSS is a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.

Appendix E. Student Performance Tables

The COVID-19 pandemic had a profound impact on the 2020-2021 school year. Data reported in this appendix may have been affected by the pandemic. Please keep this in mind when reviewing the data and take particular care when comparing data across multiple school years.

Table E1. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Scaled Scores in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
All	1,452	512.2	513.3	508.3	-3.9	496.5	11.7
African American/ Black	21	499.7	500.4	500.5	0.8	486.4	14.1
Asian	50	516.8	518.6	517.5	0.7	508.5	9.0
Hispanic/Latino	106	502.1	506.2	498.5	-3.6	484.3	14.2
Multirace	54	510.1	513.5	505.8	-4.3	499.7	6.1
White	1,217	512.7	513.7	509.0	-3.7	501.3	7.7
High need	451	495.7	498.5	493.8	-1.9	485.9	7.9
Economically disadvantaged	176	498.4	501.7	495.9	-2.5	485.2	10.6
ELs and former ELs	81	499.9	499.0	494.8	-5.1	482.8	12.0
Students with disabilities	300	490.4	492.3	489.8	-0.6	478.1	11.6

Note. Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440-469 Not Meeting Expectations; 470-499 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500-529 Meeting Expectations; 530-560 Exceeding Expectations.

Table E2. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Scaled Scores in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
All	1,454	510.4	510.9	501.5	-8.9	489.7	11.8
African American/ Black	21	498.3	493.7	492.5	-5.8	477.3	15.2
Asian	50	520.0	523.7	517.0	-3.0	508.6	8.4
Hispanic/Latino	106	500.4	503.1	489.8	-10.6	476.5	13.3
Multirace	55	510.1	513.8	501.6	-8.5	492.1	9.5
White	1,218	510.7	511.0	502.1	-8.6	494.3	7.8
High need	452	495.0	496.3	488.3	-6.7	479.0	9.3
Economically disadvantaged	176	496.7	496.6	488.4	-8.3	477.4	11.0
ELs and former ELs	81	500.2	500.0	490.6	-9.6	477.8	12.8
Students with disabilities	301	489.7	491.4	484.3	-5.4	472.5	11.8

Note. Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440-469 Not Meeting Expectations; 470-499 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500-529 Meeting Expectations; 530-560 Exceeding Expectations.

Table E3. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
All	1,452	73%	75%	66%	-7	46%	20
African American/ Black	21	53%	56%	38%	-15	28%	10
Asian	50	83%	89%	84%	1	66%	18
Hispanic/Latino	106	56%	60%	48%	-8	26%	22
Multirace	54	74%	77%	59%	-15	51%	8
White	1,217	74%	75%	68%	-6	54%	14
High need	451	36%	42%	37%	1	28%	9
Economically disadvantaged	176	41%	49%	41%	0	27%	14
ELs and former ELs	81	49%	53%	48%	-1	24%	24
Students with disabilities	300	26%	28%	28%	2	16%	12

Table E4. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
All	1,454	72%	71%	53%	-19	33%	20
African American/ Black	21	47%	33%	33%	-14	14%	19
Asian	50	86%	83%	72%	-14	64%	8
Hispanic/Latino	106	44%	51%	29%	-15	14%	15
Multirace	55	61%	66%	51%	-10	37%	14
White	1,218	74%	72%	55%	-19	40%	15
High need	452	38%	36%	27%	-11	16%	11
Economically disadvantaged	176	43%	39%	26%	-17	14%	12
ELs and former ELs	81	47%	44%	28%	-19	17%	11
Students with disabilities	301	27%	25%	22%	-5	10%	12

Table E5. Nashoba Regional School District: Next Generation MCAS ELA and Mathematics Scaled Scores in Grade 10, 2021

Group	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ Below	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ Below
All	194	516.1	507.3	8.8	197	512.3	500.6	11.7
African American/Black	4	—	494.6	—	4	—	486.7	—
Asian	11	509.3	518.2	-8.9	11	516.7	520.9	-4.2
Hispanic/Latino	9	—	491.9	—	10	498.2	485.3	12.9
Multirace	2	—	510.6	—	2	—	503.9	—
White	168	516.7	512.5	4.2	170	513.3	504.9	8.4
High need	41	493.7	493.3	0.4	43	483.4	486.5	-3.1
Economically disadvantaged	17	495.4	493.7	1.7	18	478.9	486.6	-7.7
ELs and former ELs	7	—	477.9	—	8	—	477.6	—
Students with disabilities	30	490.1	487.2	2.9	32	479.9	479.6	0.3

Table E6. Nashoba Regional School District: Next Generation MCAS ELA and Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

Group	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ Below	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ Below
All	194	82%	64%	18	197	75%	52%	23
African American/Black	4	—	41%	—	4	—	27%	—
Asian	11	64%	80%	-16	11	73%	80%	-7
Hispanic/Latino	9	—	39%	—	10	50%	26%	24
Multirace	2	—	67%	—	2	—	55%	—
White	168	85%	73%	12	170	78%	60%	18
High need	41	34%	39%	-5	43	21%	26%	-5
Economically disadvantaged	17	59%	41%	18	18	17%	27%	-10
ELs and former ELs	7	—	19%	—	8	—	15%	—
Students with disabilities	30	20%	25%	-5	32	16%	14%	2

Table E7. Nashoba Regional School District: Next Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2021

Group	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	Above/Below
All	462	70%	64%	42%	22
African American/Black	5	—	—	19%	—
Asian	16	79%	69%	62%	7
Hispanic/Latino	36	58%	50%	20%	30
Multirace	10	69%	70%	47%	23
White	394	71%	66%	50%	16
High need	137	47%	35%	23%	12
Economically disadvantaged	45	53%	38%	21%	17
ELs and former ELs	23	48%	30%	18%	12
Students with disabilities	98	35%	32%	15%	17

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 STE are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>.

Table E8. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-10, 2018-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
3	220	72%	79%	68%	-4	51%	17
4	237	79%	74%	75%	-4	49%	26
5	234	73%	73%	63%	-10	47%	16
6	261	76%	70%	67%	-9	47%	20
7	243	64%	82%	67%	3	43%	24
8	257	77%	70%	58%	-19	41%	17
3-8	1,452	73%	75%	66%	-7	46%	20
10	194	—	81%	82%	—	64%	18

Table E9. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-10, 2018-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ Below
3	220	74%	73%	44%	-30	33%	11
4	238	70%	68%	52%	-18	33%	19
5	234	64%	69%	50%	-14	33%	17
6	261	74%	71%	54%	-20	33%	21
7	242	74%	75%	60%	-14	35%	25
8	259	77%	70%	56%	-21	32%	24
3-8	1,454	72%	71%	53%	-19	33%	20
10	197	—	80%	75%	—	52%	23

Table E10. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
5	233	69%	—	57%	-12	42%
8	229	71%	—	72%	1	41%
5 and 8	462	70%	—	64%	-6	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 STE are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, students in 10th grade took the Legacy MCAS science test.

Table E11. Nashoba Regional School District: English Language Arts and Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-10, 2019-2021

Grade	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)
3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4	—	60.8	—	—	—	49.9	—	—
5	222	53.7	39.3	34.9	222	49.1	31.7	31.9
6	245	49.1	40.4	37.3	246	55.3	27.0	26.3
7	231	64.9	40.5	36.1	230	60.0	45.8	35.8
8	248	53.0	36.3	34.8	250	50.6	35.9	27.4
3-8	946	56.4	39.1	35.8	948	53.1	35.0	30.4
10	181	55.8	51.3	52.5	183	44.9	39.4	36.5

Table 12. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Rowlandson	58%	61%	50%	—	—	—	57%	—
Center	73%	88%	71%	—	—	—	78%	—
Sawyer	76%	77%	65%	75%	68%	59%	69%	—
Burbank Middle	—	—	—	62%	62%	54%	59%	—
Hale	—	—	—	66%	71%	61%	66%	—
NRHS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	84%
District	68%	75%	63%	67%	67%	58%	66%	82%
State	51%	49%	47%	47%	43%	41%	46%	64%

Table E13. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Rowlandson	34%	39%	31%	—	—	—	34%	—
Center	50%	71%	53%	—	—	—	59%	—
Sawyer	54%	48%	61%	62%	66%	54%	57%	—
Burbank Middle	—	—	—	55%	45%	56%	52%	—
Hale	—	—	—	50%	69%	60%	59%	—
NRHS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	77%
District	44%	52%	50%	54%	60%	56%	53%	75%
State	33%	33%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%	52%

Table E14. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	5	8	5 and 8	10
Rowlandson	53%	—	53%	—
Center	61%	—	61%	—
Sawyer	55%	73%	64%	—
Burbank Middle	—	69%	69%	—
Hale	—	75%	75%	—
NRHS	—	—	—	—
District	57%	72%	64%	—
State	42%	41%	42%	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 STE are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>.

Table E15. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Rowlandson	57%	29%	40%	18%	29%	—	—	25%	60%	60%
Center	78%	48%	82%	42%	—	—	80%	62%	—	80%
Sawyer	69%	37%	31%	35%	36%	—	93%	59%	63%	69%
Burbank Middle	59%	41%	47%	23%	50%	—	—	57%	—	61%
Hale	66%	30%	24%	22%	53%	—	84%	30%	45%	68%
NRHS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	66%	37%	41%	28%	48%	38%	84%	48%	59%	68%
State	46%	28%	27%	16%	24%	28%	66%	26%	51%	54%

Note. High need = students with high need; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E16. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Rowlandson	34%	18%	17%	15%	29%	—	—	21%	50%	34%
Center	59%	30%	45%	21%	—	—	60%	46%	—	61%
Sawyer	57%	31%	22%	30%	14%	—	87%	45%	63%	57%
Burbank Middle	52%	32%	38%	24%	25%	—	—	25%	—	58%
Hale	59%	28%	19%	20%	35%	—	84%	10%	45%	61%
NRHS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	53%	27%	26%	22%	28%	33%	72%	29%	51%	55%
State	33%	16%	14%	10%	17%	14%	64%	14%	37%	40%

Note. High need = students with high need; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E17. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
NRHS	84%	37%	63%	22%	—	—	—	—	—	85%
District	82%	34%	59%	20%	—	—	64%	—	—	85%
State	64%	39%	41%	25%	19%	41%	80%	39%	67%	73%

Note. High need = students with high need; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E18. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
NRHS	77%	23%	19%	18%	—	—	—	—	—	79%
District	75%	21%	17%	16%	—	—	73%	50%	—	78%
State	52%	26%	27%	14%	15%	27%	80%	26%	55%	60%

Note. High need = students with high need; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E19. Nashoba Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Rowlandson	53%	36%	47%	29%	—	—	—	—	—	53%
Center	61%	31%	—	19%	—	—	—	—	—	62%
Sawyer	64%	36%	50%	36%	—	—	—	54%	—	65%
Burbank Middle	69%	33%	—	45%	—	—	—	—	—	76%
Hale	75%	44%	—	40%	44%	—	—	—	—	77%
NRHS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	64%	35%	38%	32%	30%	20%	—	50%	70%	66%
State	42%	23%	21%	15%	18%	19%	62%	20%	47%	50%

Note. High need = students with high need; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E20. Nashoba Regional School District: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	239	95.1	94.4	95.0	96.2	1.1	89.8
African American/Black	4	—	85.7	—	—	—	84.4
Asian	9	83.3	85.7	—	100	16.7	96.1
Hispanic/Latino	3	85.7	75.0	75.0	—	—	80.0
Multirace	3	100	100	100	—	—	88.8
White	220	95.7	95.7	95.9	95.9	0.2	93.2
High need	54	82.3	77.6	83.8	87.0	4.7	82.4
Economically disadvantaged	33	75.0	72.0	80.0	87.9	12.9	81.7
ELs and former ELs	2	—	—	—	—	—	71.8
Students with disabilities	41	78.6	78.0	78.9	82.9	4.3	76.6

Table E21. Nashoba Regional School District: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2017-2020

Group	N (2020)	2017	2018	2019	2020	4-year change	State (2020)
All	220	95.7	96.3	95.6	95.0	-0.7	91.0
African American/Black	3	—	—	100	—	—	87.2
Asian	5	—	83.3	85.7	—	—	95.8
Hispanic/ Latino	8	94.4	92.9	83.3	75.0	-19.4	81.0
Multirace	7	100	100	100	100	0.0	90.8
White	197	96.4	96.6	96.2	95.9	-0.5	94.4
High need	68	87.7	85.5	82.8	83.8	-3.9	84.5
Economically disadvantaged	35	82.4	82.1	76.0	80.0	-2.4	84.1
ELs and former ELs	2	—	—	—	—	—	74.7
Students with disabilities	38	84.6	81.0	85.4	78.9	-5.7	79.3

Table E22. Nashoba Regional School District: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3
African American/Black	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Multirace	—	—	—	—	—	0.4
White	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3
High need	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4
Economically disadvantaged	0.3	1.7	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.3
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Students with disabilities	0.2	1.2	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.6

Table E23. Nashoba Regional School District: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.7	1.5	0.5	0.3	-0.4	0.5
African American/Black	—	—	—	—	—	0.6
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.5
Multirace	—	—	—	—	—	0.7
White	0.6	1.3	0.6	0.1	-0.5	0.5
High need	1.8	3.8	0.9	0.8	-1	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	2.5	6.7	1.1	1.4	-1.1	0.7
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Students with disabilities	2.1	3.2	1.4	1.0	-1.1	1.1

Table E24. Nashoba Regional School District: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	914	0.9	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.1	1.5
African American/Black	13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Asian	36	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	35	5.6	3.6	0.0	5.7	0.1	3.2
Multirace	17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
White	811	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.1	1.0
High need	178	2.5	3.7	1.8	2.8	0.3	2.7
Economically disadvantaged	74	2.0	3.8	0.0	4.1	2.1	2.9
ELs and former ELs	13	16.7	12.5	0.0	7.7	-9.0	5.8
Students with disabilities	121	1.7	3.3	2.5	2.5	0.8	2.4

Table E25. Nashoba Regional School District: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021

Group	N (2020)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
All	484	85.0	83.9	87.0	2.0	65.3
African American/Black	7	66.7	50.0	71.4	4.7	54.9
Asian	13	75.0	92.9	92.3	17.3	84.3
Hispanic/Latino	14	68.8	55.6	71.4	2.6	50.2
Multirace	7	88.9	88.9	71.4	-17.5	65.5
White	442	86.2	84.6	87.8	1.6	69.6
High need	85	46.3	44.9	56.5	10.2	47.7
Economically disadvantaged	35	62.5	61.3	68.6	6.1	49.0
ELs and former ELs	3	—	—	—	—	28.1
Students with disabilities	60	36.5	31.5	48.3	11.8	33.1