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## Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a targeted review of Winthrop Public Schools (hereafter, Winthrop) in May 2023. 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.[[1]](#footnote-2)

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

Winthrop district leaders and the school committee have a positive relationship that results in collaboration and partnership. Open lines of communication pave the way for regular updates between district leaders and the school committee and provide a foundation for transparency and trust. The budgeting process, district planning, and school improvement planning involve many stakeholders, which highlights the superintendent’s value of collaboration in improving and maintaining governance of the district. Strengths of the district include the relationship between the school committee and the superintendent, the district’s communication with school leaders and the school committee are regular and transparent, and stakeholders are involved in district and school improvement planning. However, communicating school improvement priorities and progress made on priorities and communicating budgetary decisions to teachers that are tied to student outcomes remain areas for growth.

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Winthrop during the week of May 8, 2023. The observers conducted 57 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[2]](#footnote-3) guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, student engagement (Grades 4-5), and instructional support. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, student engagement, and instructional support. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of strong emotional support, student engagement or consistently rigorous instructional support, and strong evidence of classroom organization.

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

Winthrop is committed to developing their teachers’ skills and hiring a diverse workforce. The district provides leadership opportunities to teachers and has invested in a strong mentoring program for teachers who are new to the district. Furthermore, Winthrop is exploring ways to recruit staff from diverse backgrounds. Strengths of the district include the involvement of multiple stakeholders in the hiring process, the district mentoring system, and the leadership opportunities available to teachers. Professional development is available to teachers, and district leaders encourage teachers to attend professional development outside the district, however, offering a variety of professional development at the district or school sites remains an area for growth. Streamlining human resources document miniatous, increasing critical feedback on teacher evaluations, and ensuring that end-of-cycle administrator evaluations are complete are additional areas for growth.

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

The district has a five-year capital plan that includes preventive maintenance for its facilities. In addition, the district conducts an annual audit that is part of the annual reporting and auditing requirements. The superintendent explained that there have been very minimal recommendations that have come from the independent audits. However, a more recent recommendation was to formalize the process for reimbursing staff for purchases made. District leaders embraced the recommendation and worked with the town to adopt the system the town uses. The district and town offices work together to develop the district budget using clear processes and maintain financial and asset management for the district. Communicating budget documents, process, decisions, and updates with school community stakeholders is a strength of the district. Winthrop school leaders and teachers play an important role in the budgeting process, and school leaders exercise autonomy in school-based decisions. Using a clear process for developing the budget and the strong working relationship between the district and the town are areas of strength for the district. Although the district spends above net school spending requirements, procuring additional funding to bolster program offerings is an are of growth for the district.

## Winthrop Public Schools: 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 DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management. The Winthrop review focused on only the three governance-centered standards: Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. The design of the targeted review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

### Methodology

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

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

### Site Visit

The site visit to Winthrop was conducted during the week of May 8, 2023. The site visit included 18 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 76 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with five elementary school teachers, five middle school teachers, and five high school teachers; one middle school student focus group; one high school student focus group; one in-person family focus group; and one virtual family focus group.

The site team also conducted 57 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

Winthrop is led by Lisa Howard, who was appointed superintendent in 2017, and Lori Gallivan, the assistant superintendent. The district is governed by a school committee composed of seven members who are elected for four-year terms. Committee position terms are staggered, with three members up for election every two years. The town council president holds the seventh seat.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 150 teachers in the district, with 1,941 students enrolled in the district’s four schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

Table 1. Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School  | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| Arthur T. Cummings Elementary School  | Elementary | PK-2 | 431 |
| William P. Gorman Fort Banks Elementary School | Elementary | 3-5 | 491 |
| Winthrop Middle School | Middle | 6-8 | 425 |
| Winthrop High School | High | 9-12 | 594 |
| Total |  |  | 1,941 |

*Note.* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2020 and 2023, overall student enrollment decreased by 24 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was less than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for K-12 districts of similar size in fiscal year 2021—$15,668.65 for Winthrop compared with $17,343 for similar districts and greater than average state spending per pupil ($18,518.66). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

### Student Performance

In ELA in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) declined 13 percentage points from 57 percent in 2019 to 44 percent in 2022, which was above the 2022 state rate of 41 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations decreased by 12 percentage points from 66 percent in 2019 to 54 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 58 percent. (See Tables E1 and E2 in Appendix E.)

* In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 21 percentage points and 25 percentage points for African American/Black students and Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, respectively; above the state rate by 8 percentage points and 9 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income families, respectively; above the state rate by 2 percentage points for ELs and former ELs and students with disabilities; equal to the state rate for Hispanic/Latino students; and below the state rate by 1 percentage point for White students.
* In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 1 percentage point to 4 percentage points for students from low-income families, ELs and former ELs, and Hispanic/Latino students; below the state rate by 16 percentage points for students with disabilities; and below the state rate by 1 percentage point and 5 percentage points for high needs students and White students, respectively.

In mathematics in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 18 percentage points from 52 percent in 2019 to 34 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 39 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined 19 percentage points from 61 percent in 2019 to 42 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 50 percent. (See Tables E3 and E4 in Appendix E.)

* In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 21 percentage points for African American/Black students; above the state rate by 2 percentage points to 5 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students, high needs students and students from low-income families; below the state rate by 8 percentage points and 12 percentage points for Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and White students, respectively; and below the state rate by 1 percentage point to 5 percentage points for students with disabilities and ELs and former ELs.
* In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 5 percentage points and 8 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and White students, respectively; and below the state rate by 3 percentage points to 4 percentage points for every other student group with reportable data.

In science in Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 7 percentage points from 47 percent in 2019 to 40 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 42 percent. In Grade 10, 42 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 47 percent. (See Tables E5 and E6 in Appendix E.)

* In Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in science was below the state rate by 9 percentage points for White students, above the state rate by 3 percentage points for students with disabilities, and above the state rate by 6 percentage points to 9 percentage points for every other student group with reportable data.
* In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was above the state rate by 1 percentage point to 5 percentage points for high needs students, students from low income families, and students with disabilities; below the state rate by 7 percentage points and 13 percentage points for White students and ELs and former ELs, respectively; and below the state rate 1 percentage point for Hispanic/Latino students.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the 2022 MCAS assessments in Grades 3-8 was 53.9 in ELA and 55.4 in mathematics, which represent typical growth. In Grade 10, SGPs were typical in ELA (47.4) and mathematics (43.7).[[3]](#footnote-4) (See Tables E7-E10 in Appendix E.)

* SGPs in Grades 3-8 in ELA were typical, ranging from 46.4 to 55.0 for each student group with reportable data. Mathematics SGPs were typical, ranging from 47.6 to 55.8 for every student group with reportable data.
* In Grade 10, ELA SGPs were typical for each student group with reportable data, ranging from 41.5 to 50.4, except for students with disabilities, which was low (29.2). Mathematics SGPs were typical for each student group with reportable data, ranging from 44.1 to 46.1, except for Hispanic/Latino students, which was low (37.9).

Winthrop’s four-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 1.6 percentage points from 89.9 percent in 2020 to 91.5 percent in 2022, which was above the 2022 state rate of 90.1 percent. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 2.1 percentage points from 88.9 percent in 2019 to 91.0 percent in 2021, which was below the 2021 state rate of 91.8. (See Tables E16 and E17 in Appendix E.)

* The four-year-cohort graduation rate was above the state rate in 2022 by 1.9 percentage points to 2.5 percentage points for students from low-income families, Hispanic/Latino students, and high needs students; below the state rate by 8.0 percentage points for students with disabilities; and below the state rate by 0.4 percentage point and 1.7 percentage points for White students and ELs.
* The five-year cohort graduation rate was below the state rate by 7.3 percentage points and 11.3 percentage points for students from low-income families and ELs and below the state rate by 1.5 percentage points to 4.2 percentage points for every other student group with reportable data.

The district’s annual dropout rate increased from 1.1 percent in 2020 to 3.0 percent in 2022, which was above the 2022 state rate of 2.1 percent. (See Table E20 in Appendix E.) The dropout rates in Winthrop were 0.0 percent for African American/Black students, Asian students, and Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students. The dropout rate for every other student group with reportable data was higher than their statewide peers.

## Leadership and Governance

Winthrop’s leader is Lisa Howard, who was appointed superintendent in 2017. She receives support from three district leaders, including the assistant superintendent who serves as the director of curriculum, instruction, and accountability; the director of pupil personnel services; and the human resources generalist. These district officials, particularly the superintendent, work closely with the elected school committee members who represent Winthrop residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has seven members, each serving a four-year term.

School committee members outlined that their main responsibility is to oversee district operations and entrust district leadership to guide those operations. They reported a very close working relationship with the superintendent, with open lines of communication between the school committee and the superintendent. School committee members explained that the superintendent always provides detailed presentations about major decisions, and there is a high level of trust and transparency within that relationship. They work with the town manager, the superintendent, and school leaders to develop the budget.

Winthrop has a districtwide improvement plan, and each school has its own school improvement plan tied to the overarching goals of the district. There are many stakeholders involved in developing both the district and school improvement plans, and the superintendent facilitates progress monitoring for the district’s improvement goals.

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

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

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [School committee governance](#_School_Committee_Governance) | * The school committee maintains a close working relationship with the superintendent.
 |  |
| [District and school leadership](#_District_and_School) | * District communications with school leaders and the school committee are regular and transparent.
 |  |
| [District and school improvement planning](#_District_and_School_1) | * Stakeholders at all levels are engaged in the development of clearly aligned district and school improvement plans.
 | * Communicating school improvement priorities and progress
 |
| [Budget development](#_Budget_Development) | * The district uses a collaborative approach when developing the annual budget.
 | * Perception that budgetary decisions that are tied to material needs rather than student outcomes
 |

### School Committee Governance

The strong collaborative relationship between the school committee and the superintendent is a strength of the district. The school committee in Winthrop works to uphold Massachusetts laws and regulations; communicates often with stakeholders, primarily the superintendent; and works with community leaders to develop and maintain a budget. School committee members and the superintendent agree that both entities work together consistently and communicate often about their various responsibilities. According to school committee members, they see their primary role as to “oversee, not to do,” so they work closely with the superintendent to ensure that the work done within the district is effective in bolstering student learning outcomes. School committee members shared that they support the work of the superintendent by supporting budget priorities and ensuring that all decisions relate to improving outcomes for all students. One member emphasized this by stating that “I think we’re very supportive of trying to find the resources to make [the schools] the best opportunity that kids could have in the district.”

According to the town manager, district leaders, school leaders, and school committee members, the school committee and the superintendent have a robust culture of collaboration. The superintendent described communicating with school committee members “at least two or three times a week.” The town manager also collaborates with the school committee when developing and reviewing the budget. School committee meeting notes are available to the public and posted to the district website. School committee notes show engagement with the superintendent and provide insight to the detail of updates provided to the school committee on a regular basis. Although there seems to be a strong working relationship between the superintendent and the school committee based on stakeholder interviews, the superintendent identified that the district is working on including more district and school leaders in school committee meetings to provide regular updates about what is occurring across the district. At the time of the review, the assistant superintendent had recently been invited to provide updates regarding curriculum and instruction as well as assessments, and the district intends to begin having other district and school leaders present information at school committee meetings.

### District and School Leadership

District communications with school leaders and the school committee are regular and transparent and is a strength of the district. According to district documents, the superintendent facilitates monthly meetings of district and school leaders. These meetings keep information flowing between the district and school levels; agendas provided by the district highlight topics ranging from hiring to MCAS planning to curriculum and improvement plan updates. The superintendent also collaborates with the school committee to ensure the sharing of information. School committee members expressed that the superintendent is very good at providing them with information, and one member stated, “[she] does a phenomenal job of giving us the information we need . . . [she] really explains the information, gives background, tells us the whys.” School leaders shared that they feel particularly supported by district leaders. They receive ongoing coaching and support and said that their concerns are always heard. School leaders agreed that district leaders are intentional about collaborating with them, and they feel as if their input regarding important decisions is valued

The superintendent shared that building leaders communicate regularly with their staff and have systems to support communication, which includes holding staff meetings monthly to communicate with educators in each building. Various groups within each school collaborate with the building leadership teams to support school programming. According to teachers, each school has a site council consisting of teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. Elementary teachers also mentioned an instructional leadership team (ILT) at the elementary level that includes two teachers from each grade level, a special education representative, a reading specialist, and the mathematics coach. The ILT meets monthly, and these meetings focus mainly on curriculum.

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Winthrop during the week of May 8, 2023. The observers conducted 57 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

In Winthrop, 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 Winthrop is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

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

* Emotional Support. Ratings were in the high-middle to middle range for the K-5 and 6-8 grade bands (5.4 and 4.3, respectively) and in the low-middle range for the 9-12 grade band (3.4).
* Classroom Organization. Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (6.0 for K-5, 6.4 for 6-8, and 6.9 for 9-12).
* Instructional Support. Ratings were in the low range for K-5 (2.8) and in the low-middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (3.6 and 3.1, respectively).
* Student Engagement. For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the high-middle range for Grades 4-5 (5.0) and Grades 6-8 (5.2) and in the low-middle range for the Grades 9-12 (3.9).

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

### District and School Improvement Planning

Stakeholder engagement in district and school improvement planning is a strength of the district. District leaders, school leaders, and teachers all shared that a clear improvement process involves working closely with many stakeholders, which clearly aligns with district and school improvement plans. Documents provided show that district improvement planning involves high school students, staff, a building administrator, a community representative, and parents. School leaders explained that they work closely with the superintendent to develop the district’s priorities, which are carefully reviewed and revised as needed annually during the summer. Teachers shared that school improvement plans are developed through site-based committees and tie to the overall district improvement plan. As school teams align their school improvement plans to the district improvement plan, teachers are encouraged to tie their individual goals to each school’s improvement priorities. School leaders stated that the district has become more aligned since creating a districtwide improvement plan and individual school improvement plans at each school.

Communicating regular progress updates regarding the district and school improvement priorities to all staff is an area of growth across the district. Despite stakeholder engagement with the in-depth planning process, teachers from focus groups at all levels said that they do not feel informed on how the district—and their individual schools—are doing in relation to their improvement goals. The superintendent and school leaders said that school improvement plans are developed and shared with staff within elementary ILT meetings and during common planning times at the elementary and middle schools. School leaders stated that they receive updates on progress regarding district improvement plans each summer and that they share this information with their staff. However, teachers and school leaders agreed that progress on school improvement goals is not explicitly shared regularly throughout the year and teachers explained that they do not know how their school is doing throughout the year in relation to district and school improvement goals.

### Budget Development

The district uses a collaborative approach when developing the annual budget. The school committee, the superintendent, and school leaders work together to develop the district budget. According to the town manager, there is little involvement on the town’s end in drafting the annual district budget; however, the town manager maintains oversight and works closely with the district to stay informed on fiduciary decisions. Budget documents are available to the public, and school committee members reported that they receive budget updates through informational packets every two weeks. School committee members, the superintendent, and the town manager shared that Winthrop expenditure decisions are driven by input from teachers, other school-based staff, and principals. The school committee also works closely with the superintendent to develop the annual budget. The town manager reported that they create the town budget but are not heavily involved with developing the specifics of the school budgets. According to district leaders, school committee members, and the town manager, the school budget is a set percentage of the town budget. The town manager is new to the role; when appointed, he brought in a system that uses a base budget document that outlines “all of the appropriate expenses with the school” and includes expenses such as health insurance benefits, retirees, and building insurance.

School leaders, teachers, and other school-based staff collaborate to develop the district budget and is a strength of the district. The process provides school leaders with autonomy for allocating resources and making decisions depending on the unique needs of their school. According to district leaders, there is a spreadsheet that “every principal goes through and works with their staff to identify the needs every year. So nobody has just some blanket amount that carries from year to year.” The superintendent also shared. “When we're doing our budget planning, everything has to tie into the strategic plan, the school improvement goals, and administrative and teacher goals.” All teachers are asked for their input each year—to provide their feedback, comments, and list of needs to their grade level or content area teacher leader—which is then communicated to the principal. Each budgetary decision must tie to one of the district priorities outlined in the district improvement plan. Both teachers and parents have opportunities—through surveys sent each year—to provide feedback on how the district allocates its financial resources.

Although the district has systems in place to tie budget decisions to district priorities, teachers in focus groups expressed uncertainty that budgetary decisions are directly tied to improving student outcomes, an area of growth for the district. Teachers agreed that they provide feedback to lead teachers about resource allocation, but they explained that from their perspective, their input focuses more on resources and supplies and less on improving student performance. One teacher shared, “I think most of the budgeting at the school level is probably not really student centered as much as it’s, [for example] ‘Let’s get some butcher paper because I need it next year.’” Teachers did report, however, a survey is sent to teachers and parents to receive feedback about resource allocation. School leaders stated that the districtwide improvement plan is “focused on improving teacher practice and student outcomes,” but high school teachers mentioned that budget priorities do not always feel directly tied to improving student outcomes.

### Recommendations

* The district should regularly communicate its progress on district and school improvement plans to staff and the community, so all stakeholders understand the district’s advancement towards its goals.
* The district should review its budgeting process to ensure clear alignment between resource requests and student outcomes, and communicate that connection publicly.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

Winthrop has systems in place that promote strong communication, leadership development, and leadership opportunities for teachers. District leaders are aware of the need to diversify the teacher workforce and have tried various strategies to support this goal. Hiring practices are inclusive of principals’ intentional processes to ensure the appropriate allocation of staff. Overall, Winthrop has invested in a strong mentor program for new teachers in the district and works toward providing professional development opportunities for teachers. Teachers undergo evaluation at least once per year, using TeachPoint as their formal system for evaluations.

Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.

Table 3. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Infrastructure](#_Infrastructure) |  | * Infrastructure for document maintenance
 |
| [Recruitment, hiring, and assignment](#_Recruitment,_Hiring,_and) | * Multiple stakeholders are involved in the hiring process.
 |  |
| [Supervision, evaluation, and educator development](#_Supervision,_Evaluation,_and) | * The district has a strong mentoring system.
 | * Feedback on areas for improvement in evaluations
* End of cycle evaluations for administrators
* Variety of professional development at the district and/or school sites
 |
| [Recognition, leadership development, and advancement](#_Recognition,_Leadership_Development) | * Schools provide leadership opportunities for teachers.
 |   |

### Infrastructure

District human resources are managed by the district with many responsibilities held by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent. District leaders described the infrastructure for document maintenance as a priority for the district and is an area for growth. District leaders are revamping the district’s reporting system and how the district maintains pertinent staff information. The human resources staff is verifying all employment records and data to transition employee records from iPass to PowerSchool for the 2023-2024 school year. Winthrop has recently hired a Human Resources Generalist, who reports to the superintendent, to support with improving efficiencies, human resources oversight, and operations. This individual has supported Winthrop in updating missing information, including demographic information, for all educators. Updating the employment-related records has allowed the district to provide school leaders with more accurate reports for planning and decision making. When determining staffing needs, district leaders explained that they “look at attrition every year and see what our class sizes are, what the needs are and all the different levels” and then work with school leaders to hire for any grades where class sizes are increasing or current educators are leaving. District leaders explained that reports outlining licensing are currently produced bimonthly to ensure that employee records are up to date. School principals receive these reports so that they can communicate upcoming certification requirements with their staff. In addition to submitting the required reporting to DESE, the district regularly reviews the employment data used to inform hiring and staffing decisions.

### Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

Although recruiting is largely handled by the district, hiring responsibilities are held by the principal at each school. School and district leaders said that new teacher candidates go through a round of interviews consisting of one-on-one interviews as well as interviews with hiring committees. Hiring committees are often comprised of teachers, school leaders, and parents. District leaders did explain that all candidates have their final interview with the superintendent. District leaders described the hiring process for a new principal and reported that parents, teachers, school committee members, and a high school student were involved in that process, highlighting the involvement of many stakeholders. Involving multiple stakeholders in the hiring process is a strength of the district.

District leaders, school leaders, teachers, and parents all agree that hiring more educators of color is a goal for the district. At the time of the review, 97 percent of the teachers in Winthrop identified as white. Winthrop leaders and educators understand the importance of having staff who reflect student demographics. School committee members reported that the superintendent is doing “as much as she can to broaden the hiring pool to attract a diverse group of staff,” but the efforts have not produced the desired outcomes. Winthrop belongs to the Five District Partnership (5DP), a group established by five neighboring district superintendents to align curriculum and instruction and share resources with one another. District leaders said that through the 5DP, they can tap into more communities for recruitment outreach. The district also wants to hire more Spanish-speaking staff to reflect the student body. District leaders explained that they are intentional about recruiting former students plus former and current family members for translation services to support ELs across the district. Winthrop also partners with local colleges and universities to recruit future educators.

Established policy and practices ensure that teachers are assigned to classes based on student need. The process starts with school leaders meeting with lead teachers and working with departments to “match teachers up based on their strengths to the courses.” Unique to the middle school, school leaders described teachers teaching multiple subjects. For example, science and mathematics are taught by the same person in each grade level team. District leaders, school leaders, and teachers agree that although middle school teachers often teach multiple subjects, the district is intentional about making sure that teachers teach primarily in-field, with no more than 20% of their time spent out-of-field. Ninety-eight percent of the teachers in Winthrop are licensed with 88.3% of those teaching without a provisional license.

### Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

Mentoring new teachers and teachers new to the district is a strength for Winthrop, with one teacher reporting that it “is the best thing . . . you can get when you come into a new school.” When describing the mentor system, a teacher shared that “they’ve really set you up for success. They make you feel welcome, which is most important. And then they also tell you all about the curriculum.” Teachers are set up with a mentor teacher who is usually in the same grade or subject and works with the new teacher through their first and second years. According to teachers, mentorship meetings occur throughout the year with the expectation that mentors and mentees meet for a total of 30 hours across the school year.

District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently uploaded to TeachPoint. A review of the educator evaluation files indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample of 10 professional teacher status teachers scheduled for a summative evaluation for the 2021-2022 school year. Of the 10 teacher evaluations selected for review, all summative evaluations were available for review and marked as complete and not missing required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. A review of the records shows that the expected use of specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely (SMART) goals is consistent. The review of evaluation documents indicated that 100 percent of the evaluations contained student learning and professional practice SMART goals. All evaluations (100 percent) referenced multiple sources of evidence, such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. All summative evaluations (100 percent) included feedback for each standard, and all evaluations (100 percent) included feedback identifying strengths; none of the evaluations included feedback identifying areas of improvement and is an area of growth for the district.

Regarding administrator evaluations, there were no summative or “end-of-cycle” evaluations available for review the 2021-2022 school year which is an area of growth for the district. Based on a review of the administrator files, nine administrators had their most recent evaluations completed in the 2015-2016, 2017-2018, or 2018-2019 school years. District leaders and school committee members are aware of the gap in completed evaluations for the 2021-2022 school year and attributed it to the complexities of returning to in-person learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. They further explained that all evaluations will be completed for the 2022-2023 school year.

Offering a variety of professional development at the district or school sites is an area of growth for the district. Stakeholders shared differing opinions on the frequency and availability of professional learning opportunities. Teachers mentioned the 5DP professional development day, in which “staff members can choose which professional development they want to go to.” However, teachers said that little else is offered for professional learning except for training on understanding by design, which has been a main priority for the district. Teachers at all levels mentioned limited opportunities for teachers to request professional development on a specific topic within the district or school. District leaders and teachers interviewed did recognize that teachers can request professional development outside the district, and reimbursement is available after approval.

### Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Providing teachers with leadership opportunities is a strength of the district. If interested, teachers can become a mentor to new teachers in the district. This role requires teachers to attend leadership development training and gives teachers structured opportunities to mentor new teachers or teachers who are new to the district. Teachers at all levels described that the mentorship program in Winthrop is beneficial, mentioning positive outcomes from both the mentor and mentee perspectives. Teachers also can sit on the site council at all levels and the ILT at the elementary level. Secondary teachers explained that they can be a grade level or content area lead. Teachers can apply for either of those positions and receive a stipend. Teachers describing the role and responsibilities of the lead teachers or ILT members stated that they meet with administrators monthly and serve as liaisons to communicate from leaders to their teams and vice versa. The teachers association reported that they, in conjunction with the chamber of commerce, honor one teacher annually with the Teacher of Excellence award.

### Recommendations

* The district should support the implementation of its new employee records system, PowerSchool, to ensure information documents are secure, preserved, updated, and easily accessible to the appropriate individuals.
* The district should set district-wide expectations around teacher and administrator evaluations to ensure reviews include feedback identifying areas of improvement.
* The district should work to expand its professional development offerings that cater to staff interest and identified staff area(s) for growth.

## Financial and Asset Management

The superintendent, the town manager, and school committee have a strong working relationship that lends itself to a culture of collaboration and connection across town offices. District and town leaders work together to develop the budget for Winthrop. School leaders play an essential role in the budgeting process and are responsible for developing site budgets using a “base budget” document. Through this process, principals advocate for their needs using a system that captures the unique needs of each building. In addition, the district completes an audit every year as part of their annual report and remains in compliance with all reporting and auditing requirements. Furthermore, Winthrop has developed a five-year capital plan that includes preventive maintenance for its facilities, and the superintendent works closely with municipal employees to ensure that schools are safe and accessible for students.

Table 4 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management.

Table 4. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Budget documentation and reporting](#_Budget_Documentation_and) | * Communicating budget documents, process, decisions, and updates with school community stakeholders.
 |  |
| [Adequate budget](#_Adequate_Budget) |  | * Funding to bolster program offerings
 |
| [Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits](#_Financial_Tracking,_Forecasting,) |  |  |
| [Capital planning and facility maintenance](#_Capital_Planning_and_1) | * The district has a strong working relationship with the town that results in cohesive planning.
 |  |

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

Communicating budget documents, process, decisions, and updates with school community stakeholders is a strength of the district. Winthrop maintains publicly available budget documents that clearly outline all sources of funds and the allocation of resources. In addition, according to school committee members and district leaders, the superintendent provides detailed presentations during school committee meetings regarding budget updates and tracking, budget development, and spending throughout the year. The district maintains transparency with parents and formally invites parents to school committee meetings where budget information discussion is on the agenda. The district provides publicly available documents to the school community that include the Level Service Budget and the Needs Budget. An informational email to parents explained that the Level Service Budget “reflects what is needed to maintain [their] current level of staff and programs” and the Needs Budget document “reflects what is needed to advance [their] school system developed with input from parents/guardians, the Winthrop Public Schools staff, students, and the School Committee.” According to district leaders and school committee members, both of these documents reflect and align to the District Strategic Plan and School Improvement Plans.

District leaders, committee members, and the town manager described a culture of collaboration and transparency in managing the budget. The town manager and superintendent explained that a recent change was made in the budgeting process. The district has a budget they work with and then make financial support requests of the town for additional capital funds for projects that the district is having difficulty covering. The superintendent acknowledged that the town also has a limited budget and so at the time of the review the town and district were working together on a “Green Grant” to help support the facilities maintenance projects. The superintendent explained that “each year the town has been generous in picking one or two of the larger capital items that [they] need.”

Winthrop uses Microsoft Excel to document the budget even though there are more sophisticated software programs that are specifically created to document school districts’ budgeting processes and provide multiple databases to use in communicating with stakeholders. The district provides budget documents and reports to the school committee, and the documents are publicly available through school committee meetings. The budget includes funding amounts from each source including Chapter 70 funds, federal ESSER funds, capital stabilization funds, “free cash,” and more. It also has two years of historical spending data. Town leaders shared that they use a Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) budget that includes a flat amount for the school department and refers readers to the school budget for specifics. As a town leader explained, “The school superintendent and the school committee take care of the day to day. In the GFOA budget, the school shows as one number, 35 million, or whatever it is. And then, with line item autonomy, they decide how they want to take care of those monies and where they're going to be allocated.” The superintendent shares annual budgets with school leaders during the spring semester prior to the summer of the upcoming school year when budgets are complete.

### Adequate Budget

The district has systems in place to ensure a sufficient general appropriation of funds to meet required net school spending. According to district leaders, principals use a districtwide spreadsheet to indicate their budgetary needs for the upcoming school year; district leaders also use the spreadsheet to determine the allocation of funds for each school. District leaders and the town manager said that Winthrop was recently granted increased Chapter 70 funds, which helped increase the budget for the schools. The district also receives grants to support programming which are managed by the superintendent with the support of other district leaders. Grant spending is tracked by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent. District leaders and the school committee agree that attention is paid to ensuring grant dollars are utilized.

However, district leaders, school leaders, school committee members, and the town manager agree that students would benefit from additional programming, which requires additional funds and is an area of growth for the district. One leader stated a sentiment shared across groups that the schools “definitely could use more money,” sharing that “they are very efficient with the money and definitely are meeting the students’ needs…but now we’d love to do extra stuff, additional programming, maybe new learning modules, new ways to do things, offering new software, and all that stuff, that costs money.” Based on RADAR, the district’s per pupil spending is in the middle of districts with similar demographics and on the low end for districts with similar wealth. However, Winthrop has a higher percentage of English learners (10% versus 2.5% average, respectively) and low-income students (38% versus 19.5% average, respectively) in their student community than these districts of similar wealth. School committee members stated that district funding is a point of conversation, saying that they continue to bring the budget needs up, and that the budget may have to go to an override. Teachers shared a concern across focus groups that the budget is not adequate to equip every classroom with support staff to meet the needs of all students. Currently, Winthrop has higher FTE of paraprofessionals when compared to the state average (3.5 and 2.6 respectively) and a lower FTE of teachers when compared to the state average (7.7 and 8.4, respectively). Teachers explained that they would like to have more co-taught classes as well as additional educators to support English learners in their general education classes.

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

According to district leaders, school committee members, and the town manager, Winthrop complies with all reporting and auditing requirements. District leaders reported that they procure independent financial auditing services annually for the end-of-year report. District documents show that spending data are in the budget, and data are publicly available from 2020 to 2022. Documents also highlighted how the district tracks the use of budgeted funds, with a breakdown of the entire budget and whether all allocated money was used. Winthrop shared multiple documents demonstrating how they track expenditures and funding sources. One document provided is the Departmental Expenditure Report, which outlines all expenditures that occur through all town offices, including school district expenditures. Another document is the Winthrop Trial Balance Summary report, which outlines all sources of funding and the balance in each account. School committee members stated that they receive financial tracking documents every two weeks that outline account balances and whether the district is on target with budget projections. The superintendent also shared that the budget for frequently shifting items like consumables or substitutes are often reviewed daily and, “at bare minimum weekly.” In addition, district leaders explained they forecast expected expenses which can be found in the 2023-2024 Capital Plan, the District Preventative Maintenance plan. In addition, the district is currently working on developing a combined procurement policy to effectively address all school needs. The town manager stated that there have been no problems with meeting reporting requirements.

### Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

The district has a strong working relationship with the town that results in cohesive collaboration for capital planning and facility maintenance, which is a strength of the district. Winthrop has a capital plan, and district leaders and the town manager shared that there is a good working relationship between the district and town officials to ensure that buildings are safe and accessible. District leaders reported that prior to the beginning of a school year, the superintendent walks through all schools with a team from the town offices—including the police and fire chiefs, a representative from the health office, and the building commissioner—for inspection. The team notes things that need to be fixed and creates a detailed report. District leaders highlighted a strong working relationship between many stakeholders involved in capital planning, saying:

. . . having that strong communication with the town manager allows his skill set to work with mine and their CFO [chief financial officer] for the town and the school business manager to see what kind of funds we can get. And right now we’re working on a green grant with the town to help support that capital fund so they don’t have to take it out of there because that would deplete their capital planning money.

Relevant town officials and departments review the capital plan throughout the school year. District leaders also meet with the facilities manager and the school business manager monthly to review preventive maintenance plans. This review process also can include the town CFO and the school janitorial staff. The district has a preventive maintenance planning document that supports long-term capital planning. This document outlines the scheduled preventive maintenance for all facilities in Winthrop. Each identified area for maintenance includes a monthly timeline for when maintenance will occur or when specific aspects will be inspected or serviced. For example, elevators are projected to be serviced monthly, whereas spot painting typically occurs once per year in August.

The four school buildings in Winthrop are managed by a facilities’ manager who is employed by the district. This individual is responsible for providing weekly updates regarding current and upcoming projects as well as unexpected projects. The facilities’ manager, the superintendent, and the school business manager are involved in planning and updating the district’s capital plan. Winthrop’s 2023-2024 capital plan outlines approximately, $1.3 million in general maintenance, repair and safety fixes ranging from replacing stair treads, to repairing asphalt, replacing office carpeting and cafeteria floors, replacing a playground and flagpole, and updating software. The shift to a new technology plan and firm as of the 2021-2022 school year has allowed the district to choose a technology firm that includes a refurbishing plan to fix, renew, and replace technology as needed. In addition to the current year needs, the long-term facilities plan includes two categories for funding improvement projects. The first category includes projects that are financially manageable by the district. The second includes projects that the district needs to work with the town on to secure funding for improvement projects. The superintendent explained that the district is planning on replacing two large heating units within the next two or three years which will cost the district $500,000.

### Recommendations

* The district and its municipal partners should review its level of financial spending, using tools such as DESE Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR), to better understand its financial position relative to comparable communities and determine whether additional funding for schools is merited.

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Winthrop. The team conducted 57 classroom observations during the week of May 8, 2023, and held interviews and focus groups between May 8 and May 10, 2023. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the schools and the district:

* Superintendent
* Other district leaders
* School committee members
* Teachers’ association members
* Principals
* Teachers
* Support specialists
* Parents
* Students
* Town representative

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

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

## Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report
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Introduction

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

Three observers visited Winthrop Public Schools during the week of May 8, 2023. Observers conducted 57 observations in a sample of classrooms across four schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average\*: 4.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 4.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 5.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 19 | 4.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 3.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [2 x 4] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 16] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 57 observations = 4.4

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\*: 4.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 4.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 19 | 4.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 3.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 3] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 15] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 57 observations = 4.9

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\*: 3.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 3.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 3.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 3.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 3] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 57 observations = 3.3

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.[[4]](#footnote-5)

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

Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 6.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 7.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:
([6 x 4] + [7 x 53]) ÷ 57 observations = 6.9

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

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

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average\*: 6.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 6.4 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 6.1 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 18 | 6.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 2] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 37]) ÷ 57 observations = 6.4

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

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

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

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Productivity District Average\*: 6.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 6.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 20 | 6.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 6.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 18 | 6.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:
([4 x 1] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 39]) ÷ 57 observations = 6.5

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 4.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 4.6 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 5.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 19 | 4.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 3.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 3] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 17] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 57 observations = 4.6

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K−3

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

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

Concept Development District Average\*: 2.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 2.6 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 3] + [2 x 5] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 2]) ÷ 14 observations = 2.6

\*\*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\*: 3.7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 43 | 3.7 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 4.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 3.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 5] + [2 x 4] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 43 observations = 3.7

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 43 | 2.9 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3.1 |
| Grades 9-12 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 9] + [2 x 6] + [3 x 13] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 3]) ÷ 43 observations = 2.9

\*\*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\*: 2.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 2.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 3.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 9] + [2 x 17] + [3 x 13] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 57 observations = 2.9

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 3.4 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.4 |

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

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 2.4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 43 | 2.4 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 12] + [2 x 11] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 1]) ÷ 43 observations = 2.4

\*\*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\*: 4.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 43 | 4.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 5.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 3.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 10] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 43 observations = 4.6

\*\*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 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 19 | 12 | 26 | 80 | 5.4 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 5.0 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 3.9 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 29 | 60 | 6.0 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 20 | 6.2 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 20 | 6.7 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 5.0 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 12 | 21 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 66 | 2.8 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2.6 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.2 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.4 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.3 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 3] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.0

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.9. 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 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 19 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 57 | 4.3 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 19 | 4.5 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 19 | 4.9 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 3.4 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 37 | 57 | 6.4 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 6.1 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 6.2 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 10 | 14 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 95 | 3.6 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 19 | 4.9 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 4.4 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3.1 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 3.0 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 5 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2.5 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 3] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 19 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 x 2] + [7 x 17]) ÷ 19 observations = 6.9

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 | 3 | 11 | 18 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 54 | 3.4 |
| Positive Climate | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 3.8 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 3.9 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 2 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2.6 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 47 | 54 | 6.9 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 18 | 6.8 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 18 | 6.7 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 7.0 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 16 | 15 | 22 | 23 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 90 | 3.1 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 3.8 |
| Content Understanding | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 3.6 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2.8 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2.8 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2.3 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 3.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [2 x 1] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 18 observations = 3.8

\*\*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 x 18]) ÷ 18 observations = 7.0
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [*Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB)*](https://www.erstrategies.org/cms/files/2752-student-based-budgeting-guide.pdf%29%2C%20from%20Education%20Resource%20Strategies) from Education Resource Strategies | This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs. |
| [Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html) | A series of modules designed to support novice principals and their mentors in the development of antiracist leadership competencies aligned to the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership. |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) | This guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision.  |

Table C2. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/default.html) | A suite of resources and practical tools that reflect feedback from educators on how to implement educator evaluation in support of more equitable, culturally responsive schools and classrooms for all. These resources include Focus Indicators, a subset of Indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the 2022-2023 school year. |
| [Guide to Building Supportive Talent Systems](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/talent-guide/default.html) | Resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on racial equity. |
| [Professional Learning Partner Guide](https://plpartnerguide.org/) | A free, online, searchable list of vetted professional development providers who have expertise in specific sets of high-quality instructional materials. Schools and districts can use this guide to easily find professional development providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials. |

Table C3. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource  | Description |
| [*Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District* *Budgets*](https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/3412255/Spending-Money-Wisely-Getting-the-Most-from-School-District-Budgets-e-book.pdf) (scroll down to Research section) | A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.  |
| [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) | RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions. |
| [Planning for Success (PfS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | PfS is an inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |
| [DESE spending comparisons website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) | A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table D1. Winthrop Public Schools: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | District | Percentage of total | State | Percentage of total |
| All | 1,941 | 100.0% | 913,735 | 100.0% |
| African American | 32 | 1.6% | 85,662 | 9.4% |
| Asian | 13 | 0.7% | 67,010 | 7.3% |
| Hispanic | 392 | 20.2% | 221,044 | 24.2% |
| Native American | 8 | 0.4% | 2,155 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,465 | 75.5% | 496,800 | 54.4% |
| Native Hawaiian | 1 | 0.1% | 787 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic  | 30 | 1.5% | 40,277 | 4.4% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2022.

Table D2. Winthrop Public Schools: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2022-2023

|  | District | State |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of district | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of state |
| All students with high needs | 989 | 100.0% | 50.6% | 508,820 | 100.0% | 55.1% |
| Students with disabilities | 315 | 31.9% | 16.1% | 179,095 | 35.2% | 19.4% |
| Low-income households | 742 | 75.0% | 38.2% | 386,060 | 75.9% | 42.3% |
| ELs and former ELs | 185 | 18.7% | 9.5% | 110,554 | 21.7% | 12.1% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2022. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,953; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 923,349.

Table D3. Winthrop Public Schools: Chronic Absencea Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 1,986 | 11.2 | 13.6 | 24.7 | 27.7 |
| African American/Black | 29 | 6.9 | 15.4 | 13.8 | 32.0 |
| Asian | 11 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 18.2 | 15.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 359 | 14.9 | 19.8 | 32.6 | 42.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 25 | 4.5 | 15.4 | 36.0 | 28.4 |
| Native American | 6 | — | — | 16.7 | 37.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 32.1 |
| White | 1,555 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 23.0 | 22.1 |
| High needs | 1,066 | 15.2 | 21.2 | 31.3 | 37.1 |
| Low incomeb | 879 | — | — | 32.4 | 40.6 |
| ELs | 180 | 16.8 | 28.0 | 28.9 | 39.9 |
| Students w/disabilities | 324 | 17.3 | 24.1 | 36.7 | 36.9 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. b Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a newly defined low-income student group. This change also affects the high needs group.

Table D4. Winthrop Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2020-2022

|   | Fiscal Year 2020 | Fiscal Year 2021 | Fiscal Year 2022 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual |
| Expenditures |
| From local appropriations for schools |  |
| By school committee | $21,240,650 | $21,102,754 | $22,226,254 | $21,792,605 | $22,789,950 | $22,868,899 |
| By municipality | $10,900,618 | $10,632,948 | $11,178,946 | $10,837,455 | $10,929,688 | $11,297,744 |
| Total from local appropriations | $32,141,268 | $31,735,702 | $33,405,200 | $32,630,060 | $33,719,638 | $34,166,643 |
| From revolving funds and grants | — | $2,556,202 | — | $3,375,399 | — | $4,822,927 |
| Total expenditures | — | $34,291,904 | — | $36,005,459 | — | $38,989,570 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program |
| Chapter 70 state aida | — | $7,340,903 | — | $7,340,903 | — | $7,398,113 |
| Required local contribution | — | $16,010,984 | — | $16,793,461 | — | $17,313,006 |
| Required net school spendingb | — | $23,351,887 | — | $24,134,364 | — | $24,711,119 |
| Actual net school spending | — | $25,832,300 | — | $26,677,152 | — | $28,203,694 |
| Over/under required ($) | — | $2,480,413 | — | $2,542,788 | — | $3,492,575 |
| Over/under required (%) | — | 10.6% | — | 10.5% | — | 14.1% |

*Note*. Data as of June 2, 2023, and sourced from fiscal year 2022 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.

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

Table D5. Winthrop Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Administration | $538 | $566 | $603 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $875 | $958 | $986 |
| Teachers | $5,749 | $6,299 | $6,696 |
| Other teaching services | $1,339 | $1,592 | $1,659 |
| Professional development | $78 | $86 | $83 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $343 | $596 | $545 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $445 | $493 | $511 |
| Pupil services | $942 | $1,057 | $1,182 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,006 | $1,219 | $1,213 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $2,547 | $2,802 | $3,062 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $13,863 | $15,669 | $16,540 |

*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 E. Student Performance Data

The COVID-19 pandemic had a profound impact on the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years. 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. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2019-2022

| Group | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 825 | 57 | 46 | 44 | 41 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 17 |
| African American/Black | 15 | 80 | 41 | 47 | 26 | 10 | 18 | 7 | 27 |
| Asian | 3 | — | — | — | 63 | — | — | — | 8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 124 | 40 | 31 | 22 | 22 | 9 | 22 | 19 | 31 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 11 | 67 | 64 | 73 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Native American | 3 | — | — | — | 29 | — | — | — | 25 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 17 |
| White | 668 | 60 | 48 | 47 | 48 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| High needs | 452 | 40 | 33 | 32 | 24 | 12 | 20 | 18 | 28 |
| Low incomea | 365 | — | — | 33 | 24 | — | — | 16 | 28 |
| ELs and former ELs | 136 | 34 | 27 | 22 | 20 | 11 | 22 | 24 | 34 |
| Students w/disabilities | 122 | 17 | 21 | 13 | 11 | 24 | 36 | 39 | 46 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E2. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2019-2022

| Group | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 138 | 66 | 71 | 54 | 58 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 8 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 13 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 79 | — | — | — | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 36 | 42 | 47 | 42 | 38 | 21 | 6 | 11 | 17 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 62 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 45 | — | — | — | 16 |
| White | 96 | 70 | 76 | 60 | 65 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 4 |
| High needs | 71 | 33 | 47 | 37 | 38 | 27 | 15 | 18 | 15 |
| Low incomea | 64 | — | — | 41 | 40 | — | — | 17 | 14 |
| ELs and former ELs | 17 | 33 | — | 24 | 21 | 33 | — | 12 | 30 |
| Students w/disabilities | 26 | 14 | 19 | 4 | 20 | 32 | 33 | 42 | 26 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E3. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2019-2022

| Group | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 829 | 52 | 26 | 34 | 39 | 6 | 19 | 16 | 17 |
| African American/Black | 15 | 50 | 24 | 40 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 13 | 31 |
| Asian | 3 | — | — | — | 69 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 126 | 40 | 15 | 23 | 18 | 10 | 28 | 21 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 11 | 67 | 36 | 36 | 44 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 16 |
| Native American | 3 | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 23 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 19 |
| White | 669 | 54 | 29 | 35 | 47 | 6 | 17 | 15 | 11 |
| High needs | 454 | 36 | 16 | 24 | 22 | 12 | 28 | 23 | 28 |
| Low incomea | 366 | — | — | 25 | 20 | — | — | 22 | 29 |
| ELs and former ELs | 135 | 36 | 10 | 16 | 21 | 10 | 29 | 23 | 32 |
| Students w/disabilities | 123 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 24 | 50 | 50 | 45 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E4. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2019-2022

| Group | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 135 | 61 | 54 | 42 | 50 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 10 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 20 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 78 | — | — | — | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 34 | 32 | 29 | 21 | 26 | 21 | 29 | 21 | 21 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 16 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 19 |
| White | 95 | 65 | 58 | 51 | 59 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 6 |
| High needs | 69 | 29 | 31 | 25 | 28 | 33 | 24 | 22 | 19 |
| Low incomea | 62 | — | — | 26 | 29 | — | — | 19 | 19 |
| ELs and former ELs | 16 | 25 | — | 13 | 17 | 33 | — | 13 | 32 |
| Students w/disabilities | 25 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 43 | 43 | 48 | 33 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E5. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2022

| Group | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 302 | 47 | 33 | 40 | 42 | 6 | 15 | 11 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 7 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 65 | — | — | — | 8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 47 | 38 | 16 | 26 | 20 | 6 | 24 | 21 | 33 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 4 | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 15 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 28 | — | — | — | 25 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 242 | 49 | 37 | 43 | 52 | 6 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| High needs | 163 | 31 | 22 | 31 | 24 | 10 | 23 | 17 | 29 |
| Low incomea | 133 | — | — | 32 | 23 | — | — | 14 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 48 | 33 | 24 | 25 | 18 | 6 | 24 | 23 | 37 |
| Students w/disabilities | 34 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 21 | 39 | 32 | 44 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E6. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2019-2022

| Group | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 122 | — | — | 42 | 47 | — | — | 13 | 14 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 25 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 70 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 27 | — | — | 22 | 23 | — | — | 22 | 28 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 51 | — | — | — | 12 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 14 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 45 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 89 | — | — | 49 | 56 | — | — | 9 | 8 |
| High needs | 56 | — | — | 27 | 26 | — | — | 25 | 24 |
| Low incomea | 49 | — | — | 31 | 26 | — | — | 24 | 25 |
| ELs and former ELs | 12 | — | — | 0 | 13 | — | — | 50 | 43 |
| Students w/disabilities | 24 | — | — | 21 | 16 | — | — | 42 | 37 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E7. Winthrop Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 and 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 636 | 51.9 | 53.9 | 49.8 |
| African American/Black | 11 | — | — | 48.8 |
| Asian | 3 | — | — | 58.5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 95 | 50.7 | 46.4 | 46.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | — | — | 51.5 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | 46.2 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 51.7 |
| White | 514 | 52.0 | 55.0 | 50.0 |
| High needs | 340 | 50.4 | 52.3 | 46.7 |
| Low incomea | 276 | — | 53.3 | 46.5 |
| ELs and former ELs | 104 | 51.5 | 48.6 | 47.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 85 | 51.4 | 47.2 | 41.8 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E8. Winthrop Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 and 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 118 | 54.7 | 47.4 | 50.0 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 49.8 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | 56.0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 26 | — | 41.5 | 47.6 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | 50.6 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 54.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 49.5 |
| White | 87 | 55.7 | 50.4 | 50.1 |
| High needs | 53 | 44.7 | 43.2 | 47.7 |
| Low incomea | 48 | — | 44.6 | 47.2 |
| ELs and former ELs | 9 | — | — | 50.5 |
| Students w/disabilities | 21 | 36.3 | 29.2 | 45.1 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E9. Winthrop Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 and 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 637 | 47.7 | 55.4 | 49.9 |
| African American/Black | 11 | — | — | 47.0 |
| Asian | 3 | — | — | 59.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 95 | 47.8 | 52.4 | 46.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | — | — | 51.0 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | 49.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 49.9 |
| White | 515 | 47.1 | 55.8 | 50.4 |
| High needs | 341 | 48.3 | 52.9 | 47.1 |
| Low incomea | 276 | — | 53.2 | 46.4 |
| ELs and former ELs | 103 | 47.9 | 54.3 | 48.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 85 | 53.6 | 47.6 | 43.3 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E10. Winthrop Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 and 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 116 | 48.7 | 43.7 | 50.0 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | 45.6 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | 57.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 24 | — | 37.9 | 44.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | 50.0 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 46.6 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 41.2 |
| White | 87 | 49.8 | 46.1 | 51.6 |
| High needs | 51 | 37.4 | 44.7 | 46.7 |
| Low incomea | 46 | — | 44.1 | 45.6 |
| ELs and former ELs | 9 | — | — | 48.9 |
| Students w/disabilities | 19 | 36.5 | — | 47.3 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E11. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2019-2022

| Grade | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 3 | 142 | 61 | 46 | 42 | 44 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 15 |
| 4 | 118 | 53 | 50 | 39 | 38 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 16 |
| 5 | 145 | 65 | 48 | 50 | 41 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 13 |
| 6 | 126 | 62 | 51 | 42 | 41 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 22 |
| 7 | 139 | 45 | 44 | 36 | 41 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 19 |
| 8 | 155 | 57 | 36 | 53 | 42 | 7 | 12 | 14 | 18 |
| 3-8 | 825 | 57 | 46 | 44 | 41 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 17 |
| 10 | 138 | 66 | 71 | 54 | 58 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 8 |

Table E12. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2019-2022

| Grade | *N* (2022) | Percentages meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 3 | 141 | 60 | 19 | 21 | 41 | 4 | 28 | 28 | 20 |
| 4 | 117 | 52 | 24 | 32 | 42 | 9 | 25 | 26 | 17 |
| 5 | 145 | 52 | 23 | 31 | 36 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 16 |
| 6 | 127 | 60 | 24 | 48 | 42 | 3 | 19 | 9 | 15 |
| 7 | 142 | 45 | 33 | 37 | 37 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 19 |
| 8 | 157 | 44 | 31 | 34 | 36 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 17 |
| 3-8 | 829 | 52 | 26 | 34 | 39 | 6 | 19 | 16 | 17 |
| 10 | 135 | 61 | 54 | 42 | 50 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 10 |

Table E13. Winthrop Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2019‑2022

| Grade | *N* (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 5 | 145 | 51 | 40 | 47 | 43 | 7 | 17 | 9 | 18 |
| 8 | 157 | 43 | 28 | 33 | 42 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 18 |
| 5 and 8 | 302 | 47 | 33 | 40 | 42 | 6 | 15 | 11 | 18 |
| 10 | 122 | — | — | 42 | 47 | — | — | 13 | 14 |

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

Table E14. Winthrop Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019 and 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | *N (*2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 111 | 43.0 | 56.4 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 136 | 52.7 | 59.5 | 49.9 |
| 6 | 117 | 51.9 | 56.4 | 49.8 |
| 7 | 124 | 53.8 | 39.9 | 49.7 |
| 8 | 148 | 57.2 | 56.7 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 636 | 51.9 | 53.9 | 49.8 |
| 10 | 118 | 54.7 | 47.4 | 50.0 |

Table E15. Winthrop Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019 and 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | *N* (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 111 | 51.2 | 46.5 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 136 | 51.3 | 58.1 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 117 | 49.9 | 61.4 | 49.8 |
| 7 | 126 | 44.6 | 59.7 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 147 | 41.7 | 51.0 | 49.8 |
| 3-8 | 637 | 47.7 | 55.4 | 49.9 |
| 10 | 116 | 48.7 | 43.7 | 50.0 |

Table E16. Winthrop Public Schools: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2020‑2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 153 | 89.9 | 91.0 | 91.5 | 90.1 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 86.2 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 96.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 24 | 62.5 | 81.3 | 83.3 | 81.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 88.7 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.2 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 125 | 93.2 | 92.5 | 92.8 | 93.2 |
| High needs | 81 | 82.9 | 81.6 | 86.4 | 83.9 |
| Low incomea | 74 | 84.2 | 77.8 | 85.1 | 83.2 |
| ELs | 7 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 71.4 | 73.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 20 | 71.4 | 79.1 | 70.0 | 78.0 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E17. Winthrop Public Schools: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2019‑2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2021) | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | State (2021) |
| All students | 155 | 88.9 | 91.3  | 91.0 | 91.8 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 88.1 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 97.0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | 76.0 | 75.0 | 81.3 | 84.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 91.2 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 84.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 87.7 |
| White | 134 | 90.6 | 93.2 | 92.5 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 76 | 82.1 | 85.7 | 81.6 | 85.8 |
| Low incomea | 54 | 81.2 | 87.7 | 77.8 | 85.1 |
| ELs | 9 | 66.7 | 83.3 | 66.7 | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 43 | 84.6 | 71.4 | 79.1 | 80.6 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E18. Winthrop Public Schools: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 1,990 | 0.0 | — | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| African American/Black | 29 | — | — | — | 2.2 |
| Asian | 11 | — | — | — | 0.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 358 | — | — | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 27 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native American | 6 | — | — | — | 2.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 1,558 | 0.1 | — | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| High needs | 1,077 | 0.0 | — | 0.0 | 2.2 |
| Low incomea | 880 | — | — | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| ELs | 189 | 0.0 | — | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 337 | 0.0 | — | 0.0 | 2.8 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E19. Winthrop Public Schools: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 1,990 | 1.0 | — | 1.7 | 3.1 |
| African American/Black | 29 | — | — | — | 6.2 |
| Asian | 11 | — | — | — | 0.7 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 358 | — | — | 2.5 | 4.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 27 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native American | 6 | — | — | — | 4.3 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 3.6 |
| White | 1,558 | 1.0 | — | 1.3 | 2.1 |
| High needs | 1,077 | 1.8 | — | 2.1 | 4.6 |
| Low incomea | 880 | — | — | 2.4 | 5.2 |
| ELs | 189 | 2.9 | — | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Students w/disabilities | 337 | 2.5 | — | 2.7 | 5.8 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E20. Winthrop Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 562 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 7 | 0.0 | — | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 6 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 103 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 6.8 | 4.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 4.3 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 1.2 |
| White | 440 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| High needs | 266 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 5.6 | 3.6 |
| Low incomea | 230 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 6.5 | 3.8 |
| ELs | 30 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 10.0 | 7.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 79 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 6.3 | 3.4 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

Table E21. Winthrop Public Schools: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All students | 274 | 80.6 | 88.3 | 81.8 | 64.9 |
| African American/Black | 2 | 66.7 | — | — | 55.5 |
| Asian | 3 | — | — | — | 84.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 40 | 61.5 | 80.0 | 72.5 | 49.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 66.1 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50.0 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 65.4 |
| White | 227 | 84.2 | 89.7 | 83.3 | 69.5 |
| High needs | 122 | 64.7 | 78.6 | 72.1 | 49.1 |
| Low incomea | 106 | 66.2 | 84.6 | 77.4 | 50.1 |
| ELs | 6 | 28.6 | 77.8 | 50.0 | 30.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 35 | 56.5 | 57.8 | 51.4 | 34.3 |

a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sims/redefining-lowincome.html). This change also affects the high needs group.

1. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Average SGP ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0-29.9, Low Growth = 30.0-39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0-59.9, High Growth = 60.0 or higher. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)