Dedham Public Schools

Targeted District Review Report

March 2022

Contents

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION

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 Dedham Public Schools (hereafter, DPS) in March 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the three student-centered standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.

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

DPS is led by the superintendent, Michael Welch, along with a seven-member school committee, with each member elected to three-year terms. The superintendent has been in his position since 2014. Other key central office leadership positions include the assistant superintendent of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the assistant superintendent of business and finance; directors of special education and technology; a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) officer; and preK-8 curriculum coordinators for STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and humanities.

Curriculum and Instruction

The district has curriculum maps for all subjects and grades, K-12. Curriculum reviews and mapping have been conducted and completed for the elementary level and are in progress for the middle- and high-school levels. The district also is engaging in data-driven instruction, which is most evident at the elementary level. A variety of course offerings and equity of course access are strengths for the district.

Instructional observations in DPS using the Teachstone CLASS protocol were conducted in 65 K-12 classrooms at all schools in the district. This protocol guided all classroom observations. The protocol has three grade-band levels: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest moderately strong emotional support, strong classroom organization, and strong student engagement (Grades 4-5) and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of moderately strong emotional support, strong classroom organization, mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support, and moderately strong student engagement.

Assessment

Creating systems to collect and use data to improve teaching and learning is a clear priority for DPS. DPS has established a culture of shared responsibility among stakeholders to assess student performance and adjusts practice accordingly. This fact is particularly evident at the four elementary schools. Through common planning time (CPT) in the elementary schools, educators have dedicated time to work together to analyze data and reflect on the needed changes in practice. DPS communicates students' progress with families and students through traditional reporting structures, such as progress reports and conferences for families with younger students.

Student Support

DPS prioritizes supporting students by attending to student well-being, ensuring that faculty and staff create safe and secure learning environments that are responsive to the cultural diversity of the student population, providing tiered systems of support, and communicating with families and community partners. The district and school improvement plans emphasize these priorities. Stakeholders acknowledged both the significant progress made in recent years as well as the remaining work to be done. Multiple data sources indicated that the elementary schools were more likely to have a positive climate compared with the secondary schools. In addition, the tiered levels of support are more robust at the elementary schools compared with those at the middle and high schools. In terms of family engagement, stakeholders reported mixed experiences, suggesting room for growth to ensure consistent opportunities across schools for more collaborative relationships.

Dedham 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 the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE): Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.[1] The DPS review focused only on the three student-centered standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support. Reviews identify systems and practices that may impede improvement as well as those most likely to contribute to positive results. The design of the targeted district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data before conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including school committee members, teachers' association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students' families. Team members also observe classroom instruction and collect data using the Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia.[2] Virtual interviews and focus groups also are conducted as needed. Following the site visit, the team members code and analyze the data to develop a set of objective findings. The team lead and multiple quality assurance reviewers, including DESE staff, then review the initial draft of the report. DESE staff provides recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas of growth identified, before AIR finalizes and submits the report to DESE. DESE reviews and then sends the report to the district for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website.

Site Visit

The site visit to the DPS occurred during the week of March 14, 2022. The site visit included 16 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 66 stakeholders, including district administrators, school principals, school staff members, students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted six teacher focus groups with 10 elementary-school teachers, 12 middle-school teachers, and 10 high-school teachers. The team

---

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

[2] For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit https://teachstone.com/class/.

also conducted two student focus groups, including a high-school focus group with three students and a middle-school focus group with four students.

The site team conducted 65 observations of classroom instruction in seven schools.[3] The trained and certified observation team members conducted instructional observations using the CLASS protocol.

Additional information is in the appendices. Appendix A includes details about site visit review activities. Appendix B provides information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures. The districtwide instructional observation report is in Appendix C. Appendix D contains additional resources to support implementation of DESE's District Standards and Indicators. Lastly, Appendix E contains student performance tables.

District Profile

DPS is led by a seven-member school committee, each elected to three-year terms. The superintendent has been in his position since 2014. Other key central office leadership positions include the assistant superintendent of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the assistant superintendent of business and finance; directors of special education and technology; a DEI officer; and preK-8 curriculum coordinators for STEM and humanities.

In the 2021-2022 school year, there were 228 teachers in the district, with 2,567 students enrolled in the district's seven schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

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

School	Type	Grades served	Enrollment
Avery	Elementary	1-5	280
Dedham High	High	9-12	701
Dedham Middle School	Middle	6-8	572
Early Childhood Center	Prekindergarten-Kindergarten	PreK and K	332
Greenlodge	Elementary	1-5	261
Oakdale	Elementary	1-5	249
Riverdale	Elementary	1-5	172
Totals			**2,567**

Note. Enrollment Data (2021-2022) for DPS (0073000) as of October 1, 2021.

Between 2018 and 2021, overall student enrollment decreased by 3.4 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high-need populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

---

[3] DESE exempted the early childhood center from instructional observations.

Student Performance

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Gen MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) is greater than the state average for all tested grades and subject areas. Tables 2-4 provide an overview of student performance in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science by grade level between 2018 and 2021.

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State	Above/below
3	167	56%	56%	62%	6	51%	11
4	189	55%	47%	55%	0	49%	6
5	169	55%	47%	50%	-5	47%	3
6	193	45%	61%	49%	4	47%	2
7	201	40%	43%	40%	0	43%	-3
8	232	46%	52%	38%	-8	41%	-3
3-8	1,151	50%	51%	48%	-2	46%	2
10	168	—	57%	71%	—	64%	7

Note. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00730000&orgtypecode=5& (2021).

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State	Above/below
3	166	53%	48%	34%	-19	33%	1
4	189	58%	49%	35%	-23	33%	2
5	169	54%	54%	40%	-14	33%	7
6	193	55%	60%	42%	-13	33%	9
7	201	45%	54%	42%	-3	35%	7
8	232	56%	51%	35%	-21	32%	3
3-8	1,150	54%	53%	38%	-16	33%	5
10	169	—	71%	65%	—	52%	13

Note. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00730000&orgtypecode=5& (2021).

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

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
5	169	47%	—	46%	-1	42%
8	199	47%	—	37%	-10	41%
5 and 8	368	47%	—	41%	-6	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00730000&orgtypecode=5& (2021).

In addition, the district's four- and five-year graduation rates, 91.5 percent in 2021 and 95.1 percent in 2020, respectively, are both greater than the state averages of 89.8 percent and 90.1 percent.

Curriculum and Instruction

The district has curriculum maps for all subjects and grades, K-12. Thorough curriculum reviews have been conducted and completed at the elementary level, but this work is still in progress at the middle- and high-school levels. A variety of course offerings and equity of course access are strengths for the district.

- **Curriculum Selection and Use.** Curriculum reviews have been completed at the elementary level and are in progress for the middle- and high-school levels.
- **Classroom Instruction.** The district is engaging in data-driven instruction, in which ample information is discussed and examined to understand student progress and needs. This activity is most evident at the elementary level.
- **Access to Coursework.** The district has a wide variety of academic offerings at both the middle- and high-school levels. Students and parents expressed satisfaction in this area.

Instructional observations using the CLASS protocol were conducted in 65 K-12 classrooms at all schools in the district. Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest moderately strong emotional support, strong classroom organization, and strong student engagement (Grades 4-5) and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of moderately strong emotional support, strong classroom organization, mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support, and moderately strong student engagement. Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Curriculum selection and use	Curriculum reviews at the elementary level	Completing curriculum reviews at the middle- and high-school levels
Classroom instruction	Providing a challenging, supportive, and engaging learning environment at all grade levels	Providing differentiated instruction consistently at the middle- and high-school levels
Student access to coursework	Student self-selection into AP classes	Improving opportunities for mobility between academic tracks at the high-school level

Curriculum Selection and Use

A strength of the district is its attention to curriculum planning and implementation on the K-5 level and the thoroughness of its curriculum review at this level. Curriculum reviews have been completed at the elementary level, and teachers, principals, and district leaders expressed satisfaction and confidence with the curriculum materials in place. Curriculum maps for most subjects in Grades 6-12 have been created but are still being refined. For example, the PK-5 Curriculum Map for 2021-2022, submitted by the district, contains a deep level of detail about subjects/lessons organized by month, discipline, and grade level. However, curriculum maps and scope and sequence documents in the

Grades 6-12 Master Curriculum Map are not consistent across categories, and some subjects have links to Google drive folders, whereas others do not. An area of growth for the district will be the completion of curriculum reviews at the middle- and high-school levels.

In describing the curriculum mapping and selection process, interview and focus group respondents described a multiyear process that began when the current district leadership arrived in 2016. District curriculum leaders and elementary teachers collaborated on selecting reading and literacy materials based on teachers' and leaders' previous experience with the Calkins Units of Study. The current mathematics curriculum has been in use since before the current direct leadership arrived; no participants recalled exactly when it was selected. When asked about how curriculum selection was done and how often curricula were reviewed at the high-school level, some secondary leaders said that they were not sure or not familiar with the process. District-level respondents described the review process, particularly with regard to mathematics, as something that was in the early stages at the time of the visit in March 2022. Multiple interview and focus groups respondents reported that the multiyear process of selecting, mapping, and reviewing all curricula in K-12 was interrupted by the pandemic, accounting for the lack of review of older materials or mapping at the high-school level. Evidence collected on middle-school curriculum and adoption is evidence of this interrupted process. Documents and comments from district leaders indicate that the shift to Units of Study and the workshop model began during the 2018-2019 school year. District leaders reported this this was a phased approach, with teachers selecting units to implement with the support of a consultant. This process was interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic beginning in 2020, and middle-school staff were more likely than staff at other grade levels to report a sense that changes felt sudden, incomplete, overwhelming, or incomplete. Middle-school staff shared in interviews and focus groups, for example, mixed reports on teachers' level of involvement in the process and varied satisfaction with curriculum materials. Some staff did speak of involvement in selecting the new mathematics curriculum, and the opportunity for input on a soon-to-be-adopted science curriculum. In addition, multiple middle-school staff expressed concern about their perceived lack of involvement in choosing the Calkins Units of Study curriculum.

Curricula in DPS are documented primarily in the district's internal Google drive. All teaching and coaching staff have access to this drive. The drive contains maps for K-5 and 6-12; each map has links to units by subject and month or, at the secondary level, links by year and course. Although the Google Drive contains maps at some level of detail for K-12, the K-5 map is more robustly organized and detailed than the map for Grades 6-12.

High-school teachers said that used the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to guide what topics to cover and which skills to focus on. These standards, staff reported in interviews, and associated materials their departments had selected or collected, were the basis of the curriculum at the high school. In addition to textbooks and curriculum guides, which the district provides, teachers provide their own supplementary materials to cover any additional standards not covered by the provided materials.

One district leader stated that the district was defining, aligning, and documenting curriculum at the elementary level, but was in an earlier stage at the secondary level because of the pandemic

interruption beginning in March 2020. The district did not submit a CURATE table,[4] and therefore comments on the ratings of provided curriculum materials are not in this report. District leaders noted that curriculum selected for the elementary level was reviewed to ensure that it was evidence based and provided the most support for all students. Secondary teachers often said that they had been asking for new materials for a few years and hoped they would be provided in 2022-2023. High-school department staff expressed various views about how current their textbooks were and whether there was a collaborative, evidence-informed process for selecting them. District leaders stated that the district's DEI officer has conducted an equity audit to ensure that curriculum and library materials were diverse and reflective of the student population. Teachers said that there have been suggestions about alignment across all subjects and grade levels, but no significant or documented changes have been made to date.

A document review indicated that the district's curricula included expectations about instruction, including pacing and suggestions for adapting units and content to students' learning needs, especially at the elementary level. For example, a Grade 5 mathematics unit includes color-coded standards to stress where teachers might spend more or less instructional time; it also includes specific strategies to support vocabulary development, ELs, students with disabilities, and social-emotional development. Similarly, a Grade 3 reading unit includes a pacing guide, as well as specific strategies to support vocabulary development, ELs, students with disabilities, and social-emotional development. District leaders told the team that between 2017 and 2019, curriculum consistency coaches were placed in all elementary schools to support teachers with curriculum, coaching, modeling lessons, and doing lesson study.

District leaders said that coaches, principals, and teams of teachers met weekly in every school and discussed students' learning, progress, and what should be adjusted in instruction. Instructional leaders stated that this structure benefitted teachers because the coaches were primarily responsible for observing classroom and reporting on what needed to be addressed. Teachers and coaches work together to determine students' needs. School leaders said that such coaching support was available at the elementary- and middle-school levels; high-school teachers stated that departments heads could serve as coaches but did not do so systematically.

A document review indicated a district expectation for regular data check-ins and coaching coordination meetings by subject area at the K-8 level. Several professional development sessions address data review. District and school leaders reported that these meetings between teachers, coaches, and curriculum coaches on the data team enabled teachers to be more adaptive when delivering instruction and to tailor units and lesson plans to students' needs. Curriculum coordinators stated that meetings took place monthly to discuss data and problems of practice. Middle- and high-school teachers said that they reviewed data but were less clear with what frequency this occurred in meetings to support any adjustments to instruction.

One district leader said that the district has made middle-school curriculum more student-centered in recent years to assist with student engagement. District leaders said that Grades 6 and 7 received

---

[4] CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers (CURATE): Center for Instructional Support (mass.edu).

consistent curriculum materials but also noted more work needs to be done in terms of teacher training and support for staff about implementing curriculum changes.

High-school leaders stated that some departments had strong guidelines on the taught curriculum, but other departments did not. Some high-school interviewees expressed frustration at the tension between getting through the state-mandated curriculum and providing students with the background knowledge and skills they needed to learn the subject. One teacher exemplified this more widely held view:

> Teachers have a curriculum, [as well as] what they feel that they need to get through, especially freshman, sophomore year, where we have standards-based testing. [And] then there's the reality of the students that are in front of you and what their needs are. How do we balance [all of] that?

For example, during the past decade, the student population has become more racially and ethnically diverse, from 6 percent African American, 10 percent Hispanic, and 77 percent White in 2012 to 7 percent African American, 17 percent Hispanic, and 67 percent White in 2022. Interviewees said that as a result of these demographic changes, the district has tried to adjust the social studies curriculum to provide a more inclusive and equity-focused look at history.

Some interviewees said that the absence of progress on curriculum mapping at the secondary level might have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. District-level curriculum work had been progressing into upper grades at the onset of the pandemic and thus was interrupted. Reviewed syllabi and units at the high-school level did not consistently contain instructional guidance, as noted previously for the elementary grades.

Classroom Instruction

During the week of March 14, 2022, five classroom observers visited DPS, focusing primarily on instruction in the classroom. The observers conducted 65 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics.

The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations. The protocol included three grade-band levels: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). The K-3 protocol has 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. The Upper Elementary and Secondary protocols have 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 DPS, 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 the levels of individual dimensions within those domains. The full report of findings from observations conducted in the district is in Appendix C, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

In summary, findings from the observations were as follows:

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings fell in the high end of the middle range at the K-5 grade band and the middle range for both the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands.
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings fell in the high range for all grade bands.
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings fell in the middle range for the K-5 grade band and the lower end of the middle range for both the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands.
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings fell in the high range in the 4-5 grade band, the high end of the middle range for the 6-8 grade band, and the middle range for the 9-12 grade band.

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

Providing consistent, high-quality learning experiences for all students across the district has been a central office priority for the last six years. Specific programs and resources to support these objectives are most evident at the elementary- and middle-school levels, including curriculum unit documents, coaching supports, and specific suggestions for incorporating learning elements, such as vocabulary and social-emotional learning, into elementary curriculum units. The team did not find evidence of such guidance for particular approaches to instruction in materials at the high-school level. A document review indicated that infrastructure to aid data-driven instruction were present, particularly in the form of data teams who meet regularly to assess student progress. Interviews with middle- and high-school students indicated that students were generally happy with the quality of instruction that they were receiving, citing interactive courses such as some of their science courses, as being most engaging. In addition, parents expressed satisfaction with the education that DPS provided. Teachers, especially at the high school, expressed concern about students' academic progress, particularly because of learning loss associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the realm of student choice, options appear somewhat limited. Adult interviewees noted that some electives provided an opportunity for student choice, and some teachers spoke of trying to

increase choices in recent years on some assignments, such as allowing students more choices of historical figures to research to enable them to choose figures who resembled themselves. One student offered an example of choice in an English class such that students might have a choice between two different prompts. However, another student described limited opportunities for choice in class, noting "it's a false illusion of choice because [the teachers] are going to choose."

Interviews and a document review indicate that both technical and human resources are in place to help teachers with differentiating their instructional practice to meet students' needs. Overall, differentiation is supported by guidance for teachers within curriculum documents, colleagues with varying specialties, as well as tools such as disaggregated student performance data to identify student needs to further support differentiation in the classroom.

Curriculum documents are one tool for supporting adjustments to practice. All reviewed unit plans at the K-5 level included suggested accommodations for ELs and students with special needs. Secondary plans did not yet have such resources embedded. In addition, the Everyday Math and Bridges curricula are used to differentiate and adapt instruction at the elementary level.

Specialized staff are key to ensuring that instructional experiences are adapted to meet all students' needs. All schools have access to EL teachers, special education teachers, and instructional coaches to help them tailor instruction to students' learning needs, in addition to providing general guidelines and suggestions in their elementary unit plans. District leaders said that this infrastructure existed at all levels but was most prominently used at the elementary level.

Interviews and a document review indicated that the middle school did not have consistent differentiation guidance for classroom instruction, but there was support for intervention. Middle-school teacher specialists noted that interventions at the middle-school level were taking place and were highly individualized for each student. The middle school has interventionist staff as well as a structure for providing interventions. Middle-school specialists said that at this level curriculum was not uniformly modified, but students could receive accommodations within the classroom.

The review team did not find evidence of a defined differentiation model or intervention structure in place at the high school. A review of high-school curricular materials indicated an absence of guidelines for differentiation such as those found at the elementary level. Teachers said that there was some mention of using department meetings to review student data to adjust instruction.

Some curriculum maps also have additional information on how to tailor instruction. District leaders said that staff shortages at the middle-school level also have contributed to less consistent practices in interventions. Interviewees expressed the view that more could be done for ELs and students with disabilities. District leaders noted some resistance to differentiated instruction by teachers, and one school leader cited COVID-19-related issues as an interruption to previous progress made in this area. District and secondary-school leaders spoke of a need to re-create teacher buy-in for returning to more collaborative, interactive, and student-centered approaches to instruction following the return to school after COVID-19 pandemic-induced remote learning ended. Creating teacher buy-in for differentiated instructional practices is an area of needed growth.

Providing a challenging, supportive, and engaging learning environment is a strength for the district. Participants at all levels described creating more student-centered environments as a priority in the five years before the on-site review but also noted that schools at each level were in different places in regard to creating these environments.

Elementary staff cited the Calkins Units of Study in ELA and other efforts to use workshop models in the elementary grades. One elementary-school teacher described elementary classrooms as "visual," making frequent use of tools such as projectors, whereas another teacher noted that a common model was an introductory mini-lesson, followed by partner or group work. Middle-school teachers also described using mini-lessons and workshop models. One curriculum coordinator described how DPS was encouraging middle-school students to take ownership of their learning:

> We also added an elective at the middle school, Voice in Action Through Leadership. We call it VIATL, but it's really focused on student voice and how do we get kids, give them the opportunity to use their voices for whether it's civics or maybe it's changing something at their school or something out in the community.

Middle-school students said that they could ask for help and assistance when needed. For mathematics, interviewees said that mathematics enrichment or an outside tutor were available if initial supports were not helping. Middle-school teacher specialists said that independent, paired, and group learning were encouraged at the middle-school level. This variety also helps students take ownership of their learning. A middle-school specialist noted as follows:

> In some classrooms, you'll see that students have like a consistent learning partner, either for a reading unit or a writing unit. Where during the independent work time, if the teacher is conferring with someone else, they have that other student to check in with and to get feedback from, so that they're helping each other . . . That's one way that they're taking ownership.

In addition, middle-school specialists said that the district offered transparency about grades and assignments, enabling parents to see student work in close to real time. Grades, rubrics, and feedback are provided online so that students can see what work they have missed and check their homework log.

High-school students noted that little, in their view, was being done to diversify teaching practices for students with different learning styles. Students said that if they were struggling, they would prefer to stay in their present classrooms rather than transfer to a lower level class. When asked about culturally responsive practices, elementary principals and teachers noted that they were shifting to use more diverse books in the classroom. Some evidence from interviews and focus groups illustrates that culturally responsive instruction is being used to some extent on the elementary level, but it is unclear how widespread these practices are. District leaders said that in the past, DPS did not have a districtwide EL coordinator. District leaders said now that this position has been filled, they hoped to focus more on supporting ELs at all levels.

At the high-school level, interviewees cited few specific projects or other interdisciplinary opportunities for students, and administrators reported that these opportunities were few. CLASS observation data suggest that creating opportunities for engagement (see Instructional Learning

Formats in Appendix C) are more prevalent at the elementary level, but they are at least present at the middle- and high-school levels. However, instances of content-focused discussion (see Instructional Dialogue in Appendix C) are present at the elementary level and infrequent at the middle- and high-school levels.

Student Access to Coursework

Interviews with district leaders, students, and families and a document review indicated a wide variety of course offerings at all levels in the district. Middle-school students said that there were electives available at their level. The high school offers a wide variety of honors, Advanced Placement (AP), and college prep courses. High-school specialists said that career fairs offered graduating seniors information about local colleges, trade schools, and employers. High-school students told the team that other resources for student enrichment included volunteer opportunities and afterschool clubs.

The district has made some efforts to diversify curriculum on the high-school level and keep students more engaged. High-school students said that their classes studied *When I was Puerto Rican*, *Beloved*, and *Fences*. One student noted as follows:

> I was actually surprised that we read *Fences* because it's a play about black generational trauma . . . and we talked about language and the N-word . . . and I was actually kind of impressed and I was surprised.

In a physics class, high-school students were able to connect what they were learning to real-world outcomes. The class interacted with staff at a company called CERN, which gave the students an online tour of its particle accelerator in Switzerland.

Access to rigorous and challenging course work is strongest at the elementary- and high-school levels. In interviews, district leaders said that AP classes were open to all students, and all students were encouraged to take an AP course. District leaders and teachers said that an important step toward equity was DPS's policy of allowing students to self-select into AP classes and providing credit to students regardless of their score on the AP exams. Student self-selection creates wider opportunity for students to have access to rigorous and challenging coursework and limits the influence of teacher bias in the recommendation process for higher level courses. Teachers noted that once students were tracked in freshman year, aside from the open enrollment policy for AP classes, it was difficult for students who initially enrolled in regular-level classes to move into more advanced academic tracks.

Middle- and high-school principals said that Saturday tutoring sessions were available to help students prepare to take AP classes, especially if they were enrolling in these higher level courses for the first time.

Recommendations

- The district should develop a formal, inclusive process for systematically reviewing curricula.
- The district should ensure that curricular materials are aligned to definitions of high-quality instructional materials.

- The district should put practices into place to ensure that all students receive instruction and supports that meets their needs.

Assessment

Creating systems to collect and use data to improve teaching and learning is a clear priority for DPS. The district has established a culture of shared responsibility to assess student performance and make adjustments to practice, which is particularly evident at the four elementary schools. Through CPT in the elementary schools, educators have dedicated time to work together to analyze data and reflect on the needed changes in practice. The district communicates students' progress to families and students through traditional reporting structures, such as progress reports and conferences for families with younger students. Table 6 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Data and assessment systems	Universal screeners in kindergarten through Grade 8	Creating and documenting a system for collecting and reviewing common data sources at the high school
Data use	Support for data use, including dedicated time to look at data, particularly at the elementary level	Consistent structures (e.g., data team meetings or grade-level data reviews) at the high school
Sharing results	Access to PowerSchool	

Data and Assessment Systems

Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has prioritized creating systems to collect data throughout the year. In K-8, the STAR assessment is DPS's primary universal screener. A district leader said, "STAR is the backbone of the assessment and intervention structure [in] K-8." STAR360 Assessments are administered to all K-8 students in mathematics and ELA three times per year: fall, winter, and spring. In addition, at the elementary schools, the district administers Early Bird (kindergarten), Writing Assessments, Benchmark Assessment System, Running Records reading assessment, Fundations (K-2), DPS Progress Monitoring Assessments (Tier 2), and Everyday Math unit assessments. Benchmark assessments such as STAR360 are administered at least three times per year, with tools such as Fundations screeners, Everyday Math unit assessments, and Running Records described as being used on an "ongoing" basis.

At the time of the on-site review, the district's consistent commitment to data systems was a recent effort. One district leader reported that in earlier years, "there was little alignment in the elementary level, but that has been amended." Interviewees said that now the district was focused on creating the structures and alignment at the higher grades.

In the high school, although interviewees reported the use of data, the review team did not find evidence of a documented system for collecting and reviewing common data sources. Interviewees spoke of some common rubrics and common formative assessments in some departments, such as in the mathematics department. Other interviewees spoke of analyzing MCAS data and adjusting

practice based on their analysis but did not report any common formative assessments or rubrics in other academic departments.

Data Use

In recent years, DPS has established and is supporting a culture that values the use of data in improving teaching and learning. Interviewees expressed consistently positive views about the progress made in the district in educators' views about and use of data. The structures supporting data use are more consistent in the elementary and middle schools than at the high school, although interviews and a document review suggest some data use at the high school.

Interviews and a document review indicated that district and school leaders regularly used data to guide instructional practice. Interviews indicated that the type and frequency of teacher data use varies by level. Interviewees consistently stated that the district had "come a long way in the last couple of years in looking at student data." District leaders reported an absence of universal practices for data use in prior years. In addition, interviewees said that in the past, staff were not comfortable looking at data, so talking about data was not common practice. In contrast, after what interviewees described as more concerted efforts to look at data in the five to six years before the on-site review, interviewees reported better understanding of data and knowing "how to use the data from a variety of informal and formal assessments and use that information to target instruction for the kids in front of them." At the district level, district staff, in collaboration with school-level staff, collect and analyze information from STAR assessments and MCAS scores; a document review shows regular analyses identifying student progress and needs on assessments. District leaders provide principals and coaches with a dataset that they want them to use with teachers. Educators at the elementary- and middle-school levels use data more consistently than educators at the high school. One district leader stated that at the elementary and middle levels, the structure for data use "is very much in place." This leader said that at the elementary level, "we have more data than we know what to do with." This leader also said that the challenge was that staff were not always able to translate what they were learning from the data into classroom practices, which was "the next step" for the district. A December 2021 presentation to the DPS school committee indicated the particular data sources, such as the STAR360 early literacy, reading, and mathematics assessments, that district and school leaders were using to track the "academic vital signs" of students in the district.

Interviews and a document review indicated that data collection and meetings about interpreting information on students' progress were regular features of data use in the district, particularly at the K-8 level. In particular, elementary leaders meet monthly with one another and with district leaders to review data, and school-level discussions of data take place during teachers' CPT. District leaders and teachers reported that coaches were an integral part of this data review process, particularly with literacy data.

In contrast, at the secondary level, the structures for looking at data use were not as consistent and appeared to vary by department. Multiple interviewees reported annual reviews of MCAS data. One district leader described formal structures for data use as being in the nascent stages at the secondary level, and multiple staff at the high school echoed that some structures do exist (e.g., access to grades), but formal departmental or interdepartment data analysis structures were not yet well established. A document from 2020, the *Secondary ELA MCAS Item Analysis Plan*, outlined an

annual plan for question item analysis for all ELA teachers. This document compares the performance of DPS students with the state average. The plan states that 2020 was the first year in which 10th-grade ELA teachers had CPT to analyze data. Educators reported using data to compare the MCAS performance of their students with state averages and then adjusting teaching practices accordingly. Mathematics teachers spoke of using eighth-grade MCAS scores to identify students who need additional support in mathematics. They reported reassessing students after the first semester, noting that "there's a lot of data that goes into the decision making." Interviewees reported some efforts of high-school teachers coordinating data review with middle-school teachers. No plans or documents submitted by the district described secondary data collection or use in a comparable level of detail to the elementary-level plans.

The district has established data use as a priority and articulated a vision for data use to staff. Supports include instructional coaches and guidelines for data team structures at the elementary level, although these supports are not in place across the middle- and high-school levels. One objective of a 2021-2022 presentation, titled "Supporting Teaching and Learning With a Focus on Data," was to develop and support district- and school-level teams that will use data to "develop student-centered goals for the improvement of teaching and learning." The presentation promotes a culture of shared responsibility visually with an image of a pyramid showing the roles for different teams. At the top of the pyramid is the district data team, responsible for "establishing data cycle protocols." School data teams are responsible for "analyzing data" and "identifying student-driven goals," and coach-teacher teams "establish student-driven goals" and "intended outcomes" and "supports needed." A presentation by the preK-8 humanities curriculum coordinator, titled "Using Assessment to Inform Instruction: A Beginner's Guide to STAR360," delivered through district professional development sessions, instructs K-8 teachers on how to access and analyze student data, ensuring that important data are readily available. The presentation also prompts teachers to think of "other assessments" they might want to look at to "determine the skills the child needs to work on." District and school leaders said that school-level instructional coaches supported the implementation of this process.

Interviewees said that elementary grade-level teams had weekly CPT meetings, and data team meetings took place within CPT. At these meetings, all teachers work with the instructional coach and the principal. Teachers compare and discuss student data and look at how students are doing and determine interventions. Interviewees agreed about the importance of this dedicated time "to actually analyzing the data to think about next steps." Educators reported using data "often," and a document review indicated ample data collection across elementary grades and subjects throughout the school year. Teachers stated that coaches helped them look at data and ask questions, including "What are we going to focus on?" and "How are these data going to inform our instruction?" They also spoke about the importance of using both common formative assessments and individual teachers' classroom-level formative data, which they could collect throughout class. One school leader said that when schools started looking more intently at data several years before the on-site review, teachers were merely complying with district expectations, noting that teachers were now using data "more than ever before." Teachers have received some professional development about how to use data, with recent sessions focused on the Early Bird assessment for primary grades.

At the middle school, one area of focus for professional development has been "demystifying data." Staff have been focusing on sources of data besides MCAS data and helping educators look at data

throughout the year. Teachers said that staff had access to STAR360, and coaches supported the use of this information in grade-level meetings.

At the high school, teachers reported not working with instructional coaches in trying to interpret student data. Some staff spoke of positive relationships with department chairs who could serve as sources of support at a teacher's request. The review team did not find evidence of structures such as data review protocols, formally scheduled meetings, or coaches to support the collection and interpretation of data at the secondary level.

Sharing Results

The district shares data with school leaders for use at the classroom level. The district provides training to help teachers access and use the data. In terms of communicating with families and students, report cards and PowerSchool are the primary means of communication about how students are doing. At the elementary level, teachers also hold conferences with parents, and at the secondary level, many teachers use Google Classroom, which does not include a parent dashboard, but which some parents accessed with the help of their students.

The district shares student data with school leaders. Interviewees said that district leaders provided "principals and coaches with a dataset that we want them to look at with teachers." The district has focused on reading and mathematics data. In addition, some coaches are specifically targeting classrooms with students with high needs. A document review indicated that teachers had professional development time to look at data, and the district provided guidance on how to use this information to support student learning.

District and school leaders described communication with families as following a "traditional reporting structure." At the elementary-school level, teachers share standard report cards and hold parent conferences. One interviewee stated that these conferences were an important opportunity for teachers to explain what a specific reading level meant and looked like. Generally, elementary schools do not share STAR data with parents but use STAR data as an internal measure to discuss improvements in teaching and learning. Some teachers also reported sending home unit mathematics assessments and completed writing assignments so that parents could see what their children were working on, although this practice did not appear to be a consistent across classes or schools.

Report cards are used to communicate with families at the middle and high schools. If a student is struggling, there is an expectation that the teacher will contact a parent. Interviewees stated that the general rule was that if a student was receiving a failing grade in a course, "the parents should not find out the day they receive the report card." Educators spoke about calling and emailing parents if a student was struggling in their classes.

In addition, families have access to the PowerSchool learning management system. Interviewees said that most teachers used Google Classroom or Blackboard (depending on grade level), although Google Classroom does not have a parent dashboard. Parents reported that, through Blackboard, they can see their children's grades, attendance, and assignments. One parent said, "PowerSchool is very helpful." This same parent said that "some teachers are better than others in putting their

grades in a timely [manner] or putting up assignments." A different parent whose child is on an individualized education program describes the level of communication with families as "excellent."

These traditional structures also are used to communicate with students. In addition, district leaders report encouraging high-school teachers to have conversations with students to get to know the students as individuals. Middle-school students spoke of checking PowerSchool to find out how they were doing. They said that teachers prompted them to "check PowerSchool" to find out if they were missing any work. Middle-school students also gave examples of specific teachers who checked in with them and offered extra support to those who were struggling.

Recommendations

- District and school leaders should establish a more systematic process to ensure the effective use of data districtwide.
- To create a more effective system for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data, the district should create two data teams—one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level—with representation from both leadership and teaching staff from all subjects.

Student Support

DPS prioritizes supporting students by attending to student well-being, providing tiered systems of support, communicating with families and community partners, and ensuring that faculty and staff create safe and secure learning environments that are responsive to the cultural diversity of the student population. The district and school improvement plans emphasize these priorities. Interviewees acknowledged that significant progress has taken place in recent years, but work remains to be done. Multiple data sources, including interviews and a review of documents and other data, indicated that the elementary schools were more likely to have a positive climate than the secondary schools. In addition, the tiered levels of support are more robust in the elementary schools than in the middle and high schools. In terms of family engagement, interviewees reported mixed experiences, suggesting room for growth to ensure consistent opportunities across schools for more collaborative relationships. Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth student support.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Safe and supportive school climate and culture	Positive climates in classrooms	Fostering an environment where all middle-school students feel accepted
Tiered systems of support	STAR360 is the universal screener for K-8 students.	Creating robust student support strategies at the high school
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	Opportunities for student leadership at elementary schools	Providing consistent opportunities across schools for collaborative relationships with families

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

DPS prioritizes student well-being and ensures that faculty and staff create safe and secure learning environments that are responsive to the cultural diversity of the student population. Interviewees acknowledged both the progress already made and a need to keep working toward the established goals in this area. Classroom observations, the Views of Climate and Learning survey, and interviews with stakeholders indicated that the elementary schools, on average, were more likely to have a highly positive climate than the secondary schools. In particular, interviewees expressed mixed views about whether the environment of the middle school was accepting of and respectful to all students.

Instructional observations on the Positive Climate dimension of the CLASS protocol were, on average, in the high range for the Grades 1-5 schools in the district and in mid-range for the middle and high schools. The Positive Climate dimension reflects the emotional connection between the teacher and students and among students and the warmth, respect, and enjoyment communicated by verbal and nonverbal interactions. Similarly, instructional observations were, on average, higher in the Teacher Sensitivity dimension for teachers in the Grades 1-5 schools, which fell in the high middle range (5.7 out of 7.0), compared with teachers in the middle and high schools, which fell in the middle range (5.2 for Grades 6-8 and 4.7 for Grades 9-12). The Teacher Sensitivity dimension captures the teacher's awareness of and responsiveness to students' academic and emotional

needs. High levels of sensitivity support students' abilities to learn because the teacher consistently provides comfort, reassurance, and encouragement. These instructional observations findings are consistent with the results of the 2020-2021 Views of Climate and Learning (VOCAL) student survey, which asks students in Grades 4, 5, 8, and 10 about their views on engagement, safety, and environment. The responses reported higher scores for school climate in the elementary schools and in the typical range for students in the middle and high schools.

In focus groups, middle-school students expressed differing views about whether they felt fully accepted or respected at school. One student said, "I feel very safe," noting that the teachers were "always welcoming." Some other students disagreed. One student offered an example of a student whom she believed was cyberbullied. Another student described students who "are just really mean," adding, "I've gotten called many not nice things about gay people in the hallway" and "I almost feel like the teachers don't care." A third student partially agreed with two other students' perspectives, noting, "Overall, the school is great, but there's also a lot of things we could work on." High-school students said that teachers did not enforce dress codes consistently, but did not report any issues related to school safety, respect, or acceptance.

The Elementary School Improvement Plan for 2018-2020 and the Secondary School Improvement Plan for 2018-2020 state that the district aims "to ensure that every child has appropriate opportunities to learn and master these social and emotional skills and habits of mind." The plans also state, "The district lacks a comprehensive approach to ensuring the development of key social-emotional learning skills that support overall wellness and academic achievement." An educator echoed this point, noting that the district could do more to support social-emotional learning. School leaders said that during the 2021-2022 school year, it was challenging "to find the balance between social-emotional development and learning loss and curriculum pacing." Other interviewees referred to the tension between maintaining a culture of achievement and ensuring student well-being. Several interviewees suggested that a vocal minority of parents did not agree with the district's focus on social-emotional learning. Specifically, these interviewees raised concerns that some parents were "doing everything they can to slow us down around this work because they feel that SEL [social-emotional learning] is the prerogative of the family." One district leader characterized the efforts toward both social-emotional learning and cultural competency as being met with "significant pushback in the community in ways that have not been completely supportive of that work." A review of school committee meeting minutes from 17 meetings from August 2021 to March 2022 indicated that persons were present to comment on DEI at five meetings in October, November, and January, but there was no discussion of social-emotional learning as a distinct concept in that same time period as part of public comment. One person was present in January to express support for the district's efforts for DEI, one person attended multiple meetings to submit statements opposing the district's DEI efforts, and four other persons attended meetings in October, November, and January to raise additional questions or clarify the use of language about topics related to DEI.

The Elementary School Improvement Plan for 2018-2020 and Secondary School Improvement Plan for 2018-2020 state that the district aims

> to ensure that all of its faculty and staff are proficient in their understanding of the diverse cultural backgrounds of their students and how they can create safe and secure learning

environments that are responsive to the cultural diversity represented in their classrooms and clinics.

Interviewees spoke of efforts to diversify the curriculum and ensure that classroom environments were inclusive and culturally responsive. Students spoke of reading some books written by women and/or people of color, but one student noted that students still read "a lot of just very old stuff." This student continued by saying that "as a woman, you don't see yourself in a lot of the books written by men in the 1700s." Other interviewees said that culturally responsive teaching was one of the main focuses of professional development, referring to "Diversity Talks" that asked educators to reflect on whether they were including a diverse set of voices in the district's curriculum. Similarly, other educators spoke of using more inclusive literature, teaching history through many perspectives, and diversifying the artists in music and art classes. Educators at the middle school reported reviewing their texts to "think about representation and ensure that our students are reflected in the literature that they're reading." When asked about ensuring that students with diverse backgrounds were reflected in the curriculum, one interviewee stated, "I think it's something we can get better at."

In 2020, the district hired a DEI officer. District leaders said that this officer has primarily been working with the district leadership team to set expectations with district and school leaders. At the time of the on-site review, about 150 educators were participating in a series of eight trainings. Interviewees agreed that the district has made progress on DEI, but, at the same time, work still remains to be done, noting that the process is not "like a switch that you can turn on." When asked about DEI, one parent responded, "I am particularly proud of the district's commitment to DEI; that seems like something they're very unwavering about and want to continue with for the long run."

Interviewees described a variety of ways that student voice is incorporated into different schools. For example, parents of elementary school children reported that principals ask students about what was working in the school and what changes they would like to see. At the high school, students reported in a focus group that they have representation on the school council, and there is a student liaison to the school committee. Students also described clubs or activities that provided them a forum to discuss changes at the school. At the high school, students have opportunities to join groups that allow them to express themselves, such as the Sexuality and Gender Alliance Club or the Feminist Club. There also is a "Steps for Success" that allows students to help other students. Parents described many opportunities for high-school students to get involved, concluding that "it is all up to the kid really about how involved they want to get." Middle-school students did not report any significant opportunities for student voice at the middle-school level. In elementary grades, students have student government. One parent of an elementary student stated that children were given leadership opportunities in the classroom.

Instructional observations using the CLASS protocol were, on average, in the high range for the behavior management dimension for all school levels in the district. Observations in the high range indicate that the rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and consistently reinforced by the teacher. The teacher monitors the classroom, preventing problems from developing, using subtle cues to redirect behavior and addressing situations before they escalate. CLASS observers noted no (or very few minor) instances of student misbehavior or disruptions in individual classes. The

observations were mostly consistent with statements about behavior made in interviews and focus groups. For example, interviewees said that elementary schools in the district recognized students' positive behaviors. In contrast, interviewees expressed views about the consistency of the middle-school's approach to positive behavioral approaches. Students said that the dress code was inconsistently enforced, with greater enforcement for students who were taking "lower-level classes." In addition, other interviewees said that it was challenging to implement positive behavioral interventions and supports at the elementary level because "it was really hard for us to reward expected behaviors."

Tiered Systems of Support

DPS has designed multiple tiered supports and data systems to inform the assignment of students to supports, but the implementation of these efforts varies by grade level and subject area. Interviews and a document review indicated that these processes were more robust in literacy than mathematics and were more systematically implemented at the elementary level than the secondary level.

DPS currently has a districtwide vision for data-driven student supports and team-based interventions, which include the implementation of student assistance teams, as well as other individualized academic and nonacademic supports, at all seven schools. Through the mechanisms, the district provides tiered academic and nonacademic support for students in all grades. One district leader said that the district has put more focus on the elementary and middle schools and did not "have robust strategies at the high-school level." Another school-level stakeholder agreed, noting that although Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions were available at the high school, but they were being fine-tuned.

The district's tiered system of support is based on assessments to determine student needs. DPS has established universal benchmarking windows for literacy and numeracy, with systems more robust in the lower grades than at the high school. These windows, described in the district's *Benchmarking Assessment Windows for Literacy and Numeracy* document, apply to Grades K-8 and use the assessments described earlier. This same document describes more frequent periods of progress monitoring for some students, based on their tier placement. For Grades K-8, STAR360 is DPS's primary universal screener. According to one district leader, "STAR is the backbone of the assessment and intervention structure K-8," and several elementary leaders agreed with this sentiment regarding the use of and reliance on STAR data. The district administers benchmark assessments three times per year, and district documents include specific guidelines for more frequent progress monitoring for students who are receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports. The use of STAR data was most frequently reported at the elementary level, where leaders reported it as the key metric for understanding student needs. Elementary leaders said that STAR was regularly discussed and presented both to cross-school district-level data team meetings and in staff meetings at the building level.

Various teams at the school level are used to identify student needs and provide tiered interventions. For classroom-level interventions, often academic Tier 1 supports, elementary participants described data teams, or the use of CPT among teachers, to assess students' needs and plan large or small group supports. More significant, school-level teams address individualized needs for individual

students who are referred. Multiple interview participants at all grade levels described the presence of teams at their respective schools that assign and track individualized interventions for students, although the terminology and specific intervention processes varied by grade level. In general, teachers identify students whom they are concerned about for academic or nonacademic reasons and refer students to teams of colleagues for individualized discussion.

At the high school, interview and focus group participants described separate teams for academic and nonacademic needs, although these participants described some staff—such as guidance counselors—having roles on both teams. High-school teachers described referring students to the student support team at their level, whereas elementary teachers described their schools' teams using the district-level term student assistance team. In both cases, teams convened on an as-needed basis after students are referred to put more individualized interventions in place. District plans state that school-level teams will identify students who are at risk, determine the appropriate tier of intervention, and progress monitor during a 10-week data cycle. In practice, this revisiting appears to happen more for academic issues at the elementary level and less so for academic issues at the secondary level.

In addition to school teams, district-level teams meet regularly to review the progress of interventions across elementary schools, as confirmed by a review of meeting agendas and intervention responses. The literacy intervention team, which meets monthly, covers a range of topics, including preparing for benchmarking, identifying students for interventions, and progress monitoring. The mathematics intervention team for Grades 1-5, which meets weekly, discusses about interventions, enrichment activities, and data collection. Interviewees said that at the elementary-school level, staff did a lot of progress monitoring with students who were receiving interventions. For instance, elementary staff do a weekly reading record with the students who are receiving the Leveled Literacy Intervention. The district also had records of regular student administration of mathematics assessments from throughout the 2021-2022 school year. In terms of criteria for assignment, only in literacy was there documented evidence of entry and exit criteria for tiers of intervention, which is consistent with district-level interview data suggesting that literacy interventions are more developed systems than those for mathematics at the time of the visit.

Individualized or small-group interventions can take many forms, based on level and whether the needs are academic or nonacademic. At the elementary level, interviewees agreed that the district has made great progress in moving toward consistency in tiered instruction and students receiving the appropriate level of support. Previously, the four elementary schools were "off on their own." All elementary-school leaders reported in interviews having access to interventionists, with staff noting that only Title I–eligible schools had interventionists in both literacy and mathematics. A district-level interview participant noted that mathematics interventionists had been requested but not approved by the school committee for all elementary schools. Other interventions provided by coaches and interventionists at the elementary level include Leveled Literacy Intervention (K-8); strategy groups; Lexia (K-8); and Fundations (K-3). District leaders and teachers confirmed that Bridges was used as a mathematics intervention at the elementary level. Elementary-school leaders also spoke of a teacher who worked in the schools one day a week for mathematics enrichment and extension activities.

At the middle-school level, interview respondents reported using STAR360 to identify students' needs and tier students based on needs. In 2021, the middle school hired an interventionist midway through the year. In 2021-2022, the school identifies students for support based on STAR360 data, triangulating that data with MCAS scores and classroom ELA grades. Staff reported more robust support efforts in literacy, which include support with an interventionist and use of the Lexia PowerUp program; staff also reported that students' progress was checked as a follow-up to intervention using STAR360 data. A school leader reported "seeing some great gains and graduating some kids out of the cycle of intervention." Staff also reported mathematics enrichment opportunities for students in advanced mathematics courses and small-group mathematics support for students who need additional assistance.

At the high-school level, interviewees said that teachers could send students who were struggling (but not on an individualized education program) to their guidance counselors who would then set up meetings with each student's teachers. For academic concerns, there is no standard group of people who meet regularly. Rather, the team is based on who is being referred and the need identified. After a referral, the team will meet to start to define the concern and look at accommodations that the team can put in place. High-school interview participants described helping students develop executive functioning skills, for example. In addition, the high school has an academic support center staffed by a full-time teacher who is available to provide extra support to students. Interviewees noted that students used to go to this center during the X block period, but this block was eliminated from the schedule during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, at the time of the on-site review, the district planned to restore the X block in the 2022-2023 school year. One interviewee referred to the return of the X block as an important time that can be used for "our academic intervention, remediation, and enrichment."

Interviewees also spoke of the use of social-emotional interventions. Staff said that a variety of screeners, such as a social-emotional learning survey, were important in tracking social-emotional learning needs at the high school. High-school teachers praised the district's "robust counseling department" that supported the nonacademic needs of students. The counseling department's activities include clubs that help build relationships and are open to all students, as well as Tier 2 interventions groups, such as meditation, yoga, and art therapy. The high school's nonacademic support team, which includes administrators, clinicians, nurses, and a special education administrator, meets weekly for an hour. One interviewee said, "We don't miss it [the meeting of the nonacademic support team] because there's typically a lot of students in need." Referrals are generated in those meetings and then the clinician reaches out to the families for written consent for the support. Elementary staff spoke of groups and social-emotional supports as the result of student assistance team meetings. Middle-school interviewees described their school as "well-resourced in regard to the number of mental health professionals we have in the building." These staff can provide small-group supports as well as individualized plans such that students can have social-emotional goals and support plans, although some staff described this referral process as "informal," noting that it did not always involve team-level discussion and assessment of needs.

Many of the individualized support plans at Tiers 2 and 3 are meant to be distinct from—and preemptive of—the special education referral process. A district leader described a "routinized, consistent approach for student assistance teams in all schools to come together and talk about

student needs and to put in place Tier 2, Tier 3 interventions to hopefully prevent those referrals to special education." Some staff expressed concern about the previously high rate of referral in the district; according to DESE's school profiles, in 2020-2021, 21.9 percent of students in the district were identified as students with disabilities compared with a statewide average of 18.9 percent. However, some interview and focus group respondents, when asked about the tiered system of support, conflated Tier 3 and individualized supports with special education services and individualized education programs, a potential area of clarification for staff in the implementation of these systems in DPS.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Parents consistently praised the superintendent's communication with parents during the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviewees reported different experiences in terms of communication and inclusion in decision making at schools across the district. Interviewees said that principals led most communication with families, as well as some communication at the teacher level.

Commitment 4 in DPS's Student Opportunity Act Plan states that "[d]istrict plans for ensuring that all families, particularly those representing identified student subgroups most in need of support, have access to meaningful engagement regarding their students' needs." Interviewees said that weekly emails from the superintendent as well as school principals were the main forms of communication with families. Parents said that some principals sent updates more regularly than others, and, in general, principals sent updates less regularly for older students. Interviewees said that the schools in the district used a combination of Blackboard, email, and newsletters to communicate with families. Parents expressed differing views about the effectiveness of the district's communication channels. For example, parents uniformly praised the superintendent's communication during the COVID-19 pandemic. Parents agreed with the parent who said, "I consistently felt in the loop, aware of what's going on with our community." However, one parent described the principal's weekly emails as "slipping through the cracks." Interviewees also expressed different opinions about the degree to which parents were involved in their children's schools. One parent described opportunities to "be involved in the curriculum" and with "what's going on at school," whereas another parent spoke of being happy with the school principals but not having "any input on what happens in the school." The review team did not find evidence of a district-level parent and family communication plan. Principals stated that "the same 20-25 people" attended schoolwide events or meetings. In addition to its traditional methods of communicating with and engaging families, the district plans for the new DEI officer to "work closely with key stakeholder groups to develop and implement enhanced methods and mechanisms to support engagement of all families in the Dedham community."

Opportunities for student leadership and student voice also vary. Principals at the elementary-school level spoke of fifth-grade student councils, which helped run assemblies and other activities. In addition, one school has a student leadership group that includes students across grades "to add some student voice to the school community." At this school, the students rotate positions in the group and have input to an activity that is happening at the school, such as spirit week. In contrast, high-school students who participated spoke of limited opportunities to share their views. One student referred to "a little survey at the end of year but not much during the year." In addition, students said that they were uncertain how or whether the survey results were used.

Interviewees said that the high school "is constantly engaged with other entities in the community." Interviewees also stated that community partners included the following: the William James referral service, the Dedham Police Department, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Youth Services, the Star Home, and clinicians working in temporary housing. In addition, interviewees spoke of working with local businesses to help students get jobs in afterschool programs and summer camps. At the high school, two career specialists, who have partnerships with local businesses, help students find community service opportunities, internships, and jobs. The district requires that students do at least 40 hours of community service. Parents stated that the elementary schools and the parent teacher organizations collaborated across schools to create an International Week throughout the town. Finally, parents spoke highly of the Dedham Police Department's program with the schools.

Recommendations

- District leaders, teachers, and staff should develop a well-defined, horizontally, and vertically aligned tiered system of support across the district.

- The district should put practices into place to ensure that all students receive instruction and supports that meets their needs.

- The district should continue to develop staff capacity to examine and dismantle implicit biases and systemic inequalities and to create environments where all students can deeply learn, grow, and thrive, including the work of the DEI officer and the district leadership team.

- The district should establish systems and practices that reflect the importance of building relationships with families and position them as equal partners in their students' education.

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in DPS. The team conducted 65 classroom observations and held interviews and focus groups during the week of March 14, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- 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

Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table B1. Dedham Public Schools: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	2,567	100.0%	911,529	100.0%
African American	188	7.3%	84,970	9.3%
Asian	59	2.3%	65,813	7.2%
Hispanic	440	17.1%	210,747	23.1%
Native American	0	0.0%	2,060	0.2%
White	1,740	67.8%	507,992	55.7%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.0%	788	0.1%
Multirace, Non-Hispanic	139	5.4%	39,159	4.3%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

Table B2. Dedham Public Schools: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by High-Need Populations

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of High Need	Percentage of District	N	Percentage of High Need	Percentage of State
All students with high needs	1,167	100.0%	44.8%	512,242	100.0%	55.6%
Students with disabilities	570	48.8%	21.9%	174,505	34.1%	18.9%
Low-income households	765	65.6%	29.8%	399,140	77.9%	43.8%
ELs and former ELs	139	11.9%	5.4%	100,231	19.6%	11.0%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and students with high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 2,607; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 920,971.

Table B3. Dedham Public Schools: Chronic Absence Rates[a] by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	13.4	10.9	11.6	18.9	5.5	17.7
African American/Black	12.6	8.2	8.5	29.2	16.6	24.1
Asian	6.6	9.6	16.2	13.1	6.5	7.2
Hispanic/Latino	26.3	21.5	24.1	34.2	7.9	29.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	10.9	10.1	12.3	12.7	1.8	18.9
White	10.9	8.8	8.9	14.8	3.9	13.2
High need	19.1	16.3	18.1	28.8	9.7	26.3
Economically disadvantaged	22.2	18.2	20.7	35.1	12.9	30.2
ELs	16.4	18.4	18.4	22.6	6.2	29.0
Students with disabilities	19.9	17.1	19.3	28.5	8.6	26.8

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

Table B4. Dedham Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2019-2021

	Fiscal year 2019		Fiscal year 2020		Fiscal year 2021	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	$42,789,982	$42,170,885	$44,656,193	$45,027,179	$46,645,729	$46,409,570
By municipality	$15,568,122	$19,714,444	$15,394,921	$15,000,776	$15,653,299	$15,303,262
Total from local appropriations	$58,358,104	$61,885,327	$60,051,113	$60,027,955	$62,299,028	$61,712,832
From revolving funds and grants	—	$6,432,221	—	$6,154,471	—	$7,777,006
Total expenditures	—	$68,317,548	—	$66,182,426	—	$69,489,838
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid[a]	—	$5,241,212	—	$6,066,360	—	$6,066,360
Required local contribution	—	$23,238,711	—	$24,319,967	—	$25,205,198
Required net school spending[b]	—	$28,479,923	—	$30,386,327	—	$31,271,558
Actual net school spending	—	$48,057,203	—	$51,449,192	—	$53,146,225
Over/under required ($)	—	$19,597,280	—	$21,062,865	—	$21,874,667
Over/under required (%)	—	68.7%	—	69.3%	—	70.0%

Note. Data as of April 15, 2022. Data sourced from fiscal year 2020 District End-of-Year Reports and Chapter 70 Program information on DESE website.

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

Table B5. Dedham Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2019-2021

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	$766.68	$753.68	$1,089.51
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$1,287.21	$1,326.02	$1,461.09
Teachers	$7,353.00	$7,959.43	$8,727.55
Other teaching services	$1,800.56	$1,762.33	$2,033.55
Professional development	$420.58	$435.32	$417.89
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$389.61	$456.59	$630.60
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$815.90	$899.70	$1,080.52
Pupil services	$1,673.52	$1,566.21	$1,933.88
Operations and maintenance	$1,891.13	$1,760.61	$2,629.94
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$3,104.66	$3,034.94	$3,397.68
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$20,821.30	$21,269.04	$24,952.25

Note. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from per-pupil expenditure reports on DESE website.

Dedham Public Schools

Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

March 2022

Contents

Introduction

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

Observers visited Dedham Public Schools during the week of March 14, 2022. The observers conducted 65 observations in a sample of classrooms across seven schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average*: 5.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65	5.0
Grades K-5	0	1	1	2	3	10	8	25	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	1	3	8	5	1	2	20	4.4
Grades 9-12	0	1	4	2	6	5	2	20	4.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 3] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 16] + [7 x 12]) ÷ 65 observations = 5.0

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average*: 5.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65	5.2
Grades K-5	0	1	1	3	2	10	8	25	5.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	5	5	7	2	20	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	2	1	5	6	5	1	20	4.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 3] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 22] + [7 x 11]) ÷ 65 observations = 5.2

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*: 3.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65	3.6
Grades K-5	0	3	2	3	5	5	7	25	5.1
Grades 6-8	2	8	3	5	1	1	0	20	2.9
Grades 9-12	5	5	6	3	1	0	0	20	2.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 7] + [2 x 16] + [3 x 11] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 7]) ÷ 65 observations = 3.6

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

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

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

Negative Climate

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

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

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

Negative Climate District Average*: 6.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65	6.8
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	25	6.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	20	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	0	0	1	18	20	6.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 59]) ÷ 65 observations = 6.8

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.

---

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

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*: 6.5

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**65**	**6.5**
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	25	6.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	2	1	3	14	20	6.5
Grades 9-12	2	0	0	0	2	0	16	20	6.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 2] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 49]) ÷ 65 observations = 6.5

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*: 6.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**65**	**6.4**
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	25	6.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	20	6.7
Grades 9-12	1	1	0	0	3	2	13	20	6.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [2 x 1] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 14] + [7 x 43]) ÷ 65 observations = 6.4

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–3
Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average*: 5.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65	5.1
Grades K-5	0	0	0	3	5	9	8	25	5.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	5	11	1	2	20	4.9
Grades 9-12	0	2	2	7	8	1	0	20	4.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 24] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 10]) ÷ 65 observations = 5.1

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Concept Development District Average*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**16**	**4.1**
Grades K-3**	2	1	2	4	3	3	1	16	4.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 2] + [2 x 1] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 16 observations = 4.1

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

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

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

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

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Content Understanding District Average*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	49	4.1
Grades 4-5**	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	9	4.9
Grades 6-8	1	2	4	7	5	1	0	20	3.8
Grades 9-12	1	2	5	5	3	4	0	20	4.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 2] + [2 x 4] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 8]) ÷ 49 observations = 4.1

**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**	**49**	**2.9**
Grades 4-5**	0	1	5	2	0	0	1	9	3.6
Grades 6-8	2	9	4	2	2	1	0	20	2.8
Grades 9-12	4	7	3	5	1	0	0	20	2.6

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 6] + [2 x 17] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 49 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*: 3.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65	3.8
Grades K-5	2	2	2	2	11	3	3	25	4.6
Grades 6-8	1	4	8	1	5	1	0	20	3.4
Grades 9-12	3	3	3	8	1	2	0	20	3.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 6] + [2 x 9] + [3 x 13] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 17] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 65 observations = 3.8

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*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**16**	**4.1**
Grades K-3**	1	1	2	6	3	3	0	16	4.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [2 x 1] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 16 observations = 4.1

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average*: 3.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	49	3.2
Grades 4-5**	0	1	0	3	2	3	0	9	4.7
Grades 6-8	5	7	2	4	2	0	0	20	2.6
Grades 9-12	4	5	3	3	2	2	1	20	3.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 9] + [2 x 13] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 49 observations = 3.2

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average*: 5.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	49	5.1
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	9	6.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	6	4	7	2	20	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	0	2	5	9	4	0	20	4.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 3] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 49 observations = 5.1

**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**	**5**	**4**	**8**	**10**	**28**	**45**	**100**	**5.9**
Positive Climate	0	1	1	2	3	10	8	25	5.8
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	25	6.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	1	1	3	2	10	8	25	5.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	3	2	3	5	5	7	25	5.1
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**8**	**20**	**43**	**75**	**6.4**
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	25	6.7
Productivity	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	25	6.5
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	0	3	5	9	8	25	5.9
Instructional Support Domain	**5**	**6**	**12**	**19**	**22**	**15**	**5**	**84**	**4.3**
Concept Development (K-3 only)	2	1	2	4	3	3	1	16	4.1
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	9	4.9
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	0	1	5	2	0	0	1	9	3.6
Quality of Feedback	2	2	2	2	11	3	3	25	4.6
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	1	1	2	6	3	3	0	16	4.1
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	0	1	0	3	2	3	0	9	4.7
Student Engagement (UE only)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**4**	**3**	**9**	**6.0**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 25 observations = 5.8

**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: ([6 x 3] + [7 x 22]) ÷ 25 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	**2**	**9**	**7**	**18**	**11**	**9**	**4**	**60**	**4.2**
Positive Climate	0	1	3	8	5	1	2	20	4.4
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	1	5	5	7	2	20	5.2
Regard for Student Perspectives	2	8	3	5	1	1	0	20	2.9
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**8**	**47**	**60**	**6.7**
Behavior Management	0	0	0	2	1	3	14	20	6.5
Productivity	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	20	6.7
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	20	6.9
Instructional Support Domain	**9**	**22**	**19**	**19**	**25**	**4**	**2**	**100**	**3.5**
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	1	5	11	1	2	20	4.9
Content Understanding	1	2	4	7	5	1	0	20	3.8
Analysis and Inquiry	2	9	4	2	2	1	0	20	2.8
Quality of Feedback	1	4	8	1	5	1	0	20	3.4
Instructional Dialogue	5	7	2	4	2	0	0	20	2.6
Student Engagement	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**4**	**7**	**2**	**20**	**5.2**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 4.4

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([5 x 1] + [7 x 19]) ÷ 20 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	**5**	**8**	**11**	**10**	**13**	**10**	**3**	**60**	**4.0**
Positive Climate	0	1	4	2	6	5	2	20	4.8
Teacher Sensitivity	0	2	1	5	6	5	1	20	4.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	5	5	6	3	1	0	0	20	2.5
Classroom Organization Domain	**3**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**3**	**47**	**60**	**6.3**
Behavior Management	2	0	0	0	2	0	16	20	6.2
Productivity	1	1	0	0	3	2	13	20	6.1
Negative Climate**	0	0	1	0	0	1	18	20	6.8
Instructional Support Domain	**12**	**19**	**16**	**28**	**15**	**9**	**1**	**100**	**3.5**
Instructional Learning Formats	0	2	2	7	8	1	0	20	4.2
Content Understanding	1	2	5	5	3	4	0	20	4.0
Analysis and Inquiry	4	7	3	5	1	0	0	20	2.6
Quality of Feedback	3	3	3	8	1	2	0	20	3.4
Instructional Dialogue	4	5	3	3	2	2	1	20	3.2
Student Engagement	**0**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**9**	**4**	**0**	**20**	**4.8**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 4.8

**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: ([3 x 1] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.8

References

Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK−12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf

MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary.* Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary.* Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K−3.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

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

Table D1. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

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

Table D2. Resources to Support Assessment

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

Table D3. Resources to Support Student Support

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

Appendix E. Student Performance Tables

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

Table E1. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Scaled Scores in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,151	499.4	501.4	497.4	-2.0	496.5	0.9
African American/Black	93	486.7	490.4	491.2	4.5	486.4	4.8
Asian	19	509.1	513.1	505.2	-3.9	508.5	-3.3
Hispanic/Latino	207	492.5	493.6	489.9	-2.6	484.3	5.6
Multirace	60	493.0	496.7	493.9	0.9	499.7	-5.8
White	770	502.0	504.1	500.2	-1.8	501.3	-1.1
High need	555	488.6	491.3	486.2	-2.4	485.9	0.3
Economically disadvantaged	342	490.3	492.0	486.0	-4.3	485.2	0.8
ELs and former ELs	159	490.0	490.8	487.2	-2.8	482.8	4.4
Students with disabilities	317	481.8	484.5	479.2	-2.6	478.1	1.1

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

Table E2. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Scaled Scores in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,150	501.0	501.1	494.5	-6.5	489.7	4.8
African American/Black	93	487.4	489.8	484.8	-2.6	477.3	7.5
Asian	19	514.3	517.0	511.3	-3.0	508.6	2.7
Hispanic/Latino	208	493.9	492.1	484.3	-9.6	476.5	7.8
Multirace	60	493.1	495.5	490.6	-2.5	492.1	-1.5
White	768	503.7	503.9	498.4	-5.3	494.3	4.1
High need	555	490.1	489.6	482.6	-7.5	479.0	3.6
Economically disadvantaged	342	491.3	489.6	481.9	-9.4	477.4	4.5
ELs and former ELs	160	492.9	490.8	483.7	-9.2	477.8	5.9
Students with disabilities	317	483.2	483.0	476.5	-6.7	472.5	4.0

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

Table E3. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,151	50%	51%	48%	-2	46%	2
African American/Black	93	26%	31%	42%	16	28%	14
Asian	19	67%	82%	68%	1	66%	2
Hispanic/Latino	207	36%	35%	35%	-1	26%	9
Multirace	60	39%	42%	38%	-1	51%	-13
White	770	55%	56%	53%	-2	54%	-1
High need	555	28%	31%	29%	1	28%	1
Economically disadvantaged	342	29%	31%	30%	1	27%	3
ELs and former ELs	159	29%	30%	33%	4	24%	9
Students with disabilities	317	17%	20%	17%	0	16%	1

Table E4. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,150	54%	53%	38%	-16	33%	5
African American/Black	93	22%	29%	18%	-4	14%	4
Asian	19	83%	79%	74%	-9	64%	10
Hispanic/Latino	208	40%	33%	24%	-16	14%	10
Multirace	60	41%	40%	33%	-8	37%	-4
White	768	59%	60%	44%	-15	40%	4
High need	555	30%	30%	17%	-13	16%	1
Economically disadvantaged	342	35%	30%	16%	-19	14%	2
ELs and former ELs	160	39%	32%	21%	-18	17%	4
Students with disabilities	317	17%	19%	10%	-7	10%	0

Table E5. Dedham Public Schools: Next Generation MCAS ELA and Mathematics Scaled Scores in Grade 10, 2021

Group	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below
All	168	511.1	507.3	3.8	169	507.4	500.6	6.8
African American/Black	15	508.0	494.6	13.4	15	500.5	486.7	13.8
Asian	4	—	518.2	—	4	—	520.9	—
Hispanic/Latino	29	498.3	491.9	6.4	29	493.5	485.3	8.2
Multirace	3	—	510.6	—	3	—	503.9	—
White	117	514.8	512.5	2.3	118	511.2	504.9	6.3
High need	73	502.2	493.3	8.9	74	495.1	486.5	8.6
Economically disadvantaged	47	504.1	493.7	10.4	48	497.0	486.6	10.4
ELs and former ELs	15	493.7	477.9	15.8	15	497.3	477.6	19.7
Students with disabilities	37	495.0	487.2	7.8	38	487.6	479.6	8.0

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

Table E6. Dedham Public Schools: Next Generation MCAS ELA and Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

Group	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below
All	168	71%	64%	7	169	65%	52%	13
African American/Black	15	73%	41%	32	15	47%	27%	20
Asian	4	—	80%	—	4	—	80%	—
Hispanic/Latino	29	41%	39%	2	29	41%	26%	15
Multirace	3	—	67%	—	3	—	55%	—
White	117	78%	73%	5	118	73%	60%	13
High need	73	52%	39%	13	74	38%	26%	12
Economically disadvantaged	47	60%	41%	19	48	40%	27%	13
ELs and former ELs	15	33%	19%	14	15	53%	15%	38
Students with disabilities	37	30%	25%	5	38	21%	14%	7

Table E7. Dedham Public Schools: Next Generation MCAS Science Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2021

Group	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	Above/below
All	368	47%	41%	42%	-1
African American/Black	26	30%	15%	19%	-4
Asian	5	—	60%	62%	-2
Hispanic/Latino	67	34%	30%	20%	10
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	19	15%	47%	47%	0
White	250	52%	46%	50%	-4
High need	179	26%	24%	23%	1
Economically disadvantaged	111	27%	23%	21%	2
ELs and Former ELs	48	18%	27%	18%	9
Students with disabilities	106	17%	17%	15%	2

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

Table E8. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-10, 2018-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
3	167	56%	56%	62%	6	51%	11
4	189	55%	47%	55%	0	49%	6
5	169	55%	47%	50%	-5	47%	3
6	193	45%	61%	49%	4	47%	2
7	201	40%	43%	40%	0	43%	-3
8	232	46%	52%	38%	-8	41%	-3
3-8	1,151	50%	51%	48%	-2	46%	2
10	168	—	57%	71%	—	64%	7

Table E9. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-10, 2018-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
3	166	53%	48%	34%	-19	33%	1
4	189	58%	49%	35%	-23	33%	2
5	169	54%	54%	40%	-14	33%	7
6	193	55%	60%	42%	-13	33%	9
7	201	45%	54%	42%	-3	35%	7
8	232	56%	51%	35%	-21	32%	3
3-8	1,150	54%	53%	38%	-16	33%	5
10	169	—	71%	65%	—	52%	13

Table E10. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2021

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
5	169	47%	—	46%	-1	42%
8	199	47%	—	37%	-10	41%
5 and 8	368	47%	—	41%	-6	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

Table E11. Dedham Public Schools: English Language Arts and Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-10, 2019-2021

Grade	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	*N* (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)
3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4	—	44.8	—	—	—	46.4	—	—
5	161	45.3	33.9	34.9	161	42.6	41.2	31.9
6	183	56.2	39.3	37.3	183	54.0	32.1	26.3
7	188	46.7	29.7	36.1	188	49.7	40.0	35.8
8	214	51.6	28.7	34.8	213	56.7	29.1	27.4
3-8	746	49.1	32.7	35.8	745	49.9	35.2	30.4
10	149	42.6	61.4	52.5	149	51.3	53.1	36.5

Table E12. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Early Childhood Center	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avery	57%	44%	42%	—	—	—	47%	—
Greenlodge	59%	70%	74%	—	—	—	67%	—
Oakdale	67%	56%	45%	—	—	—	56%	—
Riverdale	70%	65%	52%	—	—	—	62%	—
Dedham Middle	—	—	—	50%	40%	39%	43%	—
Dedham High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	73%
District	62%	55%	50%	49%	40%	38%	48%	71%
State	51%	49%	47%	47%	43%	41%	46%	64%

Table E13. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Early Childhood Center	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avery	17%	21%	24%	—	—	—	21%	—
Greenlodge	39%	57%	71%	—	—	—	54%	—
Oakdale	42%	42%	43%	—	—	—	42%	—
Riverdale	44%	32%	32%	—	—	—	36%	—
Dedham Middle	—	—	—	43%	42%	36%	40%	—
Dedham High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	69%
District	34%	35%	40%	42%	42%	35%	38%	65%
State	33%	33%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%	52%

Table E14. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	5	8	5 and 8	10
Early Childhood Center	—	—	—	—
Avery	44%	—	44%	—
Greenlodge	74%	—	74%	—
Oakdale	43%	—	43%	—
Riverdale	32%	—	32%	—
Dedham Middle	—	38%	38%	—
Dedham High	—	—	—	—
District	46%	37%	41%	—
State	42%	41%	42%	—

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

Table E15. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Economically disadvantaged	Students with disabilities	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multirace	White
Early Childhood Center	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avery	47%	38%	39%	17%	39%	47%	—	42%	50%	51%
Greenlodge	67%	43%	65%	26%	—	—	—	60%	—	69%
Oakdale	56%	25%	21%	25%	20%	—	—	20%	—	60%
Riverdale	62%	37%	32%	22%	47%	—	—	56%	—	66%
Dedham Middle	43%	24%	25%	14%	33%	41%	67%	30%	20%	47%
Dedham High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	48%	29%	30%	17%	33%	42%	68%	35%	38%	53%
State	46%	28%	27%	16%	24%	28%	66%	26%	51%	54%

Table E16. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Economically disadvantaged	Students with disabilities	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multirace	White
Early Childhood Center	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avery	21%	15%	13%	6%	15%	11%	—	25%	30%	21%
Greenlodge	54%	21%	24%	16%	—	—	—	40%	—	57%
Oakdale	42%	9%	0%	9%	15%	—	—	10%	—	45%
Riverdale	36%	25%	21%	19%	24%	—	—	25%	—	42%
Dedham Middle	40%	20%	20%	11%	29%	23%	83%	26%	23%	46%
Dedham High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	38%	17%	16%	10%	21%	18%	74%	24%	33%	44%
State	33%	16%	14%	10%	17%	14%	64%	14%	37%	40%

Table E17. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

School	All	High need	Economically disadvantaged	Students with disabilities	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multirace	White
Dedham High	73%	55%	63%	32%	33%	73%	—	42%	—	80%
District	71%	52%	60%	30%	33%	73%	—	41%	—	78%
State	64%	39%	41%	25%	19%	41%	80%	39%	67%	73%

Table E18. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

School	All	High need	Economically disadvantaged	Students with disabilities	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multirace	White
Dedham High	69%	42%	44%	26%	53%	47%	—	46%	—	77%
District	65%	38%	40%	21%	53%	47%	—	41%	—	73%
State	52%	26%	27%	14%	15%	27%	80%	26%	55%	60%

Table E19. Dedham Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Economically disadvantaged	Students with disabilities	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multirace	White
Early Childhood Center	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avery	44%	32%	22%	24%	50%	—	—	47%	—	48%
Greenlodge	74%	50%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	74%
Oakdale	43%	32%	—	31%	—	—	—	—	—	43%
Riverdale	32%	11%	0%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	33%
Dedham Middle	38%	20%	25%	12%	24%	9%	—	19%	—	44%
Dedham High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	41%	24%	23%	17%	27%	15%	—	30%	47%	46%
State	42%	23%	21%	15%	18%	19%	62%	20%	47%	50%

Table E20. Dedham Public Schools: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	189	88.9	90.7	93.2	91.5	2.6	89.8
African American/Black	16	93.8	95.0	96.2	93.8	0.0	84.4
Asian	6	90.0	100	—	100	10.0	96.1
Hispanic/Latino	28	69.6	80.8	80.6	78.6	9.0	80.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	—	—	—	85.7	—	88.8
White	132	91.5	91.2	95.8	93.9	2.4	93.2
High need	90	78.3	82.6	84.4	82.2	3.9	82.4
Low-income households	69	78.8	85.7	83.6	81.2	2.4	81.7
ELs	10	62.5	63.6	83.3	80.0	17.5	71.8
Students with disabilities	47	69.8	69.0	73.2	78.7	8.9	76.6

Table E21. Dedham Public Schools: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2017-2020

Group	N (2020)	2017	2018	2019	2020	4-year change	State (2020)
All	205	95.5	91.8	92.7	95.1	-0.4	91.0
African American/Black	26	91.7	93.8	100	100	8.3	87.2
Asian	4	100	100	100	—	—	95.8
Hispanic/Latino	31	85.7	78.3	84.6	80.6	-5.1	81.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	—	—	—	—	—	90.8
White	142	97.8	93.2	92.6	97.9	0.1	94.4
High need	90	91.7	84.3	85.9	88.9	-2.8	84.5
Low-income households	67	94.3	84.6	88.9	88.1	-6.2	84.1
ELs	12	88.9	68.8	81.8	83.3	-5.6	74.7
Students with disabilities	41	82.9	81.4	73.8	80.5	-2.4	79.3

Table E22. Dedham Public Schools: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	1.7	1.2	0.2	0.2	-1.5	0.3
African American/Black	3.9	1.5	0.5	1.0	-2.9	0.3
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Hispanic/Latino	2.0	2.4	0.2	0.7	-1.3	0.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic or Latino	4.5	2.5	0.0	—	—	0.4
White	1.2	0.8	0.2	0.1	-1.1	0.3
High needs	2.8	2.2	0.4	0.5	-2.3	0.4
Economically disadvantaged	3.8	2.1	0.6	0.7	-3.1	0.3
ELs	0.9	0.4	—	—	—	0.1
Students with disabilities	3.4	3.2	0.5	0.6	-2.8	0.6

Table E23. Dedham Public Schools: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	2.5	3.6	2.9	1.1	-1.4	0.5
African American/Black	5.4	5.4	4.3	2.5	-2.9	0.6
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Hispanic/Latino	5.3	7.0	5.1	1.8	-3.5	0.5
Multirace, non-Hispanic or Latino	1.8	7.6	5.5	—	—	0.7
White	1.7	2.5	2.2	0.8	-0.9	0.5
High need	3.9	6.3	4.8	1.3	-2.6	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	4.9	7.4	5.9	1.9	-3.0	0.7
ELs	1.7	2.2	—	—	—	0.3
Students with disabilities	5.2	8.4	6.5	1.3	-3.9	1.1

Table E24. Dedham Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	682	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.3	0.6	1.5
African American/Black	58	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	1.8
Asian	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	103	0.0	6.8	1.9	2.9	2.9	3.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	19	0.0	12.5	6.7	0.0	0.0	1.4
White	482	1.0	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.0	1.0
High need	271	1.2	3.3	2.0	2.6	1.4	2.7
Economically disadvantaged	171	1.4	2.6	2.8	2.9	1.5	2.9
ELs	21	0.0	2.4	6.1	9.5	9.5	5.8
Students with disabilities	129	2.4	2.9	2.1	2.3	-0.1	2.4

Table E25. Dedham Public Schools: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021

Group	N (2020)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
All	346	70.7	68.8	66.8	-3.9	65.3
African American/Black	29	68.1	61.9	58.6	-9.5	54.9
Asian	8	92.3	90.9	100	7.7	84.3
Hispanic/Latino	50	39.3	49.0	50.0	10.7	50.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	9	—	14.3	55.6	—	65.5
White	250	76.8	74.1	70.4	-6.4	69.6
High need	134	48.3	41.4	45.5	-2.8	47.7
Economically disadvantaged	88	56.4	48.2	58.0	1.6	49.0
ELs	7	33.3	56.3	28.6	-4.7	28.1
Students with disabilities	71	23.4	21.3	25.4	2.0	33.1