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## Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a comprehensive review of Hingham Public Schools (hereafter, Hingham) in April 2024. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews and were focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.[[1]](#footnote-2)

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Hingham during the week of April 22, 2024. The observers conducted 98 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[2]](#footnote-3) guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong evidence of classroom organization, and generally mixed evidence of emotional support, student engagement (Grades 4-5), and rigorous instructional support. In both the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization and moderate student engagement, as well as mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional and instructional support.

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

Hingham, under the leadership of Superintendent Margaret Adams since 2022, has a dedicated core team of central office staff and a broader administrative leadership team, including curriculum directors and principals. District officials work collaboratively with the seven-member elected school committee, which oversees key functions such as hiring and evaluating the superintendent, budget development, policy establishment, collective bargaining, and promoting the district’s vision and goals. In alignment with these responsibilities, the school committee and interim superintendent (Adams, before official appointment as superintendent), with input from an external vendor, developed a comprehensive three-year Strategic Plan (2022-2025) that outlines the district’s mission, core values, and strategic objectives. To implement this plan and other priorities, school principals receive support from instructional leadership teams.

The school committee works closely with district and town leaders to comply with Massachusetts laws and regulations while fulfilling their fiduciary responsibilities. Their primary duties include (a) hiring and evaluating the superintendent, (b) developing an adequate budget, (c) establishing and reviewing policies, (d) monitoring policy execution, (e) conducting collective bargaining, and (f) promoting the district’s vision and goals. The committee evaluates the superintendent through a DESE-outlined process and maintains a collaborative relationship with town officials, regularly updating them on district activities and budget spending. Despite strong stakeholder engagement, including student representatives, teachers expressed concerns about being unheard during stalled collective bargaining negotiations. The committee remains committed to addressing these concerns while considering financial viability.

In terms of strengths, the superintendent established a culture of collaboration between the district, the town, and the school committee. The school committee demonstrates a commitment to engaging various stakeholder groups throughout the district. Alignment exists between district and school improvement plans. The district demonstrates a commitment to employing a data-driven approach to strategic planning The town and the district have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure the town will provide funding to the school for the district for the next four years. The district also has several areas for growth, including clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the school committee for the public, establishing effective districtwide mechanisms for meaningful stakeholder feedback, enhancing the ability of both curriculum directors and school leaders to improve instructional practices, meaningfully engaging school staff and parents in reflection and refinement of the strategic plan and providing meaningful opportunities for school staff to contribute to decision-making processes.

### [Curriculum and Instruction](#_Curriculum_and_Instruction)

Hingham strives to provide equitable, rigorous, and effective instruction aligned with the Massachusetts Curricula Frameworks through a structured curricular review process led by curriculum directors. This review process, conducted every seven years for each department, involves research, stakeholder input, and program piloting to ensure the selection of standards-aligned curricula, which have received favorable evaluations from CURATE[[3]](#footnote-4) and EdReports. The district emphasizes inclusive instruction, with all educators having received professional development in the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework and ongoing revisions of unit guides at the middle and high school levels using UDL principles. Hingham also prioritizes equity by expanding advanced coursework options at the high school and offering various enrichment and accelerated learning opportunities.

Hingham has several strengths related to curriculum and instruction, including regular and structured curricular reviews, curriculum directors who provide multiple supports to school staff, the prioritization of UDL and inclusive practices, and the extensive range of rigorous learning experiences available at the high school. Areas for growth include increasing access to curricular supports for students with disabilities; ensuring all students, especially elementary students, have access to science curricula that meets expectations on CURATE or EdReports; providing sufficient instructional guidance to middle and high school teachers; revising the instructional calendar to better support social-emotional learning; ,improving the accessibility of noncore classes, particularly for students receiving instructional interventions; and enhancing communication about available courses and opportunities for all students, particularly the dual enrollment program.

### [Assessment](#_Assessment)

Hingham employs a diverse range of assessment tools across various school levels to monitor and support student progress. At the elementary level (K-5), teachers administer benchmark assessments such as Acadience DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) for ELA and i-Ready diagnostics for both ELA and mathematics thrice annually, alongside additional dyslexia screeners for Grades 1-2 and decoding surveys for Grades 3-5. The Everyday Math unit assessment is for mathematics. These assessments facilitate the implementation of the multitiered system of supports (MTSS), with teachers and specialists using the data to determine interventions and monitor progress, which earns positive feedback from educators and school leaders. At the middle school level, sixth graders take i-Ready diagnostics for mathematics, and students in Grades 6-8 requiring Tier 2 or 3 interventions take i-Ready and easyCBM assessments to monitor their progress. Both middle and high schools emphasize standardized tests, such as the STAMP (Standard Based Measures of Proficiency), the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), and Advanced Placement (AP) examinations. The district places a strong emphasis on using data to inform instruction and address achievement gaps. Although data use at the elementary level is well developed through professional learning communities (PLCs), the middle and high schools face challenges such as limited common planning time and a need for data coaching. Professional development on data usage is inconsistent across the district, with a noted need for more structured training opportunities.

In terms of strengths, at the elementary level, the district has a variety of assessments to determine needed interventions and monitor student progress, uses data to analyze and close achievement gaps, uses PLCs to strengthen data use practices, and shares data with students and families in meaningful and appropriate ways. With regard to areas for growth, the district has yet to establish progress monitoring at the secondary level particularly for students with disabilities, providing teachers at the middle and high schools sufficient time and coaching on data analysis and usage, and establishing protocols for data sharing between teachers and support staff.

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

Hingham’s human resource department manages recruitment, retention, and evaluations and collaborates with district and school leaders on matters pertaining to professional learning. The human resources department works in collaboration with district and school leaders to determine needed positions, posts positions across a variety of platforms, oversees the onboarding process, and completes the orientation process. The district has emphasized antibias in hiring and has set goals to increase hiring a diverse workforce. The district also has a well-established mentor program for new hires. At the time of the site visit, the roles of human resource director and coordinator were vacant, and the superintendent and director of business and support services were fulfilling the duties of human resources.

Hingham has several strengths related to human resources and professional development, including the development of a comprehensive hiring handbook, alignment between the district’s strategic plan and the professional development plan, and a highly structured school-based mentorship program. Areas for growth include ensuring appropriate staffing for district human resources needs, ensuring that mandated formal educator evaluations and informal instructional observations occur regularly, consistently providing constructive feedback during evaluations, developing leadership opportunities for teachers, and creating recognition structures for exemplary teachers.

### [Student Support](#_Student_Support)

The district demonstrates a strong commitment to fostering a safe, equitable, and inclusive environment for its students, staff, and families. Following an equity audit in the 2022-2023 school year, the district undertook significant initiatives to implement culturally responsive and inclusive practices, such as professional development in cultural competency, the formation of an equity task force, and the introduction of a Tier 1 social-emotional learning curriculum in each school.

The district has several strengths related to student supports, including a commitment to deepening staff understanding of inclusive and culturally responsive practices, dedication to strengthening its MTSS and special education services, streamlining its communication platform to better engage stakeholders, and meaningfully engaging parent leadership groups. With regard to areas for growth, the district could enhance guidance for staff to support students’ sense of belonging, strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of the MTSS process and instructional support teams (ISTs) at secondary level, increase the number and effectiveness of tiered academic interventions available at the secondary level, rebuilt trust with parents and families when providing special education services, implementing protocols identified in the 2023 special education report, and provide more meaningful opportunities for students to contribute to decision making.

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

District and town leaders collaborate to develop Hingham’s annual budget*.* The town and district jointly manage certain capital planning and maintenance expenses and share auditing services. As part of a five-year capital plan, the district is currently prioritizing the planning of a new school, major renovations to an existing school, and addressing anticipated capital needs such as ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliance, new roofs for multiple buildings, and the replacement of aging HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning) systems. A nonbinding fiscal year 2024-2028 financial management plan guides Hingham’s financial management—a plan endorsed by the select board, the school committee, the superintendent, and the town manager—that outlines the budget for the forthcoming school years. A director for business and support services leads district staff in gathering input from directors, principals, and other school leaders to understand individual school needs and priorities. The district provides publicly accessible budget-related presentations, including a five-year financial forecast, during the annual budgeting process.

The district has several strengths related to financial and asset planning, including user-friendly and publicly available budget documents, obtaining an operational override to support student needs, and close collaboration between district and town staff. With regard to areas for growth, the district could regularly share more information with the school committee around spending on student groups, as well as spending information with school principals.

## Hingham Public Schools: District Review Overview

### Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. The design of the comprehensive 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 prior to conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including school committee members, teachers’ association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students’ families. Virtual interviews and focus groups also are conducted as needed. Information about review activities and the site visit schedule is in Appendix A. Team members also observe classroom instruction and collect data using the CLASS protocol. The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report resulting from these classroom observations is in Appendix B.

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

### Site Visit

The site visit to Hingham occurred during the week of April 22, 2023. The site visit included 20 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 100 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted seven teacher focus groups with 12 elementary school teachers, 11 middle school teachers, and 14 high school teachers; two focus groups with five middle school and six high school students; and one family focus group with 11 parents. Data collection also included distributing a questionnaire to each principal to gather information on district and school processes and operations.

The site team also conducted 98 observations of classroom instruction in six schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

Hingham’s leadership team includes Superintendent Margaret Adams (appointed in 2022) and the assistant superintendent. The school committee has seven members who are elected for three-year terms.

In the 2023-2024 school year, there were approximately 320 teachers in the district, with 3,707 students enrolled in the district’s six schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

Table 1. Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2023-2024

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School  | Type | Grades served | Enrollment |
| East Elementary School  | Elementary | PK-5 | 519 |
| Plymouth River Elementary School | Elementary | K-5 | 358 |
| South Elementary School | Elementary | K-5 | 493 |
| William L. Foster Elementary School | Elementary | K-5 | 391 |
| Hingham Middle School | Middle | 6-8 | 846 |
| Hingham High School | High | 9-12 | 1,100 |
| Total |  |  | 3,707 |

*Note.* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2023.

Between 2021 and 2024, overall student enrollment decreased by 187 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

In fiscal year 2022, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Hingham was $18,625, which is $391 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditure in districts with similar demographics ($19,016), and $3,078 less than the average in-district per-pupil expenditures in districts of similar wealth ($21,703).[[4]](#footnote-5) In-district per pupil expenditures for Hingham were $929 less than the average state spending per pupil ($19,554). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

### School and Student Performance

The following section includes selected highlights regarding student performance in Hingham. This section is meant to provide a brief synopsis of data, not a comprehensive analysis of district performance data. For additional details and data on district performance, please see Appendix E and [School and District Profiles (mass.edu)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/general/general.aspx?topNavID=1&leftNavId=100&orgcode=01310000&orgtypecode=5).

#### Achievement

* In Grades 3-8 in ELA and mathematics and in Grades 5 and 8 in science, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next Generation Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) was higher than the state rate for each student group (excluding Hispanic/Latino students, whose data are not included in the three bullets below).
	+ ELA: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was between 17 and 35 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
	+ Mathematics: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was between 17 and 38 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
	+ Science: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was between 13 and 30 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
* In Grades 10 in ELA, mathematics, and science, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next Generation MCAS was higher than the state rate for each student group.
	+ ELA: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was between 14 and 29 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
	+ Mathematics: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was between 18 and 37 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
	+ Science: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was between 11 and 39 percentage points higher than their statewide peers.
* Hispanic/Latino students in Hingham met or exceeded expectations on the 2023 Next Generation MCAS at higher rates than their statewide peers in Grades 3-8 in ELA and mathematics, and in Grades 5 and 8 in science.
	+ ELA: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was 69 percent and was 47 percentage points higher than the state rate of 22 percent.
	+ Mathematics: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was 70 percent and was 51 percentage points higher than the state rate of 19 percent.
	+ Science: the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was 73 percent, which is 53 percentage points higher than the state rate of 20 percent.

#### Growth

* In Grades 3-8, in ELA and mathematics, student growth percentiles (SGP)[[5]](#footnote-6) were typical in 2023 for each student group with reportable data, except for Asian students, who exceeded typical growth in both ELA and mathematics.
* Two groups, All students and White students, exceeded typical growth in mathematics in Grade 10 in 2023.

#### Other Indicators

* Hingham’s four-year graduation rates in 2022 were above the state rates for each student group with reportable data by 3.6 percentage points to 13.8 percentage points.
* The dropout rate for students with disabilities in Hingham was 0.0 percent in 2022 compared with the state rate of 3.4 percent.
* In 2023, 87.8 percent of students in Hingham completed advanced coursework, which is 22 percentage points higher than the state rate of 65.8 percent.
* Plymouth River Elementary and South Elementary were identified as Schools of Recognition via the state’s district and school accountability system in 2023.

### Classroom Observations

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Hingham during the week of April 22, 2024. The observers conducted 98 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

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

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

* Emotional Support. Ratings were in the high-middle range for the K-5 and 6-8 grade bands (5.4 and 4.9, respectively) and in the middle range for the 9-12 grade band (4.6).
* Classroom Organization. Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (6.1 for K-5, 6.7 for 6-8, and 6.8 for 9-12).
* Instructional Support. Ratings were in the low-middle range for all grade bands (3.3 for K-5, 3.8 for 6-8, and 3.7 for 9-12).
* Student Engagement. For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (5.6 for K-5, 5.7 for 6-8, and 5.2 for 9-12).

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

## Leadership and Governance

Hingham is under the leadership of Margaret Adams, who was appointed superintendent in 2022. Supporting her is a core team of central office staff, including the assistant superintendent, the director of business and support services, the director of student services, and the assistant director of student services, as well as a larger administrative leadership team consisting of central office staff, curriculum directors for each subject area, and principals. These district officials, particularly the superintendent, collaborate closely with the elected school committee members, who represent Hingham residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has seven members, each serving a three-year term.

According to the district’s website and interviews with school committee members and other district leaders, the school committee has five primary responsibilities: hiring and evaluating the performance of the superintendent; developing a budget that adequately funds district needs; establishing and periodically reviewing educational goals and policies; conducting collective bargaining with all school department bargaining units; and supporting the development and promotion of the vision, mission, goals, and strategies of the school system. Aligned with the latter function, the school committee and the interim superintendent (prior to official appointment as superintendent), in consultation with an outside vendor, crafted the district’s three-year (2022-2025) Strategic Plan, which clearly delineates the district’s overarching mission statement, core values, vision statement, theory of action, and strategic objectives and initiatives.

To execute the strategic plan and other priorities, each school principal receives support from instructional leadership teams comprising principals, assistant principals, department heads (at the middle and high school levels), and lead teachers and instructional specialists at the elementary levels. Although leadership opportunities exist, teachers and parents expressed a need for more opportunities to meaningfully contribute or provide stakeholder feedback to district decision making, including refining the district’s strategic plan and contributing to decisions about budget development and resource allocation.

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

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

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [School committee governance](#_School_Committee_Governance) | * The school committee demonstrates a commitment to engaging various stakeholders, including district leadership, parents, and community members, on a regular basis.
 | * Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the school committee for the community, fostering awareness of these delineated roles, and ensuring district responsiveness to community and family concerns
 |
| [District and school leadership](#_District_and_School) | * The superintendent established a culture of collaboration and communication among district leadership and with the town and school committee.
 | * Establishing effective mechanisms for stakeholder feedback and integration into decision-making processes
* Enhancing the ability of both curriculum directors and school leaders to improve instructional practices
 |
| [District and school improvement planning](#_District_and_School_1) | * The district demonstrates a commitment to employing a data-driven approach to strategic planning. Alignment exists between the district improvement plan and all school improvement plans.
 | * Meaningfully engaging school staff and parents in reflection and refinement of the strategic plan
 |
| [Budget development](#_Budget_Development) | * An MOU between the town and school district ensures that the town will provide funding for the school district.
 | * Providing opportunities for school staff to contribute to decisions about budget development and resource allocation
 |

### School Committee Governance

The school committee collaborates with district and town leaders to uphold Massachusetts laws and regulations and fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities to the district. According to the school committee’s website and interviews with school committee members and other district leaders, the primary responsibilities of the school committee include hiring and evaluating the superintendent; developing a budget that adequately funds district needs; establishing and periodically reviewing policies; monitoring the school’s execution of established policies; conducting collective bargaining; and supporting the development and promotion of the vision, mission, goals and strategies of the school system. Both district and town leaders described the school committee taking on a “significant political role,” particularly when advocating for a $7.9 million operational budget override approved by voters in spring 2023 to support several town departments and ensure the preservation of additional positions created during the pandemic.

Although school committee members acknowledged the importance of this successful override in demonstrating the public’s support for the district, they also articulated the challenges stemming from increased public visibility. For example, committee members described a more hands-on role within the district given the sudden turnover in the superintendent role in 2021-2022 and the onset of the pandemic. With their visibility and increased involvement in district affairs, school committee members described often receiving outreach by parents regarding matters that fall under the district’s role. As one school committee member explained,

The public saw us doing more things during COVID . . . and that’s when they were really engaged. So, I think they got a little confused. Once things settled down, and they were still reaching out to us, like, “Why can’t you work on this? Can you advocate for this particular child?” And it’s kind of reminding them that those really aren’t our roles.

This type of parent outreach also was discussed and confirmed during parent focus groups. Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the school committee for the community, fostering awareness of these delineated roles, and ensuring district responsiveness to community and family concerns represents an area of growth for the district.

According to district documents and accounts from school leaders and school committee members, the school committee evaluates the superintendent using the process outlined by DESE. Through this process, the superintendent sets goals aligned with the DESE superintendent rubric, collects supporting artifacts at designated points throughout the evaluation cycle, and presents data to each committee member for review, culminating in a final report that the school committee shares with the community. Reviewed documents confirmed that the superintendent was evaluated in June 2023.

Regarding creating a culture of collaboration, school committee members, town officials, and the superintendent described having a strong and collaborative relationship, wherein all parties receive regular updates (see district and school leadership for more information). As demonstrated by school committee meeting minutes, the superintendent presents an update at every meeting and provides more formalized reports on a quarterly basis that summarize district activities, budget spending, and updates to the district improvement plan. School committee members and town officials further attested to the extent to which school committee members regularly receive and review data (e.g., enrollment numbers, MCAS data, DESE accountability data to drive budget priorities and decision making).

One strength of the district is the school committee’s commitment to regularly engaging various stakeholders. The school committee ensures the availability of not only meeting agendas and minutes but also all referenced documents and recaps of meetings that include time stamps for easy access. The school committee allocates a dedicated fifteen-minute window at the beginning of every meeting for addressing comments or questions not already on the agenda. Likewise, as evidenced by committee meeting minutes as well as accounts from the school committee and students, the school committee has two student representatives who regularly share announcements and provide input on policies and decision making, as appropriate.

In focus groups, some teachers felt unheard by the school committee throughout contract negotiations. At the time of the district review, Hingham teachers did not have a current contract, and the negotiation process between the district and the teachers’ union had stalled. Interviews with district leaders, school committee members, and members of the teachers’ association characterized the collective bargaining negotiations as an ongoing challenge. School committee members emphasized a commitment to addressing the concerns of the teachers’ association while still seeking input from both the superintendent and director of business and support services on what is financially viable.

### District and School Leadership

Several teams consisting of district-level administrators, curriculum directors, and school leaders regularly support the superintendent in monitoring initiatives and supporting teaching and learning. This includes a core team of central office staff consisting of the assistant superintendent, the director of business and support services, the director of student services, and the assistant director of student services who convene either weekly or biweekly. In addition, a larger administrative leadership team (also referred to as the leadership council or cabinet) comprising central office staff, curriculum directors for each subject area, and principals meets bimonthly. These leadership team meetings provide opportunities to discuss ongoing initiatives, receive updates on the strategic plan, and engage in professional learning about district priorities, such as UDL. Finally, a curriculum council, led by the assistant superintendent and comprising subject-level curriculum directors, convenes monthly to provide input on curriculum and instructional matters.

Accounts from school committee members and school leaders highlight the effectiveness of these leadership teams in collaborating both internally and externally with the school committee and the town. On DESE’s District Review Self-Assessment, school committee members noted, “This year saw significant enhancement in relationship building with municipal leaders and the community with a successful vote to fund a new school building and a town wide operating override. This speaks to the growing trust and collaborative work.” One school leader noted that “we conduct business here collaboratively.” Likewise, in their assessment of the superintendent’s performance during the 2022-2023 school year, the school committee attributed this collaborative culture to the superintendent’s efforts in strengthening communication channels and cultivating positive working relationships within her district leadership team in her first year as superintendent:

The evaluation highlights Dr. Adams’ ability to effectively communicate her measurable goals to the leadership team, school committee, and community. Feedback from the community, educators, and students has been actively sought through surveys, focus groups, and the information was delivered in thoughtful, high-quality presentations to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the district’s needs. The regular updates provided by Dr. Adams, including weekly emails detailing completed tasks and district happenings, have been appreciated and have helped stakeholders stay informed. Furthermore, the consistency of communication from principals to each school has been improved under her leadership.

The superintendent’s establishment of a culture of collaboration and communication among district leadership and with the town and the school committee is a clear area of strength for the district.

At the building level, each principal receives support from instructional leadership teams comprising principals, assistant principals, department heads (at the middle and high school levels), and lead teachers and instructional specialists at the elementary levels. Teachers have opportunities for leadership development by participating in school-level faculty councils, in which they provide input on school-level affairs, district-level committees, and a districtwide mentor program. For more on leadership opportunities, see the Human Resources and Professional Development section.

Despite strong collaboration between district leaders, teachers and parents raised concerns regarding their input into district decision-making processes. Teachers in multiple focus groups cited instances of participating in councils or committees without witnessing substantive changes or feeling that their voices were truly heard. One district leader echoed these sentiments, noting that district responsiveness to teacher and family member feedback remains a work in progress. Establishing effective mechanisms for meaningful stakeholder feedback and integration into decision-making processes represents an area of growth for the district.

According to several district leaders, the pandemic and ongoing challenges in staffing leadership positions have constrained the district’s ability to effectively prioritize improving instructional practices and student outcomes. At the time of the district review, the director of human resources and interim director of student supports positions were vacant, and school leaders noted that a lot of the work on improving instructional practices occurs at the school level, albeit with recognition for the positive contributions of the district’s curriculum directors. While also praising the effectiveness of curriculum directors in aligning instructional practices and fostering high-quality teaching at the district level, a district leader recommended expanding the involvement of curriculum directors in management and operational decisions, such as budgeting and staffing levels, to leverage their unique perspectives. Similarly, school leaders indicated they possess sufficient autonomy, and district leaders expressed a desire to further empower school leaders in decision making, particularly in areas related to special education staffing and instructional practices. Enhancing the ability of both curriculum directors and school leaders to improve instructional practices represents an additional area of growth for the district.

### District and School Improvement Planning

Hingham’s *2022-2025 Strategic Plan* clearly delineates the district’s strategic objectives and initiatives, including a thorough timeline, responsible person(s), and the desired outcomes and outputs for each initiative. The document also includes an overarching mission statement, core values, a vision statement, and a theory of action developed by the strategic planning committee alongside the strategic objectives and initiatives. When reviewing the strategic plan during an equity audit in the 2022-2023 school year, the Equity Project (an independent consulting firm) wrote that the plan was “very easy to follow,” and the plan is “heavily based on community expectations as well as HPS [Hingham Public Schools] community values.”

School committee members, district leaders, and district planning documents all described a deliberate process for designing the strategic plan that was data driven and inclusive of all stakeholders. In 2021-2022, the school committee and the interim superintendent engaged an external consultant, the Teaching and Learning Alliance, to facilitate the strategic planning process. The Teaching and Learning Alliance conducted comprehensive data collection, which included administering surveys to the community, conducting multiple focus groups with families and community members, and analyzing academic achievement and enrollment data. Subsequently, the district formed a strategic planning committee comprising members of the district leadership team, school administrators, department directors, teachers, parents, and students. This committee reviewed all gathered information and collaboratively developed the plan. The district’s commitment to employing a purposeful, data-driven approach to strategic planning, inclusive of diverse stakeholder input, represents a strength for the district.

At the school level, school leaders and local school councils, which include school staff and families, annually develop each school’s improvement plan, drawing directly from the overarching district strategic plan and tailoring it to the specific needs of the school. One school leader explained incorporating goals related to the district’s plan into their own such as including an academic, social-emotional learning, and parent communication goal: “So, we’ve really built that from looking at what the strategic plan is asking for, and then looking at the school improvement plan, and how do we tie our goals for the school improvement plan to the strategic plan, so we’re all on the same path, working the same way, working forward.” This clear alignment between the district and school improvement plans is a strength of the district.

According to school committee meeting minutes and presentations, the superintendent provides updates to the school committee three times per year on progress toward completing the strategic planning initiatives. To keep the public informed, the district posts all presentations on the school website, along with an end-of-year video summarizing progress toward the district plan. School leaders and teachers also described revisiting the topics of the district’s strategic plan at the beginning of every year and undergoing professional development intentionally aligned with the district’s strategic priorities. Moreover, school and district leaders frequently discuss strategic priorities during leadership team meetings, and a school committee member similarly stated that the district’s strategic plan helps guide the leadership team toward focusing on improving student outcomes.

Although the district frequently provides information to the school committee, staff, and families on progress toward achieving plan goals, it is less clear whether the district actively seeks meaningful feedback to guide the plan’s ongoing refinement. In the District Review Self-Assessment, school committee members explained as follows:

One area of improvement would be to continue to find ways to engage students and community members. The information is accessible and available but not something people are seeking out readily or staying informed about without proactive measures to update and get them involved in the process. . . . Additionally, showing the public where goals or plans were adjusted based on incoming data and changing situations could be helpful, so the plans are seen as living documents and not static. This is happening but not as clearly to stakeholders where there are reallocations or adjustments of goals.

Similarly, teachers across different focus groups questioned the extent to which the district’s instructional priorities, outlined in the strategic plan, aligned with current realities. Parents in one focus group also described that updates or progress toward the district’s equity plan, created in alignment with and to support the district’s plan, were not communicated back to stakeholders. Meaningful engagement of school staff and parents in reflection and refinement of the strategic plan is an area of growth for the district.

### Budget Development

A variety of stakeholders, including district and town leaders and school committee members, articulated a transparent budget process characterized by close collaboration with school and district leaders and the school committee. This process begins in the fall when the superintendent and the director of business and support services meet with central office staff, curriculum directors, and school leaders to gather information about staffing and operational needs. In November, the district’s leadership team collaboratively drafts a budget to propose to the school committee, basing their budget priorities largely on the district’s strategic plan. During this process, district leaders also emphasized the importance of identifying possible efficiencies for cost savings. Finally, district and school leaders present the budget to the school committee in January and hold budget meetings until receiving final approval from the school committee in March.

As highlighted in previous sections, the superintendent, the school committee, and the town maintain a collaborative relationship that facilitates the budget development process. One town leader described maintaining open lines of communication with the superintendent and holding frequent meetings during the budget process with her, members of the school committee, the town’s Select Board, and the town’s advisory committee (a group of Hingham residents appointed by the town who contribute to decision making about town finances). After meetings throughout March and April, the town presents a combined budget (including the town and the school district) for the town to vote on in late April.

According to both district and town leaders, the budget negotiation process with the town is greatly facilitated by an MOU created in spring 2023 among the district, the school committee, the Select Board, and the advisory committee. The MOU provides for an increase in funding, up to 3.5 percent, for the school district each year for the next four years. The MOU also allows for additional funding requests for special education costs. One district leader praised both the MOU and the town’s commitment to long-term planning, which enables the district to maintain necessary resources, stating as follows:

One thing this town does really well . . . is some really thoughtful long-term planning around fiscal sustainability and responsibility and the forecasting that they’re doing . . . there’s a very strong, fiscally conservative, but long-term planning, which I think has helped with the schools maintaining resources that it has.

The presence of an MOU that guarantees funding from the town is a strength for the district.

In several focus groups, school staff expressed dissatisfaction with what they described as insufficient funding from the town and a lack of opportunities to contribute to budgeting and resource allocation decisions. In one focus group, teachers expressed disagreement with a school-level decision to prioritize technology purchases over minimizing layoffs. Similarly, teachers in another focus group expressed a desire for a greater voice in decisions regarding fund allocation, with one teacher explaining, “[We would like to] know that we’re heard and listened to, and our opinion is valued because we’re the ones in the front lines.”

District leaders reported engaging other district leaders, school leaders, and school site councils in the budget development process, but they did not indicate if school staff members are part of the process. Providing meaningful opportunities for school staff to contribute to decisions about budget development and resource allocation represents an area of growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should work with the school committee to redirect inquiries through these communication channels and reinforce the delineation of roles between the school committee and the district.*
* *The district should leverage its councils and committees, particularly those with teachers and parents, to provide direction and advice on core district and school-based decisions.*
* *The district should expand opportunities for curriculum directors to become more involved in management and resource allocation decisions in their areas of expertise.*
* *The district should design a process that allows for meaningful family and staff input to refine the district’s strategic plan.*
* *The district should create opportunities for school staff to contribute to conversations regarding budget development and resource allocation.*

## Curriculum and Instruction

Hingham strives to ensure equitable, rigorous, and effective instruction for all students. Led by curriculum directors, the district’s regular curricular review process incorporates input from various stakeholders to ensure the selection of standards-aligned curricula. Every seven years, each department undergoes a thorough review involving research, stakeholder input, and piloting of new programs. Currently, the district uses a combination of district-developed and published curricula, which have received mixed ratings from CURATE and EdReports.

Documents and interviews with district and school leaders underscore Hingham’s commitment to providing inclusive instruction. All educators have received professional learning about the UDL framework, and teachers at the middle and high schools continue to work with curriculum directors in revising unit guides using UDL principles. The district also prioritizes equity and inclusion by expanding advanced coursework options at the high school level. Although a variety of enrichment and accelerated learning opportunities are available across all schools, feedback from parents, teachers, and support staff highlights the ongoing need to enhance accessibility of the curriculum and instruction, particularly for students with disabilities.

Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.

Table 3. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Curriculum and Instruction Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Curriculum selection and use](#_Curriculum_Selection_and) | * The district conducts regular and structured reviews of curricula that are inclusive of multiple stakeholders.
* Curriculum directors provide multiple supports and resources to support consistent implementation of curriculum across classrooms and schools.
 | * Ensuring curricular supports are accessible to students with learning disabilities
* Ensuring all students, especially elementary students have access to science curricula that meet expectations on CURATE or EdReports
 |
| [Classroom instruction](#_Classroom_Instruction) | * The district prioritizes implementation of a UDL framework and inclusive practices for instruction.
 | * Providing sufficient instructional guidance to teachers in the middle and high schools
* Revisiting the instructional practices and schedule for social-emotional learning and promotion of the well-being of both students and staff
 |
| [Student access to coursework](#_Student_Access_to) | * A variety of rigorous learning experiences, including AP courses, dual enrollment opportunities, and career pathways are available at the high school.
 | * Improving the accessibility of noncore classes, particularly for students receiving instructional interventions
* Enhancing communication about available courses and opportunities for all students, particularly the dual enrollment program
 |

### Curriculum Selection and Use

According to a review of Hingham’s curricula table, Hingham uses a combination of published and district-developed curricula across its grade levels. For ELA, the district had previously used Journeys 2012 Edition (not rated by CURATE; rated as does not meet expectations by EdReports) for Grades K-5, but it adopted Into Reading (rated as meets expectations by both CURATE and EdReports) starting in the 2023-2024 school year. The district uses district-developed ELA materials for Grades 6-12. In Grades K-5, Hingham’s mathematics curriculum (Everyday Math 4, 2015-2016[[6]](#footnote-7)) has no rating by CURATE and has a does not meet expectations by EdReports. Its mathematics curriculum for Grade 6 (Big Ideas Math 20136) also has no CURATE rating and does not meet expectations by EdReports. Its mathematics curriculum for Grades 7-8 (Desmos Math) has a meets expectations rating by EdReports but no rating by CURATE. For Grades 9-12, the district uses a combination of district-developed materials and the Common Core for Algebra 1-2 and Geometry (rated as partially meets expectations by EdReports; not rated by CURATE). The district uses a combination of curricula for science in Grades K-6, including FOSS (not rated by CURATE; rated as does not meet expectations by EdReports), Mystery Science (not rated by CURATE or EdReports), and Smithsonian Science for the Classroom (not rated by CURATE; rated as meets expectations by EdReports). The district uses OpenSciEd (rated as meets expectations by both CURATE and EdReports) for Grades 6-8 and district-developed curriculum for Grades 9-12. Ensuring all students, especially elementary students, have access to science curricula that meet expectations on CURATE or EdReports, is an area for growth.

District leaders and documents described a regular and structured curricular review process inclusive of multiple stakeholders, which is a strength for the district. Every seven years, each department undergoes a formal curricular review consisting of two phases. First, in the self-study phase, the assistant superintendent and appropriate curriculum directors and coordinators will research available curricular options, analyze assessment data, compare programs from similar districts, and gather input from stakeholders to narrow down a few options. Then, in the action planning phase, a sample of teachers will pilot a new curriculum if applicable and contribute to an action plan that they present to the school committee at the end of the second year that outlines proposed curriculum updates/changes, identifies professional development needs, and the resources required. Once approved, the district proceeds with providing ongoing professional development to support curriculum adoption.

Both district staff and teachers reported that selected curricula generally align with state standards. However, only some of the curricula is rated favorably by either CURATE or EdReports. As outlined in the district’s *2023-2024 Equity Plan* and echoed in interviews with district leaders and teachers, the district has prioritized ensuring that all students have access to culturally responsive curricula and materials by creating an identification tool for auditing curricula and then conducting an internal audit. Following the district’s participation in DESE’s Inclusive Practices Academy, one district leader described developing and piloting a rubric-based equity tool that enables teachers to assess the cultural responsiveness of their instructional materials. That same district leader noted positive initial feedback on this tool. Likewise, teachers in another focus group confirmed that their department conducts internal audits of curriculum unit guides, instructional materials, and classroom libraries to ensure cultural responsiveness.

Another strength of the district is that its curriculum directors provide multiple supports and resources to support consistent implementation of curricula across classrooms and schools. Both district and school leaders attributed the district’s vertical and horizontal curricular alignment to the dedicated efforts of department curriculum directors. These directors collaborate closely with teachers and instructional specialists during professional development sessions. At the elementary level, teachers also engage in monthly curriculum sessions with curriculum directors to receive ongoing curricular support. In addition, they receive supplemental instructional coaching from school-level reading specialists (one for Grades K-2 and one for Grades 3-5), as well as a mathematics specialist, who offer targeted coaching on specific instructional methods or assist with curriculum implementation as needed. Middle and high school staff reported using common planning time to convene with their respective departments and review curriculum pacing to ensure horizontal alignment. Furthermore, curriculum directors support teachers at the secondary level by assisting in the creation of common assessments and curriculum unit guides, all of which are accessible via Google Drive. A specialist affirmed the effectiveness of these supports, stating, “All the teachers are on the same page. They go at the same pace, they’re on the same topics, at the same time using the same resources. It’s all the same.”

District leaders and school staff offered varying opinions on the extent to which the curriculum adequately addresses the needs of individual students, particularly those with learning disabilities. One elementary teacher praised the district’s adoption of the Into Reading curriculum:

With our new program right now [referring to Into Reading], we have so much support in place, and I know this is districtwide where we meet monthly, we create these reading groups. They’re differentiated. We have reading groups where we’re working on the skills. We have challenging readers working on the same skill. We also have push in support from our reading specialists. We do those three times a week . . . Of course, we can all put our own creativity and spin to how we’re teaching. But I think the materials that we’re given address the needs of students as well.

However, teachers and support specialists across multiple focus groups highlighted concerns with the Everyday Math curriculum, noting its heavy reliance on language, which poses challenges for students with reading disabilities and English learners. Similarly, school staff at the middle and high schools reported that the curriculum did not sufficiently address the needs of all students. These staff expressed specific concerns about the lack of differentiated assessments and suggested that instructional standards may prioritize rigor over accessibility. Echoing these challenges, a district leader acknowledged that ensuring continuity with the curriculum for students with individualized education programs (IEPs) remained an ongoing area of improvement. Ensuring curricular supports are accessible to students with learning disabilities is an area of growth for the district.

### Classroom Instruction

As outlined in district documents and accounts by district and school leaders, teachers, and support staff, the district has prioritized instructional practices related to diversity, inclusion, and UDL. The district’s *2022-2025 Strategic Plan* highlights inclusive practices as an area of focus, and the district has engaged in various initiatives aimed at promoting UDL implementation. These efforts include the participation of all district and school leaders in a yearlong PLC dedicated to UDL, the involvement of two elementary schools (East and Plymouth River) in DESE’s Inclusive Practices Academy with a focus on UDL, and all instructional staff receiving professional development specific to UDL principles and inclusive practices. During the 2022-2023 academic year, elementary schools engaged in yearlong professional development on a student-centered workshop model for mathematics instruction. Concurrently, middle and high school staff received professional development in the 2022-2023 school year aimed at assisting in the creation of curriculum unit guides that integrate universally designed elements and inclusive practices, as detailed in the *Professional Development* handbook and affirmed by accounts from district leaders and teachers.

Consistent with these findings, staff across school levels articulated districtwide expectations that teachers differentiate instruction to accommodate variations in students’ learning needs and readiness levels. School leaders described monitoring for inclusive practices through evaluations, classroom walk-throughs, and conversations with specialists and curriculum directors. Likewise, district leaders emphasized their enforcement of instructional modifications through evaluations, wherein they specifically look for and collect artifacts that demonstrate whether teachers are forming groups based on student needs and differentiating instruction appropriately. CLASS scores also indicated middle to high levels of Teacher Sensitivity, with a districtwide average score of 5.9, indicating that teachers demonstrate awareness and responsiveness to students’ academic and emotional needs. The prioritization of UDL and inclusive practices is a strength for the district.

Despite the district’s emphasis on UDL, a variety of sources—including district documents; CLASS scores; and accounts by teachers, support staff, and students—revealed a spectrum of instructional approaches that differ in the extent to which they meaningfully promote student autonomy and engagement. At the elementary level, school leaders and staff described student-centered instructional methods, including project-based learning and station teaching, which offered students opportunities to rotate between various activities. At the middle and high schools, teachers and students described a variety of instructional strategies and formats, ranging from those that promote student autonomy and active learning, such as Socratic seminars and flipped classrooms, to formats that were more lecture based or traditional. Notably, one staff member at the high school observed a prevalence of lecture-style instruction:

A lot of the gen-ed classes are lecture based. It’s teacher-led instruction ideal for a majority of our classes. And then you’ll get pockets of student-led [instruction] or projects, but those are few and far between. I’d say most of the gen-ed instruction in the high school classroom is teacher led, lecture-style instruction.

Aligned with this finding, an equity audit conducted in the 2022-2023 school year reported as part of its observations of the middle and high schools that instructional engagement was primarily adult led, indicating a “potential imbalance in the opportunities for students to take the lead in their own collaborative learning experiences.” Likewise, CLASS scores within the Instructional Support domain revealed areas for improvement related to crafting learning experiences that challenge students and cultivate higher-order thinking skills. Although the district scored highly in Productivity (6.6), scores for Analysis and Inquiry (2.6), Content Development (2.8), and Instructional Dialogue (3.0) fell within the low to middle range.

Teachers, particularly at the middle and high school levels, also expressed receiving a lack of instructional feedback or observations from department heads, underscoring a possible lack of sufficient instructional support. School leaders at the middle and high schools similarly acknowledged the challenge of regularly observing classroom instruction given limited time. Teachers, particularly at the middle and high school levels, expressed receiving a lack of instructional feedback or having regular observations from department heads or school leaders. School leaders similarly affirmed the challenge of observing instruction because of conflicting needs and a shortage of substitute teachers. Providing sufficient instructional guidance to teachers in the middle and high schools is an area of growth for the district.

According to the district’s *Strategic Plan* and accounts from school staff, implementation of a standardized social-emotional learning curriculum remains a key focus for the district. In elementary schools, teachers and staff reported using a variety of social-emotional learning strategies, including Toolbox and Calm Classroom. The middle school adopted the Second Step curriculum for social-emotional learning, whereas the high school currently lacks a structured program. Teachers across focus groups, however, raised concerns that the district’s master schedule that was implemented in the 2023-2024 school year limits time for morning meetings, which were previously used to provide direct social-emotional instruction. Teachers reported the master schedule also reduces transition time, which adds unnecessary stress for both students and teachers. One teacher explained, “it feels very hurried . . . they can’t just kind of slow down,” whereas a teacher in another focus group similarly articulated as follows:

To have every grade, you know, K through five, everyone in building is doing math at the same time . . . it’s really tying the teachers’ hands. And we can’t do what’s good for the children sometimes because, [we’re told] “Well, in 5 minutes, if we’re not on math, we’re going to get in trouble if someone walks in the rooms.” These transition times [are] taking away recess, and the kids don’t have time to, like, breathe. It’s way too much for the children, and it’s not fair to the teachers.

Revisiting the instructional practices and schedule for social-emotional learning and promotion of the well-being of both students and staff is an area of growth for the district.

### Student Access to Coursework

Hingham strives to ensure that all students have access to a range of rigorous coursework and enrichment opportunities. The district offers a comprehensive program of academic offerings, as evidenced by the *Program of Studies*, including a range of AP offerings and a large variety of courses related to performing arts, technology, consumer and family sciences, and other electives. As articulated in the district’s *Strategic Plan* and interviews with district and school leaders, the district also continues to develop innovative pathways to enhance student learning,

At the elementary level, students receive a variety of enrichment offerings, including Spanish, art, music, computer science, and physical education. In Grade 5, students who demonstrate an aptitude for mathematics can participate in Math Plus, a project-based accelerated program occurring once every six days. Finally, school leaders and support specialists talked about the variety of opportunities during regularly scheduled intervention blocks for students to receive differentiated instruction. Regular data analysis informs decisions regarding the interventions, as outlined in the Data Use section.

Similarly, Hingham Middle School provides an expansive range of enrichment courses, including STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), performing and visual arts, and consumer sciences. Students expressed positive feedback regarding the breadth of offerings available. However, district leaders, teachers, and support staff raised concerns regarding the accessibility of these opportunities for students with specific learning needs. According to teachers and school staff, students with IEPs or receiving additional Tier 2 and 3 interventions often cannot participate in electives because of scheduling conflicts. Improving the equitable access of elective classes, particularly for students receiving instructional interventions, remains an area of growth for the district.

Beginning in seventh grade, students are placed into different levels of ELA and mathematics based on teacher recommendations and achievement data. These instructional groupings continue into high school for all content areas, with additional opportunities for AP coursework. The district provides additional avenues for high school students to engage in rigorous learning experiences through its expanding dual enrollment program, which offers classes through Quincy College and the University of Massachusetts. Starting in the 2023-2024 school year, the district offers specialized pathway programs in arts and in technology education, building on its preexisting global citizenship pathway. These pathways programs enable students to pursue focused areas of study and cultivate portfolios with relevant work-based learning experiences. The district also is exploring the creation of a business pathway, which would include an internship component with local businesses. With 87.8 percent of 11th and 12th grade students in Hingham completing advanced coursework (compared to 65.8 percent for the state), the extensive range of rigorous learning experiences available at the high school, including AP courses, dual enrollment opportunities, and career pathways, represents a strength for the district.

Despite the opportunities available at the high school, teachers and parents perceived a prevailing culture within the district that prioritizes college-bound students and potentially neglects those pursuing alternative paths. One group of parents advocated for a more comprehensive vocational technology program, highlighting a perceived gap in career readiness options. Recognizing the ongoing need to expand access to career readiness, the district created the Traces program, which enables students to engage in traditional coursework part of the day and hands-on learning in industrial technology for the remainder of the day. District and school leaders also described having frequent conversations about ensuring equitable access to accelerated courses for all students, with one district leader acknowledging “there is a lot of work to be done.” As part of these ongoing conversations concerning equity, district and school leaders demonstrate a commitment to expanding dual enrollment as an alternative to AP classes, which can be prohibitively challenging for students with disabilities. One district leader explained,

I do think that that was part of what drove us to explore dual enrollment as a promising practice for expanding students’ access to college-level courses . . . when analyzing our AP enrollment data, we did have fewer students in special education, for example, that were accessing the AP courses. Whereas in the dual enrollment, we had students on IEPs in our biotech courses, our anatomy and physiology courses, and so on.

Although the district continues to expand access to its advanced coursework offerings to all students, implementation challenges remain. Notably, teachers and support staff demonstrated uncertainty or a lack of awareness about the dual enrollment opportunities available to their students. Students similarly reported that knowledge of what courses were available to them could sometimes be unclear. Enhancing communication about available courses and opportunities for all students, particularly the dual enrollment program, remains an area of growth for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should review its curricula to better understand and address gaps in curricular accessibility for all students, particularly multilingual learners and students with disabilities.*
* *The district should issue guidance and provide support for school leaders around performing observations and supplying teachers with feedback to improve their practice at the middle school level.*
* *The district should evaluate the structural barriers to SEL support and work with school leaders to make adjustments that will support students’ overall wellbeing.*
* *In partnership with its school leaders, the district should review intervention schedules to minimize students missing elective and enrichment classes to receive Tier 2 and 3 supports.*
* *The district should further disseminate information about advanced coursework options, including dual enrollment, to promote equitable access to advanced learning opportunities at the high school.*

## Assessment

Hingham uses a variety of data systems to monitor students’ progress and inform continuous improvement efforts. Elementary teachers administer Acadience DIBELS and i-Ready diagnostics for ELA and mathematics three times per year, along with additional literacy screeners and mathematics unit assessments. Middle and high school assessments include i-Ready diagnostics, easyCBM, and district-developed common assessments, alongside standardized tests such as MCAS and AP examinations. The district also created systems to support data use, including PLCs and data meetings at elementary schools, providing opportunities for interventionists to help teachers with groupings and tiered interventions. However, district and school leaders and staff reported that systems for collecting and analyzing data at the middle and high school levels remain less developed.

The district shares data with students’ families in various ways, including report cards, parent/caregiver conferences, Google Classroom, and Aspen. District leaders also reported implemented a new data system that were developed by Open Architects to facilitate data visualization and analysis of subgroup differences. The district regularly shares data with the school committee with the goal of strengthening MTSS systems and closing achievement gaps.

Table 4 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

Table 4. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Assessment Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Data and assessment systems](#_Data_and_Assessment) | * The elementary schools have a variety of assessments to determine needed interventions and monitor students’ academic progress.
 | * Progress monitoring at the middle and high school levels, particularly for students with disabilities
 |
| [Data use](#_Data_Use) | * The examination of data with the intention of closing achievement gaps and strengthening MTSS systems The district established PLCs at each elementary school to strengthen data use practices.
 | * Creating structured opportunities with sufficient time for middle and high school staff to receive professional development and coaching support on data analysis and usage
 |
| [Sharing results](#_Sharing_Results) | * The district shares data with students and families in meaningful and appropriate ways.
 | * Establishing structures and protocols to facilitate data sharing between teachers and support staff
 |

### Data and Assessment Systems

The district’s assessment documentation and accounts from school leaders and staff confirm the use of various assessments across school and subject levels. At the elementary level (K-5), teachers administer the following benchmark assessments three times per year: Acadience Reading for ELA and the i-Ready diagnostic for both ELA and mathematics. Teachers for Grades 1 and 2 also screen students for dyslexia using the Acadience Rapid Automatized Naming assessment, whereas teachers in Grades 3-5 use the Beginning/Advanced Decoding Survey. Finally, elementary students in Grades K-5 receive the Everyday Math unit assessment for mathematics.

According to district leaders and presentations to the school committee, the district strengthened its assessment system at the elementary level in alignment with implementation of MTSS. Starting in the 2022-2023 school year, teachers and specialists use assessments to determine interventions and progress monitoring. School and district leaders, along with elementary teachers, expressed satisfaction with these new assessment systems. One teacher explained how “We’re very data driven and driven by growth measures.” Similarly, a school leader explained as follows:

The elementary level seems [to have] a pretty comprehensive system of student performance tracking. If anyone who’s working in a capacity at the elementary classroom [level] wants to know about either a student’s performance or a cohort of students and their growth, all that’s readily available to them.

The use of a variety of assessments at the elementary level to monitor students’ academic progress and determine needed interventions is a strength of the district.

At the middle school level, all sixth-grade students receive the i-Ready diagnostic for mathematics several times per year, whereas students receiving Tier 2 or 3 academic interventions (Grades 6-8) receive i-Ready and easyCBM several times per year for progress monitoring of interventions. Teachers at the middle and high school levels also administer district-developed common assessments across different departments twice per year. Finally, district documents and accounts from school leaders and teachers demonstrate that both the middle and high schools place a strong emphasis on standardized testing. These assessments include (a) STAMP, a world language assessment used to monitor language attainment and qualify select student for a Seal of Biliteracy; (b) the MCAS; and (c) AP examinations at the high school level.

A variety of sources, including district documents and accounts by district leaders and support staff, report that progress monitoring at the middle and high school levels, particularly for students receiving special education services, remains an area of growth for the district. According to both the district’s self-assessments and accounts from support specialists, middle and high schools have struggled to implement systems for skill monitoring among students receiving special education services. Likewise, a districtwide evaluation of Hingham’s special education program conducted in fall 2023 similarly identified the need for a “thorough review” of what data the district is collecting to assign interventions and monitor progress. As recommended in the evaluation:

All staff would benefit from additional training on performance data collection in all forms. There is a concern for the “in between(er)” students that performance data is not being collected in a manner that will drive the instruction for these students who are demonstrating slow or limited progress.

According to both district documents and accounts from school leaders and support staff, the district administers a variety of social-emotional learning universal screeners, including the Student Risk Screening Scale–Internalizing and Externalizing at the elementary schools and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire at the middle and high schools. The district also administers the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) yearly to students in Grades 7, 9, and 11 to gauge the extent to which students engage in health-risk behaviors, such as alcohol and tobacco use. District documents demonstrate that district and school leaders yearly review and analyze YRBS data to present to the school committee and other district stakeholders.

### Data Use

As outlined by the *District Strategic Plan* and articulated in interviews with district leaders, using data to inform instruction and close access and achievement gaps is a major priority for the district. Both district and school leaders reported meeting regularly to review a variety of data sources, including MCAS, benchmark assessments, chronic absenteeism, and failure rates to identify trends and differences between subgroups. One district leader mentioned that the leadership team

implemented a new data system that were developed by Open Architects

that facilitates data access and visualization. Another district leader similarly explained:

Over the past couple of years, [we] have developed a culture of data that existed in pockets before. But we’ve really centered our data practices, and so I do think that is one way that we can ensure that we are disaggregating data to ensure that we are meeting the needs of all students.

District documents and accounts from district leaders demonstrate that the leadership team regularly presents data to the school committee focusing on continuous improvement and closing achievement gaps, including (a) a presentation three times per year on MTSS benchmark data, including achievement and progress on Acadience Reading and i-Ready ELA and mathematics, disaggregated by grade level and special education status; (b) an annual presentation of MCAS data, disaggregated by low income, disability status, and high needs (which encompasses ELs, students with disabilities, and students from low-income backgrounds); and (c) an annual presentation of DESE accountability indicators, including MCAS, SGPs, failure rates, and chronic absenteeism.

A school committee member described in the district self-assessment that these data presentations are “an important component in showing continued progress of the district in addressing learning loss and also closing achievement gaps.” The examination of data with the intention of closing achievement gaps and strengthening MTSS systems is a strength for the district.

The district has made significant strides in enhancing data utilization at the elementary level through the implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), yet there remains a need for improved time allocation and coaching support for data analysis at the middle and high school levels. The district has notably strengthened data use at the elementary level by establishing PLCs at each elementary school, which is a strength for the district. These PLCs allow grade-level teams to meet regularly to review benchmark data, determine intervention groups, and discuss how data can shape instructional practices. Each elementary school has two literacy specialists and one mathematics specialist who lead the PLCs alongside the K-12 curriculum directors. In addition, district leaders, elementary teachers, and support specialists reported that teachers meet regularly with specialists for data meetings to review student progress on benchmark data and assigned tiered assignments (see Tiered Supports section for more details).

At the middle and high schools, departments analyze MCAS results and other common assessments (e.g., midyear and final examinations) annually, according to district documents. Middle and high school teachers reported that data use expectations are set at the departmental level. However, the extent to which departments use common planning time to review or discuss data practices varies. Middle school teachers and support specialists noted that the lack of common planning time limits their capacity to discuss data practices or needed interventions. Similarly, both district and school leaders emphasized the need for data coaches, especially at the high school level, to “build teacher leadership and teacher ownership for data.” A review of the district’s professional development catalogue and accounts from school leaders and staff demonstrates limited opportunities for professional development focused on data use. Although the leadership team has received extensive professional development on inclusive practices, including using data to strengthen MTSS systems, school leaders must design their own school-level professional development on these subjects. Yet, school leaders and staff expressed varying viewpoints on the extent to which schools offered professional learning on data use. School leaders described providing trainings on data two to three times a year, with conversations about data use and equity occurring more frequently during faculty meetings. However, teachers and support staff across school levels reported a lack of professional learning opportunities or training. Creating structured opportunities with sufficient time for middle and high school staff to receive professional development and coaching support on data analysis and usage is an area of growth for the district

### Sharing Results

The district generally shares assessment results with district staff, teachers, students, and parents in ways that are clear, timely, and easily understood and employed. As mentioned in the previous section, district leaders regularly share data externally through school committee presentations and internally through the data system developed by Open Architects. At the elementary level, all teachers have access to student assessment data through grade-level data sheets that specialists regularly update with benchmark data. According to the district’s self-assessment and accounts from elementary teachers and school leaders, the elementary schools also hold data meetings with staff to review student progress toward benchmarks in ELA and mathematics and to support the identification of students who need tiered instruction.

At the middle and high school levels, teachers have access to their students’ MCAS and other standardized test data. However, student support staff across both schools reported that data sharing between teachers and support staff remains challenging because of limited time for collaboration and a lack of designated structures or systems regarding data sharing. For example, specialists in one focus group mentioned the absence of systematic data sheets at the high school, which hinders data sharing efforts. Likewise, support staff across two different focus groups described how administrators are more likely to review schoolwide attendance and discipline data while leaving support staff out of that conversation. One support staff member also noted the lack of an effective system to flag individual students who have accrued many absences:

I found that at the middle school with attendance a lot of times, it’s just in the team meetings with the teachers where they’ll bring up a certain student, and they’re, like, “They’ve been absent a lot.” And then I’ll look at their Aspen and it’s like 20 something absences. And there isn’t like a better system in place right now where we can more easily see that.

These findings align with those from the 2023 special education program evaluation and a 2019 needs assessment of Hingham Middle School’s special education program. Both documents reported a lack of designated time for collaboration between general education and special education teachers and inconsistencies in data collection and sharing. Establishing structures and protocols to facilitate data sharing between secondary teachers and support staff is an area of growth for the district.

Beginning in the 2022-2023 school year, the district provides all families with access to the Aspen Family Portal to view their child’s progress. The elementary schools issue report cards twice per year, and midterm check-ins (for Grades 3-5) and annual parent-teacher conferences offer additional opportunities to share data and discuss individual students’ progress. During parent-teacher conferences, teachers share i-Ready data with parents. However, school leaders deliberately avoid sending i-Ready data home because the lack of context about what scores mean could cause confusion.

Middle school students receive report cards three times per year, whereas high school students receive them four times per year. At both the middle and high school levels, students and parents have immediate access to assignments and grades, according to district documents and accounts from school leaders and teachers. Students across both levels confirmed having access to their grades and assignments through Aspen and Google Classroom. Parents also described receiving “pretty robust, regular communication from teachers” about their children’s progress, although they noted a slight drop-off in communication from elementary to middle and high school. Generally, accounts from school leaders, teachers, parents, and students demonstrate that the district shares data in ways that are meaningful and appropriate—a strength for the district.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should build on its successful progress monitoring efforts at the elementary level to strengthen its progress monitoring systems at the secondary level.*
* *The district should provide additional time and support for data analysis and use, training, and coaching, particularly at the secondary level.*
* *The district should diagnose barriers to sharing data across faculty to improve collaboration between groups supporting the same students.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

The human resources department within Hingham oversees recruitment, retention, formal evaluations, and professional learning opportunities for staff. In recent years, a primary focus of the department, along with the superintendent, has been hiring diverse staff and decentralizing the hiring process. The district developed a *Hiring Handbook* to guide staff in the hiring process, with a particular focus on implementing antibias practices in hiring.

The district has a robust mentoring program for new hires and provides stipends for mentors who organize the program at both the district and school levels. Hingham also has many professional development opportunities throughout the district, both mandatory and optional, for teachers to engage in throughout the year. As reported by teachers and school administrators, Hingham does not currently have any formalized structures in place to recognize exemplary teachers throughout the district.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.

Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Infrastructure](#_Infrastructure) |  | * Ensuring open positions in the human resource department are filled to allow effective operation of essential human resource functions
 |
| [Recruitment, hiring, and assignment](#_Recruitment,_Hiring,_and) | * The district developed a comprehensive hiring handbook to improve the consistency of hiring practices.
 |  |
| [Supervision, evaluation, and educator development](#_Supervision,_Evaluation,_and) | * Close alignment exists between the district’s strategic plan and professional development plan.
* The district has a highly structured district- and school-based mentor program.
 | * Conducting instructional observations more regularly or frequently to inform instructional improvement
* Articulating areas for improvement to support all staff in continuous instructional and professional improvement.
 |
| [Recognition, leadership development, and advancement](#_Recognition,_Leadership_Development) |  | * Enhancing leadership opportunities for teachers to grow professionally within the district
* Developing recognition programs to identify exemplary teachers
 |

### Infrastructure

At the time of the site visit, the human resources coordinator position was vacant, so the superintendent and the director of business and support services were temporarily leading human resources efforts for the district. The superintendent and director of business and support services collaborate to support current and potential employees within Hingham. Overall, the human resources department oversees the district’s hiring process; collaborates with district leadership on retention processes and reporting; stores formal educator evaluations in physical storage; and collaborates with district, school, and department leadership to organize professional learning.

As described by district leaders, the department’s responsibilities for hiring include collaborating with district and school administrators; budgeting for year-to-year staffing needs; posting job descriptions on the district website, School Spring, HandShake, and Indeed; maintaining employee records; and ensuring the onboarding of new hires.

According to district leaders, the district uses the Munis system to maintain employment and payroll records for all employees, and human resource data undergo monthly reviews. However, district leaders indicated that they are “out of cycle” currently because of the human resources coordinator vacancy. Ensuring appropriate unfilled human resources positions are filled to maintain operational stability is an area for growth.

### Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

According to district leaders, the first step in the hiring process is district staff meeting with school principals to determine the staffing needs of each school building. This process starts early in the school year with ongoing conversations throughout the school year between district- and school-based administrators to address staffing and budgetary needs. District leaders emphasized the responsibility for hiring has intentionally shifted from the district to the school level in the past two years to decentralize the hiring process and better meet the needs of each school; they also reported that school principals collaborate with district curriculum directors to conduct a needs assessment and determine staffing levels for the coming school year based on student enrollment data, planned staff retirements, and resignations. School principals confirmed the district’s approach to decentralizing the recruitment, hiring, and assignment process in the district and noted having “complete autonomy.” Further, school principals reported they annually review student enrollment data as well as course selection enrollment to determine staffing needs. Once principals determine school-level staffing needs, they ask district leaders to begin the budgeting, posting, and hiring process. The human resource coordinator then coordinates with the business manager and the superintendent to determine budgetary needs.

To ensure consistency across schools in the interview, hiring, and selection process, district leaders reported the development of a comprehensive hiring handbook that they plan to implement in spring 2024. (At the time of the visit, the handbook had not been distributed given the vacancy of the hiring coordinator position.) The draft hiring handbook provides guidelines for posting positions, conducting prescreening, establishing an interview team, conducting interviews, conducting reference checks, making recommendations to hire, and onboarding. In addition, hyperlinks within the handbook direct users to additional resources, such as protocols, an antibias in hiring slide deck for the interview team to review, and sample interview questions. The development of the district’s hiring handbook is a strength for the district.

District leaders noted having a districtwide goal in the strategic plan to recruit and retain a diverse workforce. As outlined in the district’s equity plan, Hingham’s goal is to “create and implement clear procedures and practices for the recruitment, hiring, and the retention of a racially and ethnically diverse staff that reflects the diversity of our school, local, and national and global community.” The human resource coordinator normally monitors demographic data and works with district leaders to promote and report staff diversification. District leaders reported working with the Massachusetts Partnerships for Diversity in Education (MPDE) in the past but have not taken advantage of the opportunities this year because of human resource department staffing vacancies. The district established six objectives to meet their stated goal: (a) participate and use resources from MPDE; (b) implement consistent exit interviews and survey new staff for onboarding feedback; (c) create consistent hiring protocols; (d) create materials and train staff in the role of bias in hiring and screening of applicants; (e) plan outreach to student teachers, fellows, and practicum students hosted by the district; and (f) post vacancies in locations and institutions with diverse populations. To support the districtwide goal of recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce, the district began providing professional development to all district- and school-level administrators related to bias in hiring. District and school leaders reported that they took the antibias training, and they incorporated the principles of anti-bias in hiring into the new hiring handbook that the district is implementing.

### Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

Depending on the school building and the level of the staff member being evaluated, a building’s principal, assistant principal, or department head oversees evaluations. Throughout the district, evaluations follow DESE regulations, and the district uses a supervision and evaluation tool based on DESE standards. District and school leaders conduct ongoing training for educator evaluations and have been working toward calibrating walkthrough tools to ensure that school leaders have similar approaches to evaluations, observations, and feedback to teachers. Overall, the evaluation process differs for teachers who have professional teaching status and those who do not. Teachers without professional teaching status are evaluated on an annual cycle and work with evaluators to create a developing educator plan. The developing educator plan has five phases and a concurrent timeline that runs from September through June. The five phases include self-assessment and analysis, goal setting, plan implementation and collection of evidence, formative assessment, and summative assessment. Teachers with professional status use the same five phases but undergo evaluations on a two-year cycle. School leaders reported that teachers are formally evaluated every year, and teachers without professional status are observed five times per year. However, teacher focus group participants reported that with ongoing labor disputes and the lack of a contract, observations have not been occurring as regularly as they should. Ensuring informal instructional observations occur regularly is an area of growth for the district.

District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently completed. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample (29 teachers) due for summative evaluations for the 2022–2023 school year, however, only 25 of the teacher evaluations selected for review had a summative evaluation available for review. All of teacher evaluations available for review were complete and did not omit required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating, a student learning SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goal, and a professional practice SMART goal. A large majority of the evaluations reviewed (88 percent) included multiple sources of evidence, such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. Most of the summative evaluations (88 percent) included feedback for each standard and overall feedback related to the teacher’s overall rating, incorporating feedback naming strengths or practices the teacher should continue. However, less than one-quarter (20 percent) of evaluations included feedback indicating areas of improvement.

Based on district records, of the 11 administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2022–2023 school year, 10 evaluations were available for review, and all evaluations reviewed were complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Of the 10 summative evaluations reviewed, nearly all (90 percent) included student learning and professional practice SMART goals. About three-quarters (70 percent of the evaluations) included school improvement SMART goals. Nearly all evaluations reviewed (90 percent) included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards and feedback for each standard, complete with evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback naming each administrator’s strengths, and slightly more than half of evaluations reviewed (60 percent) identified areas of improvement for administrative district staff.

Taken together, the review of teacher and administration evaluations highlights that a strength of the district is in all staff developing student learning and professional learning SMART goals and highlighting areas of strength through the evaluation process. On the other hand, this evidence also highlights an area for growth for the district is articulating areas for improvement to support all staff in continuous instructional and professional improvement.

In terms of other professional development opportunities, as detailed in the two-year *HPS Professional Development Plan (2023–2025),* the district established four professional development goals that align with the district’s strategic objectives: (a) implementation of high-quality curricula and universally designed instruction, (b) implementation of inclusive and culturally responsive practices, (c) fostering a safe and supportive school environment, and (d) mentoring and leadership development. Hingham’s professional development committee, comprising district leaders, curriculum directors, school principals, general educators, and special educators within the district, developed the plan. A review of district professional development documents revealed a robust catalog of building-based, department-based, and districtwide professional development offerings aligned with the four stated professional development goals. Courses are offered by both internal staff and external partners during early release days, which occur once per month during the school year. The professional development committee conducted a midyear (January 2023) survey of teachers to assess course preferences and gather feedback from participants to inform course offerings for the 2023-2024 school year. Elementary teacher focus group participants reported that much of their professional development this year has focused on implementing the new ELA curriculum. At the secondary level, teacher focus group participants reported the primary focus has been on implementing inclusive and culturally responsive strategies. A secondary focus has been on fostering a safe and supportive school environment for both academic and nonacademic learning needs. Alignment between the district’s strategic plan and the professional development plan is a strength for the district.

District and school staff reported that Hingham has an established induction and mentoring program for new instructional staff, which was confirmed by district documentation and teacher focus groups. New hires attend a two-day induction program that provides an orientation to the district, professional responsibilities, classroom management, and the educator evaluation system. Teacher focus group participants reported having been provided mentor teachers when first inducted into the district, and some participants reported serving as mentor teachers.

The organizational structure for the mentor program includes two districtwide co-directors, building liaisons for each school, and mentor teachers. The co-directors facilitate the mentor program, plan and implement orientation and induction activities, organize professional development workshops to support new educators, collaborate with building principals and curriculum directors to pair mentors and mentees, and coordinate with building mentor program liaisons. Building liaisons acclimate new educators to the professional responsibilities of an educator and formally and informally meet during the school year to reflect on practice and plan curriculum and lessons with mentors and mentees. Mentor teachers possess a valid teacher certification and have a minimum of five years of experience and professional status. Mentor responsibilities include attending start-of-the-year orientation sessions; attending monthly afterschool support sessions; conducting peer observations of mentees and providing them feedback; meeting weekly with mentees for one to three hours; providing resources to mentees; and supporting the mentee with implementing curriculum, instruction, and student-centered equitable practices. All positions are stipend positions, with compensation based on the Hingham Education Association contract. The highly structured mentor program at Hingham is a strength for the district.

### Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Across schools, the district provides some opportunities for participating in meaningful teacher leadership activities, such as serving as mentor teachers and working on various committees. District leaders reported that a goal in the district’s strategic plan is to create more leadership opportunities for staff, but they reported a lack of success in growing the leadership pipeline from within the district. Teacher focus group participants similarly reported limited opportunities for career advancement and noted that many of the recent administrative-level positions were filled by individuals from outside the district. Accounts from several teacher focus groups and a district leader demonstrated the need for additional pathways for leadership and career development. Developing leadership opportunities for teachers is an area of growth for the district.

Another area of growth for the district is a lack of districtwide programs to recognize excellence of teachers within the district. In addition to no district programs, district leaders and teachers across all focus groups reported a lack of formal or informal mechanisms to recognize teachers for their exemplary work at the school level.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should prioritize the filling of human resources vacancies, while also designing plans to ensure continuity of daily operations and district initiatives.*
* *The district should develop and disseminate guidance for administrators around conducting informal teacher observations and providing meaningful feedback.*
* *The district should articulate areas of improvement in its evaluations to support all staff in continuous instructional and professional improvement.*
* *The district should explore opportunities to build out its teacher leadership pipelines by investing in distributive leadership models in which teachers can develop leadership skills and hold leadership roles while continuing to teach.*
* *The district should work with school leaders to develop recognition mechanisms that recognize outstanding work at the school and district level.*

## Student Support

Hingham demonstrates a commitment to ensuring a safe, equitable, and inclusive environment for all students, staff, and families. Following an equity audit conducted by an external consultant in the 2022-2023 school year, the district initiated various efforts to implement culturally responsive and inclusive practices. These efforts include providing professional development regarding cultural competency, convening an equity task force, and providing a Tier 1 social-emotional learning curriculum at each school. Although the implementation of the MTSS is not yet consistent across the district, Hingham has notably strengthened its tiered support system by hiring academic specialists, interventionists, and counselors and by revising elementary instructional schedules to include daily intervention blocks for both mathematics and ELA.

Hingham prioritizes engaging families and communities through communication initiatives and strategic partnerships. As part of its strategic plan, the district created a communications plan to increase stakeholder engagement and streamline communication channels. The superintendent meets regularly with the district’s partners, including parent leadership groups such as the parent teacher organization (PTO), to share information and identify opportunities for collaboration.

Table 6 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Safe and supportive school climate and culture](#_Safe_and_Supportive) | * The district demonstrates a commitment to deepening staff understanding of inclusive and culturally responsive practices.
 | * Providing sufficient guidance and support for staff at secondary schools to address student needs and build a sense of belonging for all students
 |
| [Tiered systems of support](#_Tiered_Systems_of) | * The district is dedicated to strengthening MTSS and special education services to promote equity and inclusion.
 | * Clarifying the purpose of the IST teams for staff and strengthening the consistency and effectiveness of MTSS processes at the middle and high schools
* Increasing the number and effectiveness of tiered academic interventions available at the middle and high schools focus on organizational and executive function skills
* Rebuilding the trust between parents and district regarding special education service delivery
* Implementing protocols and processes identified in the 2023 special education evaluation report
 |
| [Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships](#_Family,_Student,_and) | * The district has streamlined its communication platforms and enhanced its overall communication strategy.
* The district meaningfully engages parent leadership groups.
 | * Providing meaningful opportunities for more students to contribute to decision making and planning
 |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

The district demonstrates a strong commitment to creating school and classroom environments that are supportive, culturally responsive, and inclusive of all students, staff, and families. Following an equity audit conducted by an external consultant in the 2022-2023 school year, the district drafted a one-year Equity Plan to address identified needs. The plan focuses on crafting a culturally responsive curriculum, promoting inclusive instructional practices (see Curriculum Use section for more details), providing equity-focused professional development, fostering inclusive hiring practices, and analyzing academic and social-emotional learning data to inform the district’s equity and inclusion strategy. In alignment with the Equity Plan, the district launched several additional initiatives to promote equity and inclusion, such as convening a monthly equity task force at the district level; offering professional development in cultural competency and diversity, equity, and inclusion to leadership and select staff; and administering climate surveys to students, parents, and faculty.

The district also developed a three-year professional development plan that incorporates implementation of inclusive and culturally responsive practices specifically to foster a safe, supportive, and welcoming school climate and culture. District documents and school leaders highlighted various professional development opportunities aimed at creating equitable and culturally responsive learning environments. including (a) the leadership team’s participation in a yearlong professional learning community to strengthen their support for district equity initiatives; (b) select leader and staff participation in DESE’s Culturally Responsive Leadership Academy; (c) coaching through a third party inclusive practices coach at two elementary schools; (d) an antibias workshop held by the Anti-Defamation League; and (e) an inclusive practices leadership fellowship, which offers a select group of teachers yearlong professional development to deepen their understanding of inclusive practices. Although Year 1 activities of these trainings have primarily focused on district and school leadership and select staff, the “Train the Trainer” model aims to disseminate this knowledge to the broader school staff in the coming years. A review of the district’s professional development catalog identified several course offerings to develop staff. The district’s commitment to deepening staff’s understanding of inclusive and culturally responsive practices is a strength for the district.

The equity audit findings, along with accounts from students and school staff, depict largely welcoming and inclusive school and classroom environments. During equity walks as part of the audit, the consultant described observing “a shared commitment to creating calm, welcoming environments” at the elementary schools and “a commitment to kindness, warmth, and supportive relationships” at the secondary schools. Similarly, students across middle and high school focus groups reported feeling welcomed, respected, and safe. Teachers and students at both the middle and high schools also highlighted various clubs and opportunities that promote student engagement, leadership, and celebration of diversity, such as the Gay-Straight Alliance and the World Language Club at the middle schools and the People of Color and Allies club, the Peer Mentor Group, and the student council at the high schools. CLASS scores, while indicating the absence of a negative climate, showed middling scores for Positive Climate, with slightly lower scores at the elementary and high schools (5.0 and 4.9, respectively) as compared to the middle school (5.8). This indicates that some, but not all, students experience a positive classroom climate.

Despite these positive aspects, teachers and parents also reported challenges related to intimidation, bullying, and exclusion at the secondary levels. For example, teachers in one focus group described how “there’s a lot of intimidation that goes on” during the selection of after school clubs at the middle school, whereas parents mentioned multiple instances of student harassment and bullying that school and district administrators did not adequately address. Aligned with these findings, survey data collected as part of the equity audit found that approximately 30 percent of secondary students responded either “neutral” or disagree” when asked if students have a sense of belonging. In the narrative section of the survey, several students also reported instances of feeling isolated and bullied. District leaders described data from climate surveys that indicated an area for growth related to students’ sense of belonging,

We got a lot of information about how people were feeling they didn’t belong here. There was a certain group of people [and] they felt they weren’t welcome . . . [It] was disturbing that people, you know, kids felt that way. And then I think similar results came up with the second one [referring to another climate survey] that the district had done.

Providing sufficient guidance and support for staff at secondary schools to address student needs and build a sense of belonging for all students remains an area of growth for the district.

Regarding the district’s approach to promoting positive behaviors and conduct, teachers and staff described several examples of using positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) at the elementary and middle schools, such as the use of PBIS rubrics at some elementary schools and the Acts of Honor program at the middle school, which recognizes positive student behavior. CLASS scores and accounts by students and staff demonstrate that behavioral expectations are generally well understood and reinforced through student handbooks and the actions of administrators and teachers. Staff in one focus group described that the administrators at their high school “do a really good job” with handling discipline, and CLASS data included high marks for Behavior Management, with averages ranging between 6.9 and 7.0. The district also demonstrates a commitment to reviewing and identifying disparities in discipline and absenteeism data. For example, the equity audit found that although Hingham had a very low student discipline rate, most of the students receiving discipline actions were students with high needs or students with disabilities. As explained in the Data Use section, district leaders have been reviewing these data and are identifying action steps for addressing these disparities.

Despite generally low incidences of disciplinary action, district leaders and support staff reported that since returning from the pandemic, there has been a notable increase in students experiencing emotional dysregulation or demonstrating behavioral issues stemming from trauma. At the elementary level, staff acknowledged school leaders’ recognition of the need to address the root causes of misbehavior, with school counselors occasionally asked to handle discipline issues using restorative rather than punitive approaches. However, one district leader mentioned the need for more work in implementing equitable discipline practices, citing higher suspension rates and the uptick in behavioral dysregulation and chronic absenteeism. The district provides its leadership and counselors with monthly training on identifying root causes of misbehavior, whereas special education educators and paraprofessionals have received training on behavioral de-escalation. In one focus group, support staff expressed a need for additional training for teachers on identifying students who are struggling. The provision of training and supports for addressing social-emotional learning needs are explored further in the next section.

### Tiered Systems of Support

Hingham has structures and systems in place to support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of all students at the elementary level. A review of documents and accounts from school committee members, district leaders, and school leaders demonstrate the district’s commitment to improving MTSS implementation across schools. The district allocated funding (initially from Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER), then through the budget override) to ensure sufficient staff for tiered interventions. These staff include two reading specialists, a mathematics specialist, and additional reading and mathematics interventionists at the elementary schools. The district also added a guidance counselor at each elementary school and more adjustment counselors and specialists at the middle and high schools. As mentioned in the Curriculum Use section, the district also provides professional development on UDL principles to support inclusive and effective Tier 1 instruction. Finally, the district commissioned an evaluation of its special education department in fall 2023 to guide continuous improvement efforts. Hingham’s dedication to strengthening MTSS and special education services to promote equity and inclusion for all students is a strength for the district.

Despite these efforts, district leaders described efforts to implement MTSS systems and processes as emergent. As described in the 2023 special education evaluation, “There are pockets of Tiered Instruction occurring, especially at the elementary level.” As outlined by the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP), each school should have an IST consisting of administrators, counselors, and specialists who meet regularly to review referrals and student data and assign interventions. Support staff at the elementary schools confirmed that each school has an IST that meets approximately every 12 school days to review teacher- or parent-initiated referrals, assign interventions, and engage in progress monitoring using a 6-8 week cycle. Although MTSS processes are more developed at the elementary level, district leaders acknowledged that the “word is still spreading” about IST at the middle and high schools, and no clear structure or system currently exists for identifying students. At the middle school, an IST does not meet regularly, but counselors will instead consult with teachers directly about student needs. Support staff at the high school level acknowledged that an IST exists, but “we definitely could be better about the consistency of meeting.”

Although a DCAP exists, it is not well understood by staff, according to accounts from district leaders and school staff, along with the 2023 special education report. One district leader acknowledged that institutionalizing the DCAP is an area of growth, which is why at the time of the review the district is revising it through consultation with school staff. Both teachers and support staff described a lot of confusion and misunderstanding, particularly at the secondary level, regarding the purpose of the IST and tiered interventions. At the middle school, teachers and families described feeling hesitant to make a referral because they do not see any interventions or actions usually emerging from the IST process. Clarifying the purpose of the IST teams for staff and strengthening the consistency and effectiveness of MTSS processes at the middle and high schools is an area of growth for the district.

District documents and interviews with school staff indicate that schools offer a variety of tiered interventions. At each elementary school, students receive two daily intervention blocks for mathematics and ELA instruction. As mentioned in the Assessment section, teachers use these blocks to deliver Tier 1 differentiated instruction in small groups, determined by i-Ready and DIBELS diagnostic data administered three times per year. Students requiring more intensive Tier 2 or 3 instruction receive it from interventionists during these time blocks. For socioemotional supports, each elementary school implements Toolbox for Tier 1 social-emotional learning, group counseling as a Tier 2 support for students needing social skills development, and individual counseling and crisis management. Support staff described using additional resources (e.g., Everyday Speech, Circle of Friends, Goalbook) to develop additional Tier 2 and 3 supports at the elementary level.

Tiered supports are available at the middle and high schools, but support specialists and the special education report described a lack of comprehensive Tier 2 and 3 supports accessible to all students. At the middle school, interventions include an afterschool MCAS support class (Tier 1), mathematics and ELA labs providing small-group instruction (Tier 2), and reading and decoding instruction for individual students (Tier 3). Counselors administer Second Step lessons once a month as a Tier 1 intervention. Both the middle and high schools provide transition rooms for students returning from extended absences and adjustment counselors for individual or group counseling. The high school offers a Homework Club (Tier 1), a directed study program for organizational and executive functioning skills (Tier 2), and reading and decoding interventions (Tier 2). For Tier 1 intervention, the high school offers a freshman advisory class and mental health programming during health class. In addition, the high school has a Supported Learning Center for students on IEPs with intensive social-emotional learning needs, which complements the Comprehensive Learning Center and the RISE (Reaching Independence Through Structure and Education) program available at all schools.

Despite the supports available, staff across different focus groups described feeling limited in their ability to adequately address students’ academic and social-emotional needs. Staff members in one focus group expressed the need for additional interventions, such as a directed study program at the middle school or a program to help students who have missed instruction because of chronic absenteeism. In another focus group, a staff member explained,

There’s two games here in Hingham: You’re either getting a little bit of support, or you’re on a plan [referring to a 504 or IEP]. I don’t feel that we have a good, solid Tier 2 intervention for kids before they get on a plan . . . I feel like we have a lot of pockets of support here and there but not a full continuum, structured system, or clear exit and entrance criteria to support those struggling learners that aren’t disabled.

Aligned with these findings, the special education evaluation report found that existing tiered supports usually focus on reading and mathematics skill development, rather than addressing general organizational or executive functioning skills. This lack of focus has led to an increase in the number of students referred to special education. Increasing the number and effectiveness of tiered academic interventions available at the middle and high schools focused on organizational and executive function skills is an area of growth for the district.

Both district leaders and school staff described the need for additional interventions and aligned programming to address students with intensive behavioral and emotional issues. As noted in the special education evaluation report, although the high school offers the Supported Learning Center for students on IEPs, no similar program exists at the elementary or middle school levels. Likewise, elementary school support staff emphasized the need for substantially separate social-emotional learning classrooms, explaining that students with severe emotional issues hinder their ability to deliver academic interventions. District leaders recognized this challenge and reported planning the creation of a more intensive social-emotional program at each school, starting with the elementary schools in the 2025-2026 school year.

Another area for growth for the district is engaging parents meaningfully and developing a collaborative approach between parents and the school district to ensure appropriate special education service delivery. One district leader described a historic “lack of trust and a lot of animosity” between the district and parents of students receiving special education services. In one focus group, multiple parents mentioned instances of the district being noncompliant with special education and 504 procedures, resulting in their children receiving inadequate services. Parents also expressed frustration at what they perceived as a lack of responsiveness from the district on these issues. A 2019 needs assessment of special education programming at the middle school found that less than half of surveyed parents were satisfied with the available programming. Both the needs assessment and the 2023 special education evaluation report identified district-level issues with engaging parents properly in the IEP process. These issues included inconsistently providing parents with IEP meeting notes, not notifying parents of vacancies in their child’s service delivery, and using overly technical jargon that parents found difficult to understand. The 2023 report recommended protocols and processes for more meaningful and standardized parent engagement in the special education tiered support process; their implementation is an area of growth for the district.

### Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Hingham recognizes the importance of and has established opportunities toward engaging parents, families, and students in two-way communication and decision making. As outlined in the *District* *Strategic Plan* and echoed by district and school leaders, forming partnerships between families, school, and the community has been a strategic focus for the district. The district created a communications plan to increase stakeholder engagement. As part of the plan, the district conducted surveys in fall 2022 and fall 2023 to evaluate current communication strategies and identify areas for improvement. The district also implemented several initiatives aligned with the communication plan, such as increasing its social media presence, offering more school events focused on transitioning between schools, and standardizing communication across schools.

As a result of this plan, each school uses the same platform (SMORE) to deliver a weekly newsletter. The department of student supports sends out a monthly newsletter, and the district communicates via email as events occur. To improve communication awareness and accessibility, the district released a protocol chain of command and partnered with Lexikeet Language Services to translate communications for ELs and their families. Hingham’s efforts to streamline and enhance its communication strategy represent a strength for the district.

School leaders and staff generally reported a proactive approach to communicating with parents, with one school leader explaining that “they [referring to parents] expect a lot, and we deliver a lot.” District and school leaders cited multiple opportunities for parents to volunteer at their schools or attend parent nights. Support staff mentioned regularly inviting parents to address issues with their children. Parents reported feeling well-informed about school events and appreciated teachers’ and staff’s efforts to initiate outreach. However, several parents mentioned challenges with district leadership being nonresponsive, lacking transparency about public events, or being “hostile” in their responses. A district leader acknowledged “animosity” between the parents of students receiving special education services and the district (see Tiered Supports section).

District documents and accounts from leaders and parents outlined various leadership opportunities for parents and families, such as school councils, the PTO, and the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC). One parent described her experience on the school council as very positive, calling it a “great forum for change” and a “very satisfying experience.” District and school leaders described both the PTO and SEPAC as very active, citing multiple events organized in collaboration with the school. SEPAC also annually surveys the parents of students with special needs and meets with the director of student supports monthly. According to another district leader and the district self-assessment, the superintendent meets monthly with the PTO to support collaboration and share information. As one district leader explained,

I do believe, you know, she meets with all the constituents in town. When there’s an opportunity for a grant, she’ll meet with those folks who can support the grant. If there’s an opportunity to do something in the school, she’ll meet with those parents. She meets with the PTOs. So I think as far as communicating, she’s out there a lot.

Meaningful engagement with parent leadership groups represents a strength for the district.

An area for growth, according to parents and students, is providing meaningful opportunities for more youth to contribute to decision making and planning. One parent mentioned limited opportunities for youth to participate in decision making, with none at the elementary school level. Citing an example in which her elementary-age child wanted to provide feedback on an instructional schedule change that reduced recess time (see Classroom Instruction section), she felt district leadership was overly reactive and dismissive. Similarly, a student in another focus group shared an experience of trying to provide feedback to an administrator and being “shot down.” In both focus groups, students could not recall any instances in which school or district leaders asked for their feedback. Although the high school has a school council and one student remembered attending a school committee meeting, students generally reported that these opportunities were not well promoted to students.

Hingham recognizes the importance of forming partnerships to address the needs of its students and families. District leaders and school staff cited multiple community partnerships that expand student support, including a partnership with Care Solace, which provides mental health coordination and services to students, families, and school staff, and a partnership with Landmark School to support the district’s language-based program. Starting in the 2024-2025 school year, the district aims to partner with McLean Hospital to expand mental health support. The district also plans to expand its dual enrollment offerings through partnerships with Quincy College, Bridgewater State University, and the University of Massachusetts. According to the district self-assessment and district leaders, the Superintendent meets monthly with representatives of these groups to facilitate collaboration with the schools and among the organizations.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should invest in services to support students’ mental health, prevent and address bullying, and promote a greater sense of belonging at the secondary level.*
* *The district should replicate its successes in implementing MTSS at the elementary level to further institutionalize the DCAP and strengthen IST and MTSS processes at the secondary level.*
* *The district should assess the effectiveness and sufficiency of its existing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions available at the middle and high school levels and make additional interventions available, as needed.*
* *The district should work closely with special education administrators and service providers to affirm trust with families and demonstrate transparency.*
* *The district should implement the protocols and processes identified in the 2023 special education evaluation report so that parents can be more engaged in their children’s education.*
* *The district should create and advertise additional opportunities for students to participate in leadership and decision-making across all grades.*

## Financial and Asset Management

Hingham’s town manager and staff from the business and support services office for Hingham work closely to develop yearly and longer-term budgets. District staff prepares budget proposals for review and approval by the school committee, the superintendent, and the town manager, and all key budget documents are publicly available.

The town and district share responsibility for some capital planning and maintenance costs and share auditing services as well. As part of the district’s five-year capital plan, the district is currently focusing on planning for a new school, substantial improvements to an existing school, and planning for anticipated capital needs, which include ADA transition needs, new roofs for several buildings, and aging HVAC systems.

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management.

Table 7. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Budget documentation and reporting](#_Budget_Documentation_and) | * The district provides clear, user-friendly budget documents that are publicly available.
 | * Providing specific details to school committee members regarding the equitable use of funds for specific student groups
 |
| [Adequate budget](#_Adequate_Budget) | * The district obtained an operational override to support student needs.
 |  |
| [Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits](#_Financial_Tracking,_Forecasting,) |  | * Regularly sharing information about spending with principals
 |
| [Capital planning and facility maintenance](#_Capital_Planning_and) | * The town and district collaborate regularly to proactively identify and address capital needs.
 |  |

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

The financial management plan for fiscal years 2024-2028, a nonbinding document signed by the Select Board, the school committee, the superintendent, and the town manager, guides Hingham’s spending and outlines the budget for the next several school years. District staff, led by the director for business and support services, described a process for gathering information from directors, principals, and other school leaders about staffing and other needs to better understand individual school needs and priorities. Using this information, they provide publicly available budget-related presentations, including a financial forecast for the next five years, during the annual budgeting process.

Budget documents shared by the district are clear and user-friendly, with itemized information about the allocation of resources and the sources of funds. The budget documents available also compare budgeted costs to actual costs each year with enough detail that stakeholders can understand how resources past and future budget allocations. All budget documents, going back 10 years and including all budget presentations and itemized budget summary reports, are publicly available on the district website. The provision of clear, user-friendly budget documents is a strength of the district.

According to school committee members, district staff have not always reported on spending in a detailed enough way that committee members could assess the effectiveness of efforts. However, the district recently hired a new business director and established a finance facilities subcommittee that meets monthly. According to school committee members, these efforts have been “helpful at improving the budget-related information that committee members receive.” Still, committee members would like to receive more information related to how equitably, or not, funds are used to meet the needs of specific student groups. Providing specific details to school committee members regarding the equitable use of funds for specific student groups is an area of growth for the district.

### Adequate Budget

District staff and finance reports show that the district exceeded its net school spending requirements for the previous school year. However, according to RADAR data, Hingham’s in-district per-pupil expenditure in 2022 was $18,625, which is lower than the state average and lower than many comparable districts, in terms of wealth and demographics. In fact, school committee members reported that the yearly appropriation funds for the district meet, but “never exceed”, the district’s needs, especially given significant capital needs (see Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance).

Furthermore, as outlined in the *FY2025 Budget Presentation* and echoed by district leaders, the rising costs of gas, special education out-of-district placements, increased student needs requiring more comprehensive MTSS supports, and contractual obligations on personnel have contributed to a projected budget deficit for 2024-2025 school year at the time of the district visit. The Superintendent explained that during and in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, the district experienced an influx of new positions. As noted in the leadership and governance section, in 2023, the superintendent developed an MOU with the town of Hingham to approve an operational override for fiscal year 2024, above the 3.5 percent increase cap in place for the town, to maintain some of those positions, particularly those supporting special education needs. The Select Board of Hingham, the school committee, and the advisory committee approved the override. There is reportedly some contention among stakeholders, though, about how these override funds are being used; teachers expected that the additional funds would support salary increases. Still, seeking and obtaining approval for the override to support student needs is a strength of the district. The district is seeking additional funds from the town to cover the part of the deficit relating to special education costs (as outlined in the MOU), yet district leaders also project potential staff layoffs. However, the exact number of layoffs is challenging to determine because the district is still negotiating contracts with the Hingham Education Association, which will impact teacher compensation.

School committee members and town representatives agreed that the district generally uses its budget effectively. They noted that the district’s MCAS scores and college acceptance rates are both high, despite per pupil spending that is “middle of the road” despite data suggesting they are below comparable school districts Committee members added, however, that the district has had to increase special education–related funding to ensure that student needs are met, which led to the requested override for fiscal year 2024. District staff reported conducting a staffing audit to examine class sizes and staffing needs. Specifically, the audit helped identify especially small classes, and the district used this information to inform staffing decisions.

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

The district’s director of business and support services is responsible for tracking, forecasting, and reporting on district spending. According to the superintendent, the director of business and support services works with a team to do end-of-the-year reporting. District staff added that they have met their year-end reporting requirements, which include presenting to the school committee (typically in June) and getting committee approval for any spending greater than 10 percent of the budget. Committee members added that the finance subcommittee typically receives preliminary end-of-year spending reports between May and June and final reports in July.

School committee members reported receiving updates from district staff on spending at least once per year, through the budgeting process, and then as needed. District staff, however, described providing quarterly reports on spending to the school committee and the superintendent. They acknowledged that they share information about spending with principals less frequently, which is an area of growth for the district.

To forecast spending, district staff described a process for examining spending from the previous year and evaluating any changes to spending that may be necessary. For example, staff talked about CareSolis, a mental health resource funded by the ESSER grant. To keep this resource, without ESSER funds, the district had to make room in the budget. District staff also reported using enrollment data; data regarding special needs such as speech, language, and behavioral needs; and data regarding out-of-district placements to accurately forecast spending.

To monitor the effectiveness of programs, district staff reported relying primarily on student assessment data. District staff pointed to the implementation of MTSS, during and after the COVID‑19 pandemic, as an effective approach to improving student achievement and therefore made sure to maintain funding for MTSS in current and future budgeting. District staff reported formally tracking spending on a monthly basis and “looking at numbers every day” because they are responsible for all procurements.

District staff explained that they have a grant manager who works in collaboration with the finance office to help monitor and manage grant funds. The district provided a grant summary report in June 2023, which showed allocations by grant, with both expended and encumbered costs. District staff also shared and maintain a 10-year summary of grants and revolving accounts for long-term planning and tracking purposes.

Both the town and district finance staff use Munis software for accounting purposes, which district staff described as a “major upgrade” compared with previous systems. According to district staff, the town is responsible for procuring independent financial auditing services for both the town and district at the same time. District staff provided documentation of external auditing, in compliance with DESE requirements, that occurred in June 2021.

### Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

According to district staff, the current superintendent inherited a five-year capital plan from her predecessor, which was developed with the help of an external vendor in spring 2021 and includes considerations related to class size and space needs for specialized student supports. The Hingham town manager works closely with the Hingham superintendent and the school committee to identify and make plans for addressing the district’s long-term capital and ongoing maintenance needs, as outlined in the five-year plan. These key stakeholders representing both the town and the school district reportedly work together “early and often” before district needs become “acute,” and this regular process is a strength of the district.

The superintendent explained that planning for capital needs is part of the district’s overall improvement planning process, and capital planning is integral to the district’s annual budget development, review, and approval process. For example, this year, the superintendent requested additional funding for capital planning projects, including a new school building and improvements to the Plymouth River Elementary School.

To inform the district’s annual capital planning and facilities maintenance efforts, Hingham’s director of facilities meets with each building principal and with finance staff early each school year to review and update the district’s five-year capital plan. The director of facilities presents any proposed updates to the superintendent, the school committee and its finance subcommittee, and the town manager for approval. Updates may relate to preventive maintenance needs or anticipated maintenance or capital needs. For example, the five-year plan includes new roofs, boilers, and HVAC systems that will need updating within the next few years, and facilities staff assesses these needs each year to determine whether they need updates in the coming year. Even though efforts are guided by a five-year plan, the town’s capital committee is responsible for reviewing and approving the plan each year, for one fiscal year at a time.

According to both town and school committee representatives, the town and district share responsibility for some ongoing facility maintenance needs, such as snow removal, whereas the school district handles individual grounds maintenance for each school building. District staff added that they try to address preventive maintenance needs as much as possible each year.

According to key stakeholders, Hingham schools “have a great custodial program, school resource officer program, ADA transition plan, and building compliance plans.” In fact, the district contracted with an external partner in fall 2023 to develop an ADA transition plan for all schools in the district. However, stakeholders also added that they “always need more money” and reported creating a capital stabilization fund for the first-time last year to provide a more stable source of funding for capital needs.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The district should provide regular updates to its school committee on how its spending is (or is not) being equitably spent on different student groups.*
* *The district should develop a system for regularly updating principals on district spending.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Hingham. The team conducted 98 classroom observations during the week of April 22, 2024, and held interviews and focus groups between April 22 and April 24. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

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

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

## Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report
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Introduction

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

Three observers visited Hingham Public Schools during the week of April 22, 2024. Observers conducted 98 observations in a sample of classrooms across six schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Emotional Support | Classroom Organization | Instructional Support |
| * 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\*: 5.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 5.2 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 3 | 43 | 5.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 5.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 32 | 4.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 2] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 21] + [5 x 26] + [6 x 22] + [7 x 19]) ÷ 98 observations = 5.2

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\*: 5.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 5.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 43 | 5.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 23 | 6.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 32 | 5.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 1] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 25] + [6 x 25] + [7 x 37]) ÷ 98 observations = 5.9

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

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 3.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 3.3 |
| Grades K-5 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 43 | 3.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 3.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 3.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 5] + [2 x 23] + [3 x 28] + [4 x 24] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 98 observations = 3.3

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

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

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

Negative Climate

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

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 55, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.[[7]](#footnote-8)

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

Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 6.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 41 | 43 | 7.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 23 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 32 | 7.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:
([6 x 5] + [7 x 93]) ÷ 98 observations = 6.9

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

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

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average\*: 6.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 6.6 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 25 | 43 | 6.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 23 | 6.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 32 | 6.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:
([5 x 5] + [6 x 26] + [7 x 67]) ÷ 98 observations = 6.6

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\*: 6.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 6.6 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 31 | 43 | 6.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 23 | 6.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 32 | 6.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:
([5 x 7] + [6 x 23] + [7 x 68]) ÷ 98 observations = 6.6

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 | 98 | 5.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 14 | 5 | 43 | 5.2 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 23 | 5.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 32 | 4.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 1] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 35] + [6 x 25] + [7 x 11]) ÷ 98 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\*: 2.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 27 | 2.8 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 4 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 2.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 4] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 5]) ÷ 27 observations = 2.8

\*\*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\*: 5.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 71 | 5.0 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 4.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 23 | 5.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 32 | 5.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 11] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 26] + [6 x 22] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 71 observations = 5.0

\*\*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\*: 2.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 71 | 2.6 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 2.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 2.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 32 | 2.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 20] + [2 x 19] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 7]) ÷ 71 observations = 2.6

\*\*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\*: 3.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 98 | 3.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 3.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 3.1 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 3.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 9] + [2 x 28] + [3 x 25] + [4 x 20] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 98 observations = 3.1

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 27 | 3.8 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 0 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 27 | 3.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:
([2 x 4] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 6]) ÷ 27 observations = 3.8

\*\*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\*: 3.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 71 | 3.0 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3.5 |
| Grades 6-8 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 2.8 |
| Grades 9-12 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:
([1 x 18] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 14] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 71 observations = 3.0

\*\*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\*: 5.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 71 | 5.5 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 5.6 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 23 | 5.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 32 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:
([3 x 1] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 26] + [6 x 25] + [7 x 10]) ÷ 71 observations = 5.5

\*\*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 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 25 | 37 | 27 | 61 | 172 | 5.4 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 3 | 43 | 5.0 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 41 | 43 | 7.0 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 43 | 5.9 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 1 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 43 | 3.7 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 24 | 36 | 61 | 129 | 6.1 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 25 | 43 | 6.5 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 31 | 43 | 6.6 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 14 | 5 | 43 | 5.2 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 10 | 34 | 42 | 33 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 145 | 3.3 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 4 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 2.8 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 4.3 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 2.6 |
| Quality of Feedback | 2 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 3.1 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 0 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 27 | 3.8 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3.5 |
| Student Engagement (UE only) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 5.6 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 2] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 12] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 43 observations = 5.0

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 41]) ÷ 43 observations = 7.0. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

|  | Low Range | Middle Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Emotional Support Domain | 2 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 21 | 69 | 4.9 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 5.8 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 23 | 6.0 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 2 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 3.0 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 51 | 69 | 6.7 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 23 | 6.6 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 23 | 6.7 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 23 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 21 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 22 | 20 | 8 | 115 | 3.8 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 23 | 5.4 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 23 | 5.4 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 2.4 |
| Quality of Feedback | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 3.1 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 8 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 2.8 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 23 | 5.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 2] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 10]) ÷ 23 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 2] + [7 x 21]) ÷ 23 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 | 2 | 14 | 10 | 21 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 96 | 4.6 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 32 | 4.9 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 32 | 5.8 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 2 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 3.0 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 80 | 96 | 6.8 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 32 | 6.8 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 32 | 6.6 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 32 | 7.0 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 20 | 28 | 29 | 22 | 34 | 23 | 4 | 160 | 3.7 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 32 | 4.7 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 32 | 5.0 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 8 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 32 | 2.6 |
| Quality of Feedback | 3 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 3.2 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 9 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 2.9 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 32 | 5.2 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 32 observations = 4.9

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 31]) ÷ 32 observations = 7.0
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision.  |
| [Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html) | A series of modules designed to support novice principals and their mentors in the development of antiracist leadership competencies aligned to the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership. |
| [Planning for Success In Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |

Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf) | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision. |
| [Curriculum Frameworks Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/) | Some of the most frequently used resources include “What to Look For” classroom observation guides; the Family Guides to help families understand what students are expected to know and do by the end of each grade; and the Standards Navigator tool and app, which can be used to explore the standards, see how they are connected to other standards and related student work samples, and access reference guides and definitions. |
| [Curriculum Matters Webpage](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/default.html) | A suite of resources to support the use of high-quality curriculum, including [IMplement MA](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/implement-ma.html), our recommended four-phase process to prepare for, select, launch, and implement new high-quality instructional materials with key tasks and action steps. Also includes [CURATE](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate/default.html), which convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate evidence on the quality and alignment of specific curricular materials and then publish their findings for educators across the Commonwealth to consult. |
| [Digital Literacy and Computer Science (DLCS) Curriculum Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/dlcs/curriculum-guide.pdf?v=4/12/2023) | This curriculum guide provides curricular overviews for schools to engage students in learning DLCS concepts and skills aligned to the standards found in the 2016 Massachusetts DLCS Framework. |
| [Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/ccr/ewis/) | Tools for districts to identify students who are at risk of not meeting important academic goals to help students get back on track. This comprehensive system spans first grade through high school graduation and beyond. |
| [Foundations for Inclusive Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) | This guidebook includes tools for districts, schools, and educators that are aligned to the MA Educator Evaluation Framework and promote evidence-based best practices for inclusion. |
| [Guidebook of Culturally Diverse Artists and Artworks](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Finstruction%2Farts%2Fdiverse-arts-guidebook.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | This resource promotes culturally responsive teaching in the arts through the study of culturally diverse artists and their artworks. This guidebook highlights art made by people with racial identities that historically have been and continue to be marginalized. |
| [Mass Literacy Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/massliteracy/) | An interactive site with research, information, and resources on evidence-based practices for early literacy that are culturally responsive and sustaining. There is current information on complex text, fluent word reading, language comprehension, students experiencing reading difficulties, equity in literacy, how to support an MTSS for ELA/literacy, and much more.  |
| [Massachusetts Blueprint for English Learner Success](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/blueprint/default.html) | A framework for EL education in Massachusetts, with embedded Quick Reference Guides and other resources to support implementation. |
| Massachusetts Curricular Resources: * [Appleseeds](https://sites.google.com/view/appleseedsk2/home)
* [Investigating History](https://www.doe.mass.edu/investigatinghistory/)
* [OpenSciEd](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/openscied.html)
 | Free, open-source curricular resources aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. |
| [Planning for Deeper Learning](https://www.doe.mass.edu/kaleidoscope/planning/default.html) | KCL worked with educators and leaders across the Commonwealth to develop tools, protocols, examples, and professional learning experiences. |
| [Supporting Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/culturally-sustaining/default.html) | Culturally and linguistically sustaining practices are essential for all students in the classroom, regardless of their background, culture, or identity. |
| [Synthesized ILT Framework](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsdp%2Fguidebook%2Fappendix-ilt-framework.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | District and school teams can use this resource to reflect and identify specific actions they could take to establish or improve their instructional leadership teams (ILTs). |

Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Approved Early Language and Literacy Assessments for Preschool](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/default.html) | DESE’s Early Learning Team in collaboration with the Department of Early Education and Care is working with a vendor to approve preschool language and literacy assessments to support classroom instruction. |
| [Assessment Literacy Continuum](https://www.doe.mass.edu/acls/assessment/continuum.pdf) | Tool to help teachers identify what aspects of assessment literacy they should focus on for their own goal setting. |
| [District Data Team Toolkit](http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/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. |
| [Early Literacy Universal Screening Assessments](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/screening-assessments.html) | Guidance and support for schools and districts to select and use an early literacy universal screening assessment. Grant funding may be available. |
| [Student Assessment](https://www.doe.mass.edu/assessment/) | Statewide assessments help parents, students, educators, and policymakers determine where districts, schools, and students are meeting expectations and where they need additional support. |

Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Early Literacy Observation Form](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/resources/early-literacy-observation.html) | This tool supports the observation and provision of high-quality feedback to teacher candidates on their practice in evidence-based early literacy. |
| [Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/default.html) | A suite of resources and practical tools for effective and equitable implementation of educator evaluation, including Focus Indicators, a subset of Indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the school year. |
| Induction and Mentoring:* [Teacher Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.html)
* [Principal Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html)
 | Resources that highlight best practices and reinforce the recently updated guidelines and standards for induction and mentoring. |
| [Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/mtel/) | Information on MTEL exams, MTEL alternatives, and licensure requirements for educators.  |
| [OPTIC](https://www.ma-optic.com/) | A professional development tool that supports Massachusetts educators to build a shared understanding of high-quality instruction and improve the feedback that teachers receive. |
| [Professional Learning Partner Guide](https://plpartnerguide.org/) | A free, online, searchable list of vetted professional development providers who have expertise in specific sets of high-quality instructional materials. Schools and districts can use this guide to easily find professional development providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials. |
| [“What to Look For” Observation Guides](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/observation/) | Observation tools to help district staff observe instruction. |
| [Talent Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/talent-guide/default.html) | An online hub of resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on equity. |
| [WIDA Professional Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/prof-learning/wida/default.html) | Provides great information and strategies to support multilingual learners in Massachusetts public schools, and WIDA PDPs satisfy educator licensure renewal requirements. These DESE-sponsored courses are available at no cost to participants and are perfect for teams of teachers seeking impactful collaboration to support students' access to rigorous course content. |

Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support

| Resource  | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Bullying Prevention and Intervention](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/bullying/default.html) | DESE’s Guidance and Technical Assistance for districts/schools related to state requirements for bullying prevention and intervention.  |
| Emergency Management* [Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools](https://rems.ed.gov/) (Federal Guidance)
* [Emergency Management Planning](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/emergencyplan/default.html) (State Guidance)
 | Guidance and Technical Assistance for districts/schools related to emergency management planning and implementation.  |
| Family Partnerships* [DESE Family Portal](https://www.doe.mass.edu/families/)
* [Strengthening Partnerships: A Framework for Prenatal through Young Adulthood Family Engagement in Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/family-engagement-framework.pdf)
* [Learning Standards For Families](https://www.doe.mass.edu/highstandards/default.html)
 | Resources for authentically engaging families in their child’s education and centering families voices in school and district decision making. |
| [Guidance on Updated Expectations for School and District Leaders Related to Student Discipline](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/discipline/updated-expectations.docx) | Guidance on updated expectations for school and district leaders related to student discipline associated with the 2022 mental health law (G.L. c. 71, §37H¾). |
| MTSS Resources: * [MTSS Blueprint, Self-Assessment, and Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/)
* [Massachusetts Tools for Schools](https://matoolsforschools.com/)
 | MTSS is a framework for how districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that every student receives a high-quality educational experience. |
| [Resources for Supporting Immigrant and Refugee Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/resources/immigrant-refugee.html) | An evolving compilation of resources that can support districts in meeting the needs of immigrant and refugee students. |
| [Safe and Supportive Schools Framework and Self-Reflection Tool](https://www.sassma.org/) | These resources can help guide school- and district-based teams to create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures. Through a phased process (with preliminary and deeper dive self-reflection options) teams can create plans based on local context and data, and through examination of six areas of school operation.  |
| [School Breakfast: Breakfast After the Bell Resources](https://www.projectbread.org/resource-directory/breakfast-after-the-bell-resources) | The goal of the Breakfast After the Bell Toolkit Series is to help with the launch and implementation of alternative breakfast models.  |
| [School Wellness Initiative for Thriving Community Health](https://massschoolwellness.org/) (SWITCH) | SWITCH provides resources that support and advance wellness efforts for Massachusetts students, schools, and communities. |
| Social-Emotional Learning:* [SEL Resources Grades 1-3](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/resources/sel1-3/resources-g1-3.docx)
* [SEL Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/bullying/selguide.docx) (K-12)
* [SEL/APL Standards](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/resources/#standards) (PK/K)
* [Playful Learning Institute, Preschool through 3rd Grade](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/pli.html)
* [Culturally Responsive Social-Emotional Competency Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/sel/sel-all.docx)
 | These resources provide evidence-based and developmentally appropriate guidance around supporting social emotional learning in schools. |
| [Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/slife/default.html) | Guidance and resources to support districts in meeting the needs of Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education. |

Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource  | Description |
| [DESE Spending Comparisons Website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/default.html) | A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public. |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grants resources.  |
| [Massachusetts Farm to School Grant Opportunities](https://www.massfarmtoschool.org/announcement/grant-opportunities/) | A summary of state, regional, and national grant opportunities related to farm to school, school gardens, hydroponics, school food and more. |
| [Office for Food and Nutrition Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/) | Resources for school districts, childcare centers, family day care homes, adult day health programs, Summer Eats community organizations, USDA Foods storage and distribution vendors, food banks, and anti-hunger organizations across the Commonwealth. |
| [Planning for Success](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |
| [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) | RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions. |
| [Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets](https://gtlcenter.org/products-resources/spending-money-wisely-getting-most-school-district-budgets) (scroll down to the Research section) | A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.  |
| [Summer Eats | Free Meals for Kids and Teens in MA](https://www.projectbread.org/summer-eats-program?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&gclid=CjwKCAjwzo2mBhAUEiwAf7wjkljB4ngm0uZLSTYsl5hK5QGTkC3mKF_4ae_5AUxyrVs6UiPIIrys1RoCQV0QAvD_BwE) | Summer Eats is a free-of-charge program that provides free meals to all kids and teens, ages 18 and under, at locations all across Massachusetts during the summer months. |
| [Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB) from Education Resource Strategies](https://www.erstrategies.org/cms/files/2752-student-based-budgeting-guide.pdf%29%2C%20from%20Education%20Resource%20Strategies) | This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table D1. Hingham Public Schools: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2023-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | District | Percentage of total | State | Percentage of total |
| All | 3,707 | 100.0% | 914,959 | 100.0% |
| African American | 72 | 1.9% | 88,104 | 9.6% |
| Asian | 107 | 2.9% | 67,847 | 7.4% |
| Hispanic | 142 | 3.8% | 229,930 | 25.1% |
| Native American | 2 | 0.1% | 2,178 | 0.2% |
| White | 3,254 | 87.8% | 484,692 | 53.0% |
| Native Hawaiian | 1 | 0.0% | 790 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic  | 129 | 3.5% | 41,418 | 4.5% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023.

Table D2. Hingham Public Schools: Student Enrollment by High-Need Populations, 2023-2024

|  | District | State |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of district | *N* | Percentage of high needs | Percentage of state |
| All students with high needs | 901 | 100.0% | 24.1% | 515,939 | 100.0% | 55.8% |
| Students with disabilities | 686 | 76.1% | 18.3% | 187,160 | 36.3% | 20.2% |
| Low-income  | 288 | 32.0% | 7.8% | 385,697 | 74.8% | 42.2% |
| English learners | 27 | 3.0% | 0.7% | 119,749 | 23.2% | 13.1% |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2023. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 3,746; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 924,947.

Table D3. Hingham Public Schools: Chronic Absencea Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 3,887 | 6.3 | 13.3 | 9.6 | 22.2 |
| African American/Black | 68 | 28.0 | 36.0 | 20.6 | 25.3 |
| Asian | 119 | 2.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 13.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 147 | 9.0 | 22.1 | 17.0 | 34.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 132 | 2.2 | 14.7 | 15.2 | 23.3 |
| Native American | 2 |  |  |  | 33.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 |  |  |  | 28.3 |
| White | 3,417 | 6.0 | 12.4 | 8.9 | 17.0 |
| High needs | 927 | 13.6 | 22.0 | 16.3 | 30.3 |
| Low income | 348 | — | 30.2 | 27.0 | 33.5 |
| English learners | 31 | 17.6 | 26.3 | 22.6 | 33.5 |
| Students w/disabilities | 674 | 11.2 | 18.8 | 12.8 | 30.4 |

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

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

|   | Fiscal year 2020 | Fiscal year 2021 | Fiscal year 2022 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual |
| Expenditures |
| From local appropriations for schools |  |
| By school committee | $54,319,826 | $56,047,081 | $58,080,851 | $57,385,684 | $62,810,591 | $63,293,226 |
| By municipality | $13,271,428 | $12,864,886 | $10,253,028 | $13,232,504 | $11,732,269 | $12,771,126 |
| Total from local appropriations | $67,591,254 | $68,911,967 | $68,333,879 | $70,618,188 | $74,542,860 | $76,064,352 |
| From revolving funds and grants | — | $6,456,096 | — | $7,197,563 | — | $7,604,635 |
| Total expenditures | — | $75,368,063 | — | $77,815,751 | — | $83,668,987 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program |
| Chapter 70 state aida | — | $7,695,110 | — | $7,955,623 | — | $8,074,033 |
| Required local contribution | — | $36,268,483 | — | $37,505,081 | — | $35,667,963 |
| Required net school spendingb | — | $43,963,593 | — | $45,460,704 | — | $43,741,996 |
| Actual net school spending | — | $57,303,936 | — | $59,253,335 | — | $65,578,171 |
| Over/under required ($) | — | $13,340,343 | — | $13,792,631 | — | $21,836,175 |
| Over/under required (%) | — | 30.3% | — | 30.3% | — | 49.9% |

*Note*. Data as of July 25, 2023, and sourced from fiscal year 2022 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.

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

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Administration | $426 | $471 | $625 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $895 | $1,035 | $1,119 |
| Teachers | $6,847 | $7,649 | $8,494 |
| Other teaching services | $1,551 | $1,736 | $1,588 |
| Professional development | $60 | $69 | $116 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $240 | $275 | $705 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $701 | $780 | $863 |
| Pupil services | $1,087 | $1,263 | $1,447 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,085 | $1,331 | $1,621 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $1,364 | $1,725 | $2,046 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $14,255 | $16,334 | $18,625 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from <https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/per-pupil-exp.xlsx>.
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Table E1. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 1,711 | 73 | 74 | 42 | 24 | 22 | 39 | 3 | 4 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 29 | 53 | 52 | 26 | 39 | 38 | 45 | 8 | 10 | 29 |
| Asian | 50 | 81 | 88 | 64 | 17 | 10 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 70 | 74 | 69 | 22 | 19 | 26 | 43 | 7 | 6 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 67 | 68 | 69 | 49 | 28 | 27 | 35 | 3 | 4 | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 29 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 28 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 45 | — | — | 37 | — | — | 18 |
| White | 1,494 | 73 | 75 | 50 | 24 | 22 | 37 | 3 | 3 | 13 |
| High needs | 453 | 39 | 41 | 24 | 49 | 47 | 45 | 13 | 12 | 31 |
| Low income | 141 | 47 | 41 | 24 | 41 | 48 | 44 | 12 | 11 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 22 | 45 | 55 | 20 | 45 | 32 | 42 | 9 | 14 | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 350 | 30 | 35 | 12 | 54 | 50 | 40 | 16 | 15 | 48 |

Table E2. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 270 | 90 | 87 | 58 | 9 | 11 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 7 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 17 |
| Asian | 14 | — | 93 | 79 | — | 7 | 16 | — | 0 | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 13 | — | 62 | 36 | — | 31 | 39 | — | 8 | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | — | 90 | 63 | — | 0 | 29 | — | 10 | 9 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | 47 | — | — | 11 |
| White | 225 | 92 | 88 | 67 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| High needs | 53 | 59 | 58 | 37 | 33 | 30 | 42 | 9 | 11 | 21 |
| Low income | 30 | 74 | 67 | 39 | 19 | 30 | 40 | 7 | 3 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | 2 | — | — | 16 | — | — | 39 | — | — | 45 |
| Students w/disabilities | 29 | 38 | 45 | 22 | 46 | 34 | 47 | 17 | 21 | 31 |

Table E3. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 1,712 | 67 | 71 | 41 | 29 | 26 | 41 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 29 | 40 | 45 | 21 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 14 | 10 | 32 |
| Asian | 50 | 85 | 88 | 71 | 15 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 71 | 62 | 70 | 19 | 31 | 27 | 47 | 7 | 3 | 34 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 67 | 68 | 69 | 46 | 28 | 27 | 38 | 3 | 4 | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 28 | — | — | 46 | — | — | 26 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 1,494 | 67 | 71 | 49 | 29 | 26 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 11 |
| High needs | 456 | 38 | 40 | 23 | 50 | 50 | 47 | 12 | 10 | 30 |
| Low income | 142 | 41 | 43 | 21 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 13 | 10 | 31 |
| ELs and former ELs | 22 | 64 | 59 | 21 | 27 | 27 | 44 | 9 | 14 | 34 |
| Students w/disabilities | 353 | 32 | 34 | 13 | 53 | 54 | 41 | 15 | 12 | 46 |

Table E4. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 268 | 81 | 82 | 50 | 17 | 17 | 42 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| African American/Black | 7 | — | — | 27 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 15 |
| Asian | 14 | — | 100 | 80 | — | 0 | 17 | — | 0 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 13 | — | 62 | 25 | — | 31 | 57 | — | 8 | 18 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | — | 90 | 54 | — | 10 | 39 | — | 0 | 8 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 32 | — | — | 59 | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | 57 | — | — | 7 |
| White | 223 | 83 | 83 | 60 | 15 | 15 | 36 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| High needs | 51 | 50 | 45 | 27 | 37 | 47 | 57 | 13 | 8 | 16 |
| Low income | 29 | 63 | 52 | 27 | 26 | 45 | 57 | 11 | 3 | 16 |
| ELs and former ELs | 2 | — | — | 14 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 28 |
| Students w/disabilities | 28 | 29 | 36 | 16 | 50 | 50 | 59 | 21 | 14 | 25 |

Table E5. Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 547 | 69 | 71 | 41 | 28 | 26 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
| African American/Black | 9 | 36 | — | 21 | 55 | — | 47 | 9 | — | 32 |
| Asian | 15 | 85 | 93 | 65 | 10 | 7 | 27 | 5 | 0 | 8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 26 | 68 | 73 | 20 | 24 | 23 | 45 | 8 | 4 | 35 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 17 | 87 | 71 | 47 | 13 | 29 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 31 | — | — | 44 | — | — | 25 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | 41 | — | — | 16 |
| White | 480 | 68 | 71 | 50 | 29 | 26 | 38 | 3 | 3 | 11 |
| High needs | 137 | 39 | 36 | 23 | 49 | 53 | 46 | 13 | 12 | 31 |
| Low income | 50 | 44 | 28 | 22 | 44 | 60 | 46 | 11 | 12 | 32 |
| ELs and former ELs | 8 | — | — | 18 | — | — | 43 | — | — | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 97 | 33 | 32 | 14 | 52 | 53 | 40 | 15 | 15 | 45 |

Table E6. Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

| Group | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 255 | 80 | 76 | 47 | 18 | 20 | 42 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 7 | — | — | 26 | — | — | 55 | — | — | 20 |
| Asian | 13 | — | 100 | 75 | — | 0 | 21 | — | 0 | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 8 | — | — | 24 | — | — | 52 | — | — | 24 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 10 | — | 90 | 51 | — | 0 | 39 | — | 10 | 10 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 30 | — | — | 58 | — | — | 12 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 31 | — | — | 54 | — | — | 15 |
| White | 216 | 81 | 77 | 55 | 18 | 21 | 39 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| High needs | 46 | 50 | 39 | 26 | 40 | 46 | 54 | 10 | 15 | 21 |
| Low income | 24 | 60 | 50 | 26 | 32 | 42 | 53 | 8 | 8 | 21 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | 13 | — | — | 50 | — | — | 38 |
| Students w/disabilities | 26 | 33 | 27 | 16 | 48 | 50 | 53 | 19 | 23 | 31 |

Table E7. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2023

| Grade | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | 298 | 71 | 75 | 44 | 26 | 22 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| 4 | 287 | 72 | 69 | 40 | 26 | 26 | 43 | 2 | 5 | 17 |
| 5 | 293 | 72 | 78 | 44 | 27 | 20 | 40 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| 6 | 290 | 77 | 72 | 42 | 17 | 24 | 34 | 5 | 3 | 24 |
| 7 | 287 | 74 | 79 | 40 | 23 | 18 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
| 8 | 256 | 71 | 73 | 44 | 24 | 21 | 34 | 5 | 6 | 22 |
| 3-8 | 1,711 | 73 | 74 | 42 | 24 | 22 | 39 | 3 | 4 | 19 |
| 10 | 270 | 90 | 87 | 58 | 9 | 11 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 11 |

Table E8. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2023

| Grade | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | 300 | 65 | 69 | 41 | 31 | 28 | 39 | 4 | 3 | 20 |
| 4 | 287 | 76 | 78 | 45 | 22 | 20 | 37 | 1 | 3 | 18 |
| 5 | 288 | 71 | 79 | 41 | 26 | 20 | 46 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| 6 | 291 | 75 | 70 | 41 | 22 | 27 | 42 | 3 | 2 | 17 |
| 7 | 287 | 62 | 68 | 38 | 35 | 28 | 40 | 3 | 5 | 22 |
| 8 | 259 | 52 | 63 | 38 | 42 | 33 | 42 | 6 | 4 | 20 |
| 3-8 | 1,712 | 67 | 71 | 41 | 29 | 26 | 41 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| 10 | 268 | 81 | 82 | 50 | 17 | 17 | 42 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

Table E9. Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2023

| Grade | # included (2023) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations | Percentage partially meeting expectations | Percentage not meeting expectations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 5 | 289 | 76 | 80 | 42 | 22 | 18 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 19 |
| 8 | 258 | 62 | 61 | 41 | 33 | 34 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 19 |
| 5 and 8 | 547 | 69 | 71 | 41 | 28 | 26 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
| 10 | 255 | 80 | 76 | 47 | 18 | 20 | 42 | 1 | 3 | 11 |

Table E10. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 1,366 | 58.6 | 55.4 | 49.7 |
| African American/Black | 24 | 59.7 | 46.0 | 48.0 |
| Asian | 40 | 67.8 | 67.0 | 56.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 60 | 57.2 | 51.4 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 53 | 54.3 | 56.9 | 50.0 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 46.7 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 50.5 |
| White | 1,189 | 58.5 | 55.3 | 50.0 |
| High needs | 354 | 50.2 | 51.2 | 47.3 |
| Low income | 121 | 51.0 | 51.0 | 47.0 |
| ELs and former ELs | 15 | — | — | 49.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 267 | 48.9 | 50.6 | 43.7 |

Table E11. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 247 | 51.6 | 52.0 | 49.5 |
| African American/Black | 7 | — | — | 45.5 |
| Asian | 13 | — | — | 56.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 7 | — | — | 45.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | 51.3 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 46.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 45.2 |
| White | 210 | 51.5 | 52.2 | 50.7 |
| High needs | 44 | 58.9 | 48.7 | 44.7 |
| Low income | 25 | 54.6 | 57.8 | 44.9 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | 42.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 24 | 62.7 | 43.9 | 39.9 |

Table E12. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 1,363 | 52.2 | 52.1 | 49.8 |
| African American/Black | 23 | 47.6 | 43.9 | 47.8 |
| Asian | 40 | 59.4 | 61.3 | 57.7 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 60 | 55.5 | 51.5 | 47.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 53 | 48.3 | 51.5 | 50.3 |
| Native American | — | — | — | 47.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 51.5 |
| White | 1,187 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 50.1 |
| High needs | 355 | 50.3 | 52.1 | 47.8 |
| Low income | 120 | 47.6 | 52.4 | 47.3 |
| ELs and former ELs | 15 | — | — | 49.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 269 | 51.1 | 51.1 | 44.8 |

Table E13. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All students | 245 | 60.7 | 61.5 | 49.6 |
| African American/Black | 7 | — | — | 41.4 |
| Asian | 13 | — | — | 55.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 7 | — | — | 41.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | 51.1 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | 45.4 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | 56.1 |
| White | 208 | 61.5 | 61.3 | 52.9 |
| High needs | 41 | 59.2 | 56.6 | 43.9 |
| Low income | 23 | 60.2 | 58.6 | 43.2 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | 40.2 |
| Students w/disabilities | 23 | 57.9 | 54.5 | 41.7 |

Table E14. Next-Generation MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 273 | 57.7 | 54.8 | 49.4 |
| 5 | 287 | 63.9 | 58.4 | 49.8 |
| 6 | 281 | 65.5 | 57.7 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 275 | 52.4 | 58.6 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 250 | 52.6 | 46.2 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 1,366 | 58.6 | 55.4 | 49.7 |
| 10 | 247 | 51.6 | 52.0 | 49.5 |

Table E15. Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2023) | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 273 | 60.8 | 66.7 | 49.6 |
| 5 | 284 | 61.6 | 56.9 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 282 | 54.0 | 45.6 | 49.9 |
| 7 | 273 | 45.5 | 44.4 | 49.9 |
| 8 | 251 | 37.8 | 46.6 | 49.7 |
| 3-8 | 1,363 | 52.2 | 52.1 | 49.8 |
| 10 | 245 | 60.7 | 61.5 | 49.6 |

Table E16. Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 319 | 98.4 | 95.3 | 96.6 | 90.1 |
| African American/Black | 6 | — | — | 100 | 86.2 |
| Asian | 9 | 100 | — | 100 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 92.9 | 83.3 | 92.9 | 81.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 13 | 100 | 83.3 | 92.3 | 88.7 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.2 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 277 | 98.6 | 95.6 | 96.8 | 93.2 |
| High needs | 82 | 95.9 | 84.6 | 91.5 | 83.9 |
| Low income | 52 | 91.4 | 82.5 | 90.4 | 83.2 |
| English learners | — | — | — | — | 73.1 |
| Students w/disabilities | 42 | 95.8 | 83.3 | 88.1 | 78.0 |

Table E17. Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2021) | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | State (2021) |
| All | 319 | 96.5 | 98.4 | 97.2 | 91.8 |
| African American/Black | 5 | — | — | — | 88.1 |
| Asian | 5 | — | 100 | — | 97.0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | 92.9 | 83.3 | 84.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | 100 | 100 | 91.2 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 84.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 87.7 |
| White | 297 | 97.0 | 98.6 | 97.3 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 65 | 87.7 | 95.9 | 90.8 | 85.8 |
| Low income | 40 | 81.5 | 91.4 | 85.0 | 85.1 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 48 | 85.2 | 95.8 | 89.6 | 80.6 |

Table E18. Annual Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All | 1,202 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 22 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 42 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 44 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 40 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Native American | 1 | — | — | — | 4.3 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 1.2 |
| White | 1,053 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.3 |
| High needs | 194 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 106 | — | — | 2.8 | 3.8 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 7.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 109 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 |

Table E19. In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 3,858 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 67 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 119 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 146 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 130 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 1.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| White | 3,392 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| High needs | 949 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 2.0 |
| Low income | 333 | — | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| English learners | 32 | — | — | — | 1.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 706 | — | 1.2 | 1.0 | 2.5 |

Table E20. Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 3,858 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 2.5 |
| African American/Black | 67 | — | — | — | 5.0 |
| Asian | 119 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 146 | — | — | — | 3.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 130 | — | — | — | 3.0 |
| Native American | 2 | — | — | — | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 2 | — | — | — | 3.1 |
| White | 3,392 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
| High needs | 949 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 3.8 |
| Low income | 333 | — | 1.1 | 1.8 | 4.3 |
| English learners | 32 | — | — | — | 2.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 706 | — | 0.8 | 1.3 | 4.7 |

Table E21. Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | State (2023) |
| All | 599 | 84.4 | 83.8 | 87.8 | 65.8 |
| African American/Black | 7 | 36.4 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 57.3 |
| Asian | 17 | 92.9 | 81.8 | 100 | 84.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 21 | 57.1 | 72.0 | 76.2 | 51.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 18 | 83.3 | 90.9 | 94.4 | 67.4 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50.6 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 60.0 |
| White | 536 | 86.1 | 84.6 | 88.8 | 70.4 |
| High needs | 72 | 47.6 | 51.5 | 45.8 | 49.8 |
| Low income | 38 | — | 62.5 | 57.9 | 50.7 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 31.7 |
| Students w/disabilities | 42 | 33.9 | 31.1 | 28.6 | 36.0 |

Table E22. Accountability Percentile and Classification, 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| District | 88 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| East Elementary School | 62 | 87 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Plymouth River Elementary School | 91 | 95 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | School of Recognition |
| South Elementary School | 100 | 99 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | School of Recognition |
| William L. Foster Elementary School | 99 | 99 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Hingham Middle School | 76 | 84 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |
| Hingham High School | 96 | 90 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting or exceeding targets |

1. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. CURATE: CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Districts with similar demographics and similar wealth are based on [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR) data](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) retrieved in February 2024. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Average student growth percentile (SGP) ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0—29.9, Low Growth = 30.0—39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0—59.9, Exceeded Typical Growth = 60.0 or higher. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. More recent editions of this curriculum are rated as meets expectations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)