

South Hadley Public Schools

Targeted District Review Report

December 2022

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

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

American Institutes for Research

Education Systems and Policy

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



Contents

Executive Summary 1

South Hadley Public Schools: District Review Overview 3

Curriculum and Instruction 7

Assessment 13

Student Support 16

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities A-1

Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report B-1

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

Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures D-1

Appendix E. Student Performance Data E-1



MASSACHUSETTS

Department of Elementary
and Secondary Education



AIR[®]

Advancing Evidence.
Improving Lives.

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

Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner

Published August 2023

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

© 2023 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper.

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

Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a comprehensive review of South Hadley Public Schools (hereafter, South Hadley) in December 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on three of the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.¹

Curriculum and Instruction

South Hadley has experienced leadership turnover at the middle school, an elementary school, and the district office, resulting in a breakdown in systems for reviewing curricula on a regular schedule. District leadership is aware of this breakdown and has developed a plan to restart the curricular review process by first reestablishing a curricular review committee that involves building principals, teachers, and district leaders.

Vertical and horizontal curricular alignment is an area of growth for the district, particularly at the elementary and middle school levels. The district has documents that show the supports available to students to meet individual learning needs; however, translating these supports into practice remains a challenge at all levels. The district lacks assessment tools to understand gaps in students' knowledge and skills, so teachers cannot adequately target their instruction to meet student needs. The district recognizes the importance of assessment tools and has started implementing iReady for Grades K-8 to address this area of need.

Currently, because of contractual limitations, the district is using an outdated evaluation tool that, according to some district and school leaders, has resulted in challenges for supporting teachers through instructional observations, feedback, and coaching. South Hadley is working to negotiate a contract that includes adding an updated evaluation system and tools, but as of December 2022, updates have not been adopted.

Four observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited South Hadley during the week of December 5, 2022. The observers conducted 68 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 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 mixed evidence of emotional support, instructional support, student engagement (Grades 4-5), and rigorous classroom organization. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of emotional support, instructional

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

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

support, student engagement, and rigorous classroom organization. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of emotional support, instructional support, rigorous classroom organization, and student engagement.

Assessment

Data and assessment systems are an area for growth for South Hadley. Classroom-level assessments, including subject area tests and literacy screeners, are used to gather data on student performance. However, teachers noted that these assessments are incoherent, and both teachers and students would benefit from the adoption of districtwide assessments.

The lack of assessment systems translates to a lack of data available for teachers to inform their instructional decisions, communicate student progress with relevant stakeholders, and accurately identify students who may need more intensive supports and interventions.

Student Support

South Hadley provides a safe and supportive environment for students and provides students opportunities to reflect on their experiences related to school climate. The district has some social-emotional supports in place for students and has increased its focus on social-emotional learning following the COVID-19 pandemic. However, social-emotional curricula are better embedded at the elementary and high school levels than at the middle school. Students have meaningful leadership opportunities, and families reported receiving communication from the district, school leaders, and individual teachers as needed. Overall, the district creates welcoming environments for students, but districtwide supports and services are an area for growth.

South Hadley Public Schools: District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management. The South Hadley review focused on only the three student-centered standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. In addition, 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 South Hadley was conducted during the week of December 5, 2022. The site visit included 13 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 71 stakeholders, including district administrators, school staff, students, and students' families. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with seven elementary school teachers, four middle school teachers, and seven high school teachers; two student focus groups; and two family focus groups. The team conducted one focus group with middle school students and one focus group with high school

students. The family focus groups consisted of one in-person focus group and one virtual focus group; the virtual focus group was open to all families who could attend.

The site team also conducted 68 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

District Profile

South Hadley is led by Mark McLaughlin, who was appointed interim superintendent in 2022, as well as an assistant superintendent for finance and business operations and the director of human resources.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were approximately 149 teachers in the district, with 1,678 students enrolled in the district’s four schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

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

School	Type	Grades served	Enrollment
Plains Elementary School	Elementary	PK-1	307
Mosier Elementary School	Elementary	2-4	345
Michael E. Smith Middle School	Middle	5-8	526
South Hadley High School	High	9-12	500
Total			1,678

Note. Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2020 and 2023, overall student enrollment decreased by 222 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.

School and Student Performance

In ELA in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) declined 7 percentage points, from 41 percent in 2019 to 34 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 41 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 24 percentage points, from 70 percent in 2019 to 46 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 58 percent (see Tables E1 and E2 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 20 percentage points for Asian students, by 11 percentage points for both Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and White students,

and by 1 percentage point to 6 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 10 percentage points to 18 percentage points for students with disabilities, high needs students, students from low-income households, and White students and by 1 percentage point for Hispanic/Latino students.

In mathematics in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 12 percentage points, from 41 percent in 2019 to 29 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 39 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 20 percentage points, from 60 percent in 2019 to 40 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 50 percent (see Tables E3 and E4 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 33 percentage points for Asian students, by 11 percentage points for Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, by 15 percentage points for White students, and by 2 percentage points to 9 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 26 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and by 13 percentage points to 17 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

In science in Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS was 54 percent in both 2019 and 2022, which is above the 2022 state rate of 42 percent. In Grade 10, 46 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 47 percent (see Tables E5 and E6 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was above the state rate by 23 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students; above the state rate by 5 percentage points to 8 percentage points for White students, high needs students, and students from low-income households; and equal to the state rate for ELs and former ELs and students with disabilities.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was above the state rate by 3 percentage points for students from low-income households, equal to the state rate for high needs students, and below the state rate by 7 percentage points to 11 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the Next-Generation MCAS in Grades 3-8 was 47.1 in ELA and 44.3 in mathematics, which represent typical growth. In Grade 10, SGPs were typical in ELA (43.7) and mathematics (48.0)³ (see Tables E7-E10 in Appendix E).

- ELA and mathematics SGPs in Grades 3-8 were typical for most student groups with reportable data, ranging from 42.2 to 47.1 in ELA and from 41.0 to 48.4 in mathematics. The mathematics SGP for students with disabilities in Grades 3-8 was low (37.6).
- In Grade 10, ELA SGPs were typical for White students (44.9) and high needs students (40.6). SGPs in mathematics also were typical for White students (51.6) and high needs students (41.5). Grade 10 SGPs for students from low-income households were low in both ELA (35.5) and mathematics (39.5).

South Hadley's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 0.6 percentage point, from 95.9 percent in 2020 to 96.5 percent in 2022. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 1.2 percentage points, from 96.1 percent in 2019 to 97.3 percent in 2021 (see Tables E16 and E17 in Appendix E).

- The four-year-cohort graduation rate was above the state rate in 2022 by 16.1 to 14.3 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and students with disabilities, respectively, and by 3.2 percentage points to 8.6 percentage points for every other student group with reportable data.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate increased from 2018 and 2021 by 1.8 percentage points to 7.8 percentage points for each student group with reportable data.

The district's annual dropout rate was 0.5 percent in 2020 and 0.7 percent in 2022, which was below the state rate of 2.1 percent (see Table E20 in Appendix E). The dropout rate in South Hadley was below the state rate in 2022 for each student group with reportable data.

³ Average SGP ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0–29.9, Low Growth = 30.0–39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0–59.9, High Growth = 60.0 or higher.

Curriculum and Instruction

South Hadley has experienced leadership turnover at the middle school, an elementary school, and the district office, resulting in a breakdown in systems for reviewing curricula on a regular schedule. District leadership is aware of this breakdown and has developed a plan to restart the curricular review process by first reestablishing a curricular review committee that involves building principals, teachers, and district leaders. Students make many transitions to different buildings throughout their academic careers in South Hadley. At the time of the district review, there was no evidence of vertical alignment of curricula across schools.

Although district documents show South Hadley has supports available to meet students' different learning needs, district staff reported several barriers to supporting all students, including a lack of horizontal, vertical, and cross-curricular alignment between special education and general education. The district lacks tools to assess students' academic readiness, diagnose students' skill and knowledge gaps, and monitor student progress. However, the district has started implementing iReady to address this area of need.

Currently, because of contractual limitations, the district is using an outdated version (2012) of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework to evaluate teachers, which limits the support that teachers receive through instructional observation, feedback, and coaching. South Hadley is working to negotiate a contract that includes the current state evaluation system and tools, but as of December 2022, updates have not been adopted.

Table 2 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.

Table 2. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Curriculum and Instruction Standard

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Curriculum selection and use		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The curricular selection and review process ■ Lack of alignment of Grades K-8 curricula to statewide curricular frameworks ■ Implementation of new curricula ■ Absence of clear vertical curricular alignment between elementary schools
Classroom instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers collect student feedback to inform adjustments to instructional practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Using data to identify and inform differences in students' learning needs, skill levels, interest, and levels of readiness in Grades K-8
Student access to coursework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ High school students have a wide variety of courses available. 	

Curriculum Selection and Use

South Hadley currently lacks a regular, rigorous, transparent, and inclusive process for selecting curricula, which is an area of growth for the district. The district experienced turnover in district and school leadership, causing a breakdown in several systems, including the system for curricular reviews. District leaders and teachers in the elementary and middle school buildings said that ongoing decisions about curricula tend to be made by subject area specialists without larger stakeholder involvement or transparency for the process and decisions. With the turnover of several key leadership positions, district leaders paused the curricular review process to revise it and ensure that (a) district and building administrators are involved, and (b) decisions align with CURATE.⁴

Staff from all grade levels said their locally created curricula are documented, with online access to curriculum maps for each course. The district provided these maps as evidence of the documented curricula. Staff at South Hadley, including district leaders, building leaders, and teachers, said that the Grades K-8 curricula in the district do not align with the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, which is an area of growth for the district. Vertical alignment for Grades K-8 also is an area of growth for South Hadley. District leaders acknowledged having no districtwide scope and sequence document.

In South Hadley, students transition to the upper elementary school as they enter Grade 3. Teachers explained that the lower and upper elementary schools lack vertical alignment of curricula. Although both schools use Fountas and Pinnell for Grades K-4, the fidelity of implementation is inconsistent. Teachers reported using pieces from many other curricular resources to construct the curricula for various subject areas; individual teachers determine these pieces, but the process is not systematic. Teachers agreed that several curricular changes have occurred in recent years, but these changes have not been communicated adequately. The lower elementary school largely models the ELA curriculum after the Literacy Collaborative approach, whereas the upper elementary school is beginning to adopt the science of reading. In addition to disjointed curricula between schools, elementary teachers said that they often pay for supplemental materials to support instruction. Middle school teachers explained that the science curricular resources are difficult to use and do not completely align to the Massachusetts science standards.

High school teachers said that their ELA curriculum is (a) based on the Massachusetts state frameworks, (b) driven by the use of novels to teach the standards, and (c) supplemented with additional units. For example, in addition to structuring the scope and sequence around novels, they include specific poetry units. For mathematics, teachers explained that the curriculum is based on the Massachusetts state frameworks; they are moving away from using specific textbooks and instead pulling resources from a variety of places. The culinary and carpentry curricula are driven by industry standards, based on the Massachusetts frameworks, the Massachusetts code books, and ProStart, which is owned by the National Restaurant Association. Teachers agreed that they are mostly satisfied with the curriculum and are committed to its continuous improvement.

The application of curricula is an additional area for growth in South Hadley. District leaders described a perception that many teachers do not implement newly purchased curriculum packages

⁴ CURATE: CUrriculum RATings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>.

and continue to use their old curricular resources. Some teachers also explained during focus groups that all colleagues do not implement new curricula, making it difficult to establish consistency, coherence, and alignment vertically and horizontally. The lack of consistent implementation of curricula also translated to family reactions. Parents described that inconsistent outcomes across grade levels on MCAS may be the result of instruction not aligned with grade-level standards. Districtwide, teachers select instructional strategies independently, so the use of student grouping or project-based instruction varies across grades and subject areas. Pacing in grade-level content is similarly varied. However, the district has hired instructional coaches to help increase consistency in instruction in the Grades 2-4 elementary school.

Classroom Instruction

Four observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited South Hadley during the week of December 5, 2022. The observers conducted 68 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 South Hadley, 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 South Hadley is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

In summary, findings from the South Hadley observations were as follows:

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (5.6 for K-5, 4.6 for 6-8, and 5.9 for 9-12).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (6.0 for K-5, 6.5 for 6-8, and 6.8 for 9-12).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (3.9 for K-5, 3.6 for 6-8, and 5.3 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 Grades 4-5 and 6-8 (5.4 and 5.1, respectively) and the high range for Grades 9-12 (6.6).

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

Interview data concur with the instructional observations data, showing lower instructional support scores in the elementary grades; interviewees also shared that standards-based, grade-level instruction is less consistent at the elementary level than at the high school level. Relatedly, high school students and some middle school students indicated that their teachers offer hands-on, group projects and connect current events to instruction, particularly in social studies classrooms. High school students also think their teachers hold appropriately high expectations. Some participating middle school students expressed less connection to their teachers and the content of their classes.

South Hadley offers opportunities for some students to develop social-emotional competencies. Special education teachers described mixed experiences across the district. For example, teachers explained that one school uses a program called Social Thinking, which is open to any student who needs support with social cognition. South Hadley also offers the Transitional Therapeutic Program for students with social-emotional needs. These students can attend regular support groups that focus on skill building that are led by guidance and adjustment counselors. Conversely, special education teachers said they would benefit from having additional support available to help with student behavior and needs. Currently, with the lack of available staff, special education teachers handle most behavior issues by themselves. The lower elementary school uses the Second Step curriculum with all students to develop social-emotional competencies. School leaders, special education teachers, and elementary teachers agree that Second Step is used to provide weekly lessons. Student support specialists said that the middle school uses Zones of Regulation to support students with social-emotional development. They further explained that as students move up in grade level, the tool is phased out because it is not as developmentally appropriate for older students. Furthermore, school leaders explained that high school advisory teachers have started including social-emotional lessons designed by guidance counselors.

Using data to identify and inform differences in students' learning needs, skill levels, interest, and levels of readiness is an area of growth for Grades K-8. District leaders, school leaders, and teachers agree that data are not consistently used to inform instruction. District-submitted documents, including school improvement plans, activity plans for ELs, and the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP), demonstrate how instructional decisions are informed by differences in students' learning needs, skill levels, interests, and levels of readiness. The district's *School Improvement Plans, 2022-2024* outline different priorities related to informing instructional decisions. The middle school highlighted a focus to implement multitiered systems of support (MTSS), and the high school's plan points to the intention to identify assessments for core subject competencies. However, district leaders and multiple teacher focus groups agreed about continued limitations in meeting students' diverse learning needs. Teachers explained that MTSS is not implemented with fidelity, and Tier 1 instruction is an area the district continues to focus on strengthening. The district recently invested in iReady for Grades K-8 to support a better diagnosis of student needs. The district's *Focus on Data* presentation document was shared during a professional development meeting in November 2022 and noted that the assessment will measure student progress toward intended outcomes. District leaders and school leaders are hopeful this will provide helpful data for understanding student readiness and needs.

The consideration of student feedback to inform adjustments to practice is a strength of the district. High school teachers agreed about the emphasis on engaging students in collaborative group work and project-based learning. High school students explained that their teachers collect frequent feedback through Google Forms. Parents of middle school students said their students' teachers use a lot of group work and group projects, further explaining that teachers also incorporate technology into their lessons to make learning activities more engaging for students. One parent explained that in the elementary school, "it's no longer the traditional classroom, which is great." Parents asserted that the collaborative teaching style engages students, and they have noticed their students enjoying what they are learning. Parents also like that classrooms focus on collaborative learning to foster relationships between students. High school students commented on their experience in their classes and agreed that their teachers focus on providing meaningful lessons. Middle school students commented on their experience in their classes, saying that teachers often let them choose if they would like to work individually or in a group. However, middle school students said they have a difficult time understanding how what they are learning is connected to real life.

Student Access to Coursework

South Hadley provides standard core courses in the elementary and middle school levels and offers a wide variety of courses at the high school level. The wide variety in course selection at the high school is a strength of the district. District staff submitted multiple syllabi and curriculum maps to illustrate the course offerings in the district. Schools in the district offer core courses with arts rotations in the elementary grades, and the middle school provides exploratory courses for students rotating through them each trimester. The middle school formerly offered foreign language as an option but recently cut the program. Students and parents expressed their disappointment and a desire to have these course options return. The high school offers Advanced Placement (AP) courses and vocational courses in criminal justice, carpentry, and culinary arts. When asked to name their favorite courses, high school students identified AP courses and vocational courses as favorites

because students are challenged and supported. The school offers an array of courses to determine students' interest; the school has had to cancel select classes, particularly higher-level mathematics courses, because of low enrollment. However, the district offers online AP courses for a variety of courses to accommodate student interest.

Recommendations

- The district should conduct a review of its curricula and implementation, with the aim of implementing CURATE-rated curricula in the core subject areas and ensuring their consistent use across grades. Components of this review should include a districtwide scope and sequence; a formalized and robust curricular review process; and intentional, vertical integration of the social-emotional learning curriculum.
- The district should ensure that high-performing students continue to have access to rigorous coursework in the face of low enrollment, through blended models or alternative means.
- The district should utilize data to better identify and inform differences in students' learning needs, skill levels, interest, and levels of readiness in Grades K-8, whether through iReady or other tools.

Assessment

Districtwide assessments are sparsely available, and teachers use locally created assessments to identify student knowledge and skill gaps. The district has taken steps to adopt a districtwide assessment system for use as a diagnostic and progress monitoring tool. The paucity of districtwide assessment systems translates to a lack of standardized data to inform teachers' understanding of student achievement and growth, thus making it challenging to adjust their instruction based on student needs. The lack of data also hinders teachers' ability to communicate detailed student progress. This lack of data also forced schools to base decisions about interventions and academic support on anecdotal evidence.

Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Data and assessment systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District leaders selected iReady, and school staff began implementing it for Grades K-8. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing and implementing a data and assessment system that incorporates multiple sources of data
Data use		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing a consistent culture of data use across all staff at all levels
Sharing results		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactively sharing data with educators to support classroom level decision making Communicating with families, especially about college and career readiness

Data and Assessment Systems

Consistent reports from interviews and focus groups at multiple levels suggest that developing and implementing a robust data and assessment system is an area of growth for the district. During the 2021-2022 school year, South Hadley did not have a previously established assessment system to provide a comprehensive picture of student, school, and district performance from multiple sources of data. The district responded by adopting iReady for Grades K-8 during the 2022-2023 school year. Previous district leaders discontinued use of a benchmark assessment, and teachers expressed frustration about the lack of such tools during the pandemic, when “they really needed to know where the students were.” With the lack of districtwide data and assessment systems, there is wide variation in what teachers are choosing to use for assessments at the elementary schools. Elementary teachers said they are moving away from Fountas & Pinnell; a phonics screener and the Heggerty phonemic awareness screener were added to the K-2 classrooms during the 2022-2023 school year. This change was largely by teacher discretion, not a district initiative.

The high school has been working to use common assessments to ensure that students are receiving consistency across grade levels and subject areas. Specifically, high school teachers explained that ninth-grade ELA uses the same midterm and final.

Data Use

Establishing a culture of data use in South Hadley is an area of growth across all levels. Although district leaders and teacher focus groups shared that MCAS data are reviewed every school year, teachers commented on the minimal role the state assessment plays in guiding their instruction. District leaders described efforts to establish district- and building-level data teams, which are not currently in place. Teachers at all levels reported receiving no expectations about consistently collecting and using data, but, informally, many are using data to inform their instruction. Some elementary teachers did, however, provide mixed responses and explained that they are expected to collect student benchmark data three times per year. Formal meetings to analyze and discuss data are inconsistent in the district. The upper elementary grades meet regularly to identify learning gaps, but the lower elementary grades do not have such meetings. High school teachers sometimes discuss student progress in department meetings, using class assessments.

South Hadley uses a student assistance team to help identify supports for students who show signs of risk in academics, behavior, or attendance. Students are referred to the student assistance team, and data provided to the team help the team problem-solve and connect students to appropriate supports. However, according to teachers and student support staff at all levels, anecdotal information is used to refer students to the student assistance team without documentation of attempted intervention. Furthermore, district leaders and specialists agreed that the process for collecting and maintaining progress monitoring data is implemented inconsistently, and specialists commented that the inconsistency in data impacts their ability to discuss student progress on individualized education programs in meetings with parents. Specialists also expressed frustration with the selection and use of data collection tools for students receiving special education services; specialists noted that some tools are not used correctly by all staff administering assessments, resulting in flawed data. Establishing a consistent culture of data use among all staff at all levels is an area of growth for the district.

District leaders expect that the iReady system will support teachers' data use with reports that recommend next steps for learners based on their performance. However, teachers and specialists agree that teachers need more professional development to understand how to administer assessments and access reports. Specialists, school administrators, and secondary teachers emphasized that although professional development has been offered on programs or initiatives that will produce student data, these programs or initiatives often are optional for teachers to use or implement. Although administrators and specialists shared that the district has offered data-focused professional development, elementary teachers could not identify recent professional development on assessment and data use to inform professional practice.

Sharing Results

With no formal data and assessment system, district leaders do not regularly share data with educators to support classroom decision making, which is an area of growth for the district. High school teachers described using informal methods to attempt to gather information about incoming students. They explained that they reach out to middle school teachers informally to find out about rising ninth graders' academic characteristics. One teacher noted asking for eighth grade MCAS scores, but the scores are not sent to ninth-grade teachers automatically. Elementary teachers at the

lower and upper elementary schools agreed that they do not meet to discuss transitioning students, and no formal system exists to communicate student information to teachers receiving new students.

Parents and students described having some access to information about student results. Parents and students in the middle and high schools reported using PowerSchool to monitor progress in classes. Students described using the PowerSchool phone app to stay informed about assignments and grades. Parents also said that some teachers use Google Classroom, but student performance is not clearly indicated on assignments. Elementary parents commented that they generally learn about classroom activities by talking with their children because they do not consistently receive information about student performance beyond progress reports, report cards, and parent-teacher conferences. Although students, parents, and teachers may request additional conferences, multiple parents from focus groups reported having little success in scheduling conferences upon request. Parents of high school students also find communication to be minimal; they hear general announcements from the principal in weekly updates but nothing from teachers. This lack of information about student progress, especially related to college and career readiness, is an area of growth for the district.

Recommendations

- The district should develop a coherent districtwide data strategy that identifies the system(s) to be used at each level, grade, and subject and details expectations for their consistent implementation in classrooms.
- The district should build a culture of regular data use and reset expectations for teachers to ensure that data are regularly incorporated into informing classroom instruction. Some strategies may include instituting data teams, modeling exemplar teacher data use, piloting intensive individualized data training with volunteer teachers, devoting common planning time for data, and engaging in regular data check-ins outside the formal evaluation process.
- The district should implement schoolwide systems that proactively communicate student-level information with families to ensure that they feel connected to and are aware of student performance. These could include (but are not limited to) automated weekly emails with grades or teacher notes, regular telephone calls between teachers and parents, and targeted outreach to the families of students who are struggling academically.

Student Support

Evidence from interviews, focus groups, and documents suggest that South Hadley provides a safe and supportive environment for students and offers students opportunities to reflect on their experiences related to school climate. The district has supports in place for students and placed an increased focus on social-emotional learning following the COVID-19 pandemic. However, based on focus groups, the focus of social-emotional learning curricula is not districtwide and is embedded better at the elementary and high school levels than at the middle school. In addition, the district does not have a districtwide PBIS (positive behavioral interventions and supports) system in place. Students have meaningful leadership opportunities, and communication with parents is most frequent at the high school level.

Table 4 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Safe and supportive school climate and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A culture of support exists throughout all schools. ■ There is a districtwide focus on social-emotional learning. ■ High school students are provided with a variety of leadership opportunities. 	
Tiered systems of support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Schools have resources available for students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A cohesive referral process for intervention and special education services
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The district offers opportunities for parental involvement. 	

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

Creating a safe and supportive school climate and culture is a strength for the district, although some specific areas of improvement remain. According to student, teacher, and student support staff focus group responses and district documents, students tend to feel safe, supported, and respected at their schools, and the district is acutely focused on both diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and social-emotional learning professional development. District leaders engage in monthly professional development with external consultants primarily focused on DEI to create inclusive environments. Data from the district’s Views of Climate and Learning survey show that students feel generally positive about their school environment, with most scores in the “somewhat favorable” and “favorable” ranges. In focus groups, students shared that they feel safe and respected at their schools because of close relationships with teachers and school leaders. Students explained that school leaders are “always walking around,” and most students “know [school leaders] on a more personal level.” However, some students shared that students who are “different” do not always feel warmly welcomed by other students, although they shared that teachers are generally supportive of

all students, regardless of background. Students in focus groups shared that they felt comfortable going to guidance counselors or teachers when they need support. Students and school leaders shared that students often take school climate surveys, usually administered by the guidance department during their advisory period. The district at large deployed a school climate survey, with the hopes of better understanding how to serve the needs of all students. School leaders described the survey as a way to identify student needs, “where students [are] thriving, and where we are seeing pockets where students were really struggling.”

Student support specialists said that discipline is handled differently in each building. District leaders, school leaders, and students explained in interviews and focus groups that behavioral expectations and subsequent consequences are inconsistently enforced throughout the district. Middle school student focus group respondents reported mixed reviews when discussing consequences to student behaviors, with some students saying that consequences are fair, but others believing the consequences are too harsh. Students also agreed that many negative behaviors seem to go unnoticed or, if addressed, negative behaviors still persist. Middle school teacher focus group respondents described experiencing several leadership changes, which led to inconsistent structures, systems, and supports about student behavior and discipline. High school students reported a different experience. Students from the focus group agreed that expectations are clearly communicated, and consequences to behaviors are fair and consistently enforced.

Providing leadership opportunities at the high school level is a strength of the district. Students explained the various leadership opportunities available, with opportunities increasing as students move from the middle school to the high school. Students explained that there is a school council and a student representative for the school committee. In addition, students have opportunities to serve on the student council at the middle and high school levels. Student support specialists agree that students can influence policy when becoming involved with the school council and the student council. Teachers added that peer leaders provide students with leadership opportunities plus various clubs and activities that students can lead.

Tiered Systems of Support

School leaders described using PBIS with elementary students, but PBIS use is not consistent throughout all schools. Teachers also described interventionists and special educators with “overloaded” caseloads, resulting in an environment in which there are not enough staff to provide supports to students who need them. School leaders explained that the district does implement their DCAP, but because of staffing constraints, schools “do not necessarily have interventionists to provide . . . the recommendations” cited in the DCAP. The district is aware of the constraints and has employed various practices to provide students with the services they need, such as a meditation room, student assistance teams, and a program that connects families with resources and services in the community. District leaders also described the transitional therapeutic classroom geared toward students with “trauma . . . [and] severe social-emotional disabilities.” School leaders explained that all teachers go through yearly training focused on identifying underlying causes of student behavior, and the training is provided by a school adjustment counselor. However, district leaders said that despite districtwide training, there was little change in how staff handle student behavior, particularly at the elementary level.

District leaders described varying levels of leadership involvement and assessment use when providing supports and services to students. School leaders described a student assistance team and a response to intervention team at the elementary level. However, district leaders described difficulties at the middle and high school levels because those schools often do not have interventionists available. District leaders noted that there is “no tracking districtwide,” and the district “[does not] have [response to intervention] across the district that is consistent.” Similarly, school staff mentioned that referrals for intervention and student special education evaluation often come from teacher or parent concerns, but they have little assessment data for that process. On occasion, key support staff are not included in referral meetings, making some stakeholders unaware of the referral process. In addition, inconsistencies exist in the referral process across schools. Some school and district leaders described processes that are in place at the elementary level, but those processes are inconsistently implemented throughout the middle and high schools. School leaders explained that both parents and teachers are involved in meetings regarding interventions and services, although student involvement is limited to the high school level. Overall, developing and implementing a cohesive referral process for students needing more intensive support is an area for growth for the district.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

The district demonstrates some strengths related to family and student engagement. South Hadley has systems and structures in place for parents to engage with the district and individual schools; however, many parents expressed that the communication is “sporadic” and “random” because the communications seem to come from a new person every time. Some parents said they received monthly newsletters from schools, but this practice was inconsistent across schools. Parents also mentioned receiving “robo calls” from the superintendent, but agreed that they are not as helpful or engaging as they would like. Parents did, however, express that they like hearing from their child’s teacher and find that communication helpful when it does come through. Parents described inconsistencies in the district’s communication. They specifically cited the various learning management systems used throughout the district, saying it can be confusing when the district does not have a uniform learning management system throughout the district. Parents of high school and middle school students discussed the use of PowerSchool to check on student progress, as well as progress and report cards. Parents also said they had limited opportunities for involvement beyond school-based parent teacher association activities and a school council at the high school level.

Recommendations

- The district should continue and expand its DEI and social-emotional learning efforts to ensure that all students feel welcome.
- The district should establish a districtwide PBIS to ensure consistency in behavioral expectations and a coherent districtwide safety plan to ensure student safety and health.
- Using newly established data systems, the district should create and formalize a districtwide response to intervention referral process, including data cycles, to substantiate intervention qualification criteria and ensure that learning gaps are quickly addressed.
- The district should further its engagement with families to improve existing avenues of parental involvement and expand their opportunities for meaningful participation with the district.

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in South Hadley. The team conducted 68 classroom observations during the week of December 5, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups during that same week. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

- Superintendent
- Other district leaders
- Principals
- Teachers
- School specialists
- Nonacademic student support staff
- Parents
- Students

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- Data on the district's staffing and finances
- Curricular review process and timeline
- South Hadley 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

South Hadley Public Schools

Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

December 2022

Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Positive Climate.....	4
Teacher Sensitivity.....	5
Regard for Student Perspectives	6
Negative Climate.....	7
Behavior Management	8
Productivity.....	9
Instructional Learning Formats.....	10
Concept Development	11
Content Understanding.....	12
Analysis and Inquiry	13
Quality of Feedback	14
Language Modeling	15
Instructional Dialogue.....	16
Student Engagement.....	17
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K-5	18
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6-8	19
Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9-12.....	20
References	21

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.

Four observers visited South Hadley during the week of December 5, 2022. Observers conducted 68 observations in a sample of classrooms across four schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K-3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average*: 5.5

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	7	14	9	3	33	5.2
Grades 6-8	0	1	1	2	6	3	2	15	5.0
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	1	0	6	12	20	6.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 2] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 20] + [6 \times 18] + [7 \times 17]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 5.5$

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		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	10	16	6	33	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	1	2	1	2	5	4	15	5.3
Grades 9-12	0	2	0	0	0	2	16	20	6.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 3] + [3 \times 2] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 12] + [6 \times 23] + [7 \times 26]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 5.9$

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*: 4.3

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	9	13	5	4	2	33	4.3
Grades 6-8	0	6	2	3	1	3	0	15	3.5
Grades 9-12	1	1	3	0	9	3	3	20	4.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 7] + [3 \times 14] + [4 \times 16] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 10] + [7 \times 5]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 4.3$

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.¹

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		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	33	6.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	15	6.8
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	7.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as: $((6 \times 5) + [7 \times 63]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

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.

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average*: 6.5

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	0	0	0	15	17	33	6.4
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	15	6.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	20	6.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [4 \times 1] + [5 \times 3] + [6 \times 17] + [7 \times 46]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 6.5$

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

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

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

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Productivity District Average*: 6.5

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	0	0	2	7	23	33	6.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	15	6.3
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	3	0	1	16	20	6.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 12] + [7 \times 47]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 6.5$

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average*: 5.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	3	1	18	10	1	33	5.2
Grades 6-8	1	0	0	1	6	6	1	15	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	0	2	0	5	5	8	20	5.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 29] + [6 \times 21] + [7 \times 10]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Concept Development District Average*: 3.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	1	3	6	4	5	2	0	21	3.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 3] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 2]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 3.7$

**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		
Grades 4-5**	0	1	2	5	1	1	2	12	4.4
Grades 6-8	1	0	6	4	2	0	2	15	3.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	20	6.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 1] + [3 \times 8] + [4 \times 11] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 13]) \div 47 \text{ observations} = 5.0$

**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*: 3.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	1	1	2	4	2	2	0	47	3.6
Grades 4-5**	1	1	2	4	2	2	0	12	3.9
Grades 6-8	4	6	2	1	0	1	1	15	2.6
Grades 9-12	1	4	2	5	2	6	0	20	4.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 6] + [2 \times 11] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 1]) \div 47 \text{ observations} = 3.6$

**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*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	1	6	8	5	8	3	2	33	3.9
Grades 6-8	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	15	3.2
Grades 9-12	1	2	2	0	3	7	5	20	5.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 3] + [2 \times 13] + [3 \times 15] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 12] + [6 \times 11] + [7 \times 8]) \div 68 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

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*: 3.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	7	3	5	4	2	0	21	3.6

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 7] + [3 \times 3] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 2]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 3.6$

**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*: 4.3

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	1	1	3	3	0	2	2	12	4.2
Grades 6-8	4	3	2	0	5	1	0	15	3.1
Grades 9-12	2	2	0	1	3	4	8	20	5.3

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 7] + [2 \times 6] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 8] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 10]) \div 47 \text{ observations} = 4.3$

**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*: 5.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	1	6	4	1	12	5.4
Grades 6-8	1	0	0	1	8	3	2	15	5.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	20	6.6

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 16] + [6 \times 11] + [7 \times 17]) \div 47 \text{ observations} = 5.8$

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	0	9	21	29	31	42	132	5.6
Positive Climate	0	0	0	7	14	9	3	33	5.2
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	33	6.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	1	10	16	6	33	5.8
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	0	9	13	5	4	2	33	4.3
Classroom Organization Domain	0	2	3	1	20	32	41	99	6.0
Behavior Management	0	1	0	0	0	15	17	33	6.4
Productivity	0	1	0	0	2	7	23	33	6.5
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	3	1	18	10	1	33	5.2
Instructional Support Domain	4	19	24	26	20	12	6	111	3.9
Concept Development (K-3 only)	1	3	6	4	5	2	0	21	3.7
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	1	2	5	1	1	2	12	4.4
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	1	1	2	4	2	2	0	12	3.9
Quality of Feedback	1	6	8	5	8	3	2	33	3.9
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	7	3	5	4	2	0	21	3.6
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	1	1	3	3	0	2	2	12	4.2
Student Engagement (UE only)	0	0	0	1	6	4	1	12	5.4

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([4 \times 7] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 3]) \div 33 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 31]) \div 33 \text{ observations} = 6.9$. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	8	5	6	9	11	6	45	4.6
Positive Climate	0	1	1	2	6	3	2	15	5.0
Teacher Sensitivity	0	1	2	1	2	5	4	15	5.3
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	6	2	3	1	3	0	15	3.5
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	0	1	5	9	30	45	6.5
Behavior Management	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	15	6.4
Productivity	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	15	6.3
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	15	6.8
Instructional Support Domain	11	14	15	7	14	9	5	75	3.6
Instructional Learning Formats	1	0	0	1	6	6	1	15	5.2
Content Understanding	1	0	6	4	2	0	2	15	3.9
Analysis and Inquiry	4	6	2	1	0	1	1	15	2.6
Quality of Feedback	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	15	3.2
Instructional Dialogue	4	3	2	0	5	1	0	15	3.1
Student Engagement	1	0	0	1	8	3	2	15	5.1

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 3] + [7 \times 2]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 5.0$

**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: $([6 \times 3] + [7 \times 12]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 6.8$

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	1	3	4	1	9	11	31	60	5.9
Positive Climate	0	0	1	1	0	6	12	20	6.4
Teacher Sensitivity	0	2	0	0	0	2	16	20	6.4
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	1	3	0	9	3	3	20	4.8
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	0	3	1	1	55	60	6.8
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	20	6.9
Productivity	0	0	0	3	0	1	16	20	6.5
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	7.0
Instructional Support Domain	4	8	6	8	17	27	30	100	5.3
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	2	0	5	5	8	20	5.9
Content Understanding	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	20	6.1
Analysis and Inquiry	1	4	2	5	2	6	0	20	4.1
Quality of Feedback	1	2	2	0	3	7	5	20	5.2
Instructional Dialogue	2	2	0	1	3	4	8	20	5.3
Student Engagement	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	20	6.6

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 1] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 12]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 6.4$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([7 \times 20]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

References

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

Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

Resource	Description
Quick Reference Guide: The Case for Curricular Coherence	This guide describes three types of curricular coherence that support student learning: vertical coherence, aligned tiers of instruction, and cross-subject coherence.
Increasing Access to Advanced Coursework	Describes how districts can use the federal Every Student Succeeds Act to expand access to advanced coursework and increase students’ achievement in these courses.
CURATE	CURATE convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate evidence on the quality and alignment of specific curricular materials and then publishes their findings for educators across the Commonwealth to consult.

Table C2. Resources to Support Assessment

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

Table C3. Resources to Support Student Support

Resource	Description
Safe and Supportive Schools Framework and Self-Reflection Tool	Based on Five Essential Elements , these resources (see At-a-Glance overview) can help guide school- and district-based teams 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 thoroughly examine six areas of school operation.
MTSS Blueprint	This resource offers a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.
Strengthening Partnerships: Prenatal Through Young Adulthood Family Engagement Framework for Massachusetts	This resource offers a roadmap for practitioners and families in health, human services, and education. A companion document is the Family, School, and Community Partnership Fundamentals (Version 2.0).
State and local student survey data, such as the Voices of Climate and Learning and the Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey	State and local student survey data can provide information about student experiences, strengths, and needs. They also help prompt additional local inquiry through focus groups, advisories, and ongoing communication with students, families, staff, and partners to inform continuous improvement efforts.

Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	1,678	100.0%	913,735	100.0%
African American	31	1.8%	85,662	9.4%
Asian	31	1.8%	67,010	7.3%
Hispanic	285	17.0%	221,044	24.2%
Native American	2	0.1%	2,155	0.2%
White	1,277	76.1%	496,800	54.4%
Native Hawaiian	0	0.0%	787	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	52	3.1%	40,277	4.4%

Note. As of October 1, 2022.

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

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of state
All students with high needs	826	100.0%	48.6%	508,820	100.0%	55.1%
Students with disabilities	400	48.4%	23.5%	179,095	35.2%	19.4%
Low-income households	588	71.2%	35.0%	386,060	75.9%	42.3%
ELs and former ELs	85	10.3%	5.1%	110,554	21.7%	12.1%

Note. As of October 1, 2022. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,678; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 913,735.

Table D3. South Hadley Public Schools: Chronic Absence^a Rates by Student Group, 2019-2022

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,843	14.6	21.7	34.5	27.7
African American/Black	32	10.3	30.3	34.4	32.0
Asian	35	17.8	24.3	57.1	15.4
Hispanic/Latino	318	21.4	37.1	49.7	42.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	52	20.0	25.0	28.8	28.4
Native American	2	—	—	—	37.8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	32.1
White	1,404	13.2	18.0	30.6	22.1
High needs	903	21.3	35.6	44.1	37.1
Low income ^a	722	—	—	48.6	40.6
ELs	88	29.9	38.6	64.8	39.9
Students w/disabilities	317	20.7	33.6	37.9	36.9

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

	Fiscal Year 2020		Fiscal Year 2021		Fiscal Year 2022	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	21,526,460	21,554,642	21,976,460	21,976,457	22,476,460	22,470,368
By municipality	9,140,075	9,094,897	9,149,886	9,200,296	9,005,812	8,980,867
Total from local appropriations	30,666,535	30,649,539	31,126,347	31,176,753	31,482,272	31,451,235
From revolving funds and grants	—	3,499,995	—	3,019,142	—	5,068,255
Total expenditures	—	34,149,534	—	34,195,895	—	36,519,490
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid ^a	—	8,248,287	—	8,530,839	—	8,585,949
Required local contribution	—	13,763,185	—	14,027,360	—	14,084,456
Required net school spending ^b	—	22,011,472	—	22,558,199	—	22,670,405
Actual net school spending	—	26,496,558	—	27,503,109	—	27,849,764
Over/under required (\$)	—	4,485,086	—	4,944,910	—	5,179,359
Over/under required (%)	—	20.4%	—	21.9%	—	22.8%

Note. Data as of February 10, 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. South Hadley Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2020-2022

Expenditure category	2020	2021	2022
Administration	\$512	\$541	\$689
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$627	\$741	\$772
Teachers	\$5,592	\$6,057	\$6,358
Other teaching services	\$1,502	\$1,633	\$1,866
Professional development	\$74	\$70	\$105
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$747	\$745	\$630
Guidance, counseling, and testing services	\$487	\$523	\$615
Pupil services	\$1,475	\$1,312	\$1,773
Operations and maintenance	\$1,009	\$1,285	\$1,337
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$2,461	\$2,612	\$2,603
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$14,485	\$15,519	\$16,748

Note. Any discrepancy between expenditures and the total is because of rounding. Data are from [FY18-FY22 Per Pupil Expenditures, All Funds - Statistical Comparisons - School Finance \(mass.edu\)](#).

Appendix E. Student Performance Data

The COVID-19 pandemic had a profound impact on the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years. Data reported in this appendix may have been affected by the pandemic. Please keep this in mind when reviewing the data and take particular care when comparing data across multiple school years.

Table E1. South Hadley Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2019-2022

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	809	41	42	34	41	13	19	17	17
African American/Black	13	31	33	23	26	15	17	23	27
Asian	14	57	—	43	63	7	—	7	8
Hispanic/Latino	145	28	27	21	22	24	31	25	31
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	19	44	31	37	48	11	38	21	14
Native American	1	—	—	—	29	—	—	—	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	43	—	—	—	17
White	617	43	46	37	48	12	16	15	11
High needs	401	23	22	20	24	26	33	28	28
Low income ^a	319	—	—	22	24	—	—	28	28
ELs and former ELs	60	20	18	17	20	30	37	32	34
Students w/disabilities	150	10	8	5	11	44	54	51	46

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	128	70	56	46	58	3	4	5	8
African American/Black	2	—	—	—	41	—	—	—	13
Asian	4	—	—	—	79	—	—	—	4
Hispanic/Latino	19	67	22	37	38	13	17	16	17
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	3	—	—	—	62	—	—	—	6
Native American	—	—	—	—	53	—	—	—	8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	45	—	—	—	16
White	100	71	63	47	65	0	2	3	4
High needs	59	49	38	27	38	8	8	10	15
Low income ^a	47	—	—	28	40	—	—	6	14
ELs and former ELs	5	—	—	—	21	—	—	—	30
Students w/disabilities	20	30	25	10	20	15	15	30	26

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	801	41	25	29	39	14	27	21	17
African American/Black	12	15	17	17	19	15	25	25	31
Asian	14	50	20	36	69	14	20	7	6
Hispanic/Latino	142	22	12	16	18	23	43	33	32
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	18	44	20	33	44	0	40	50	16
Native American	1	—	—	—	27	—	—	—	23
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	39	—	—	—	19
White	614	45	28	32	47	12	23	18	11
High needs	396	23	8	13	22	28	43	36	28
Low income ^a	316	—	—	12	20	—	—	36	29
ELs and former ELs	60	16	5	17	21	32	45	37	32
Students w/disabilities	147	13	5	6	12	52	60	56	45

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	124	60	45	40	50	6	11	5	10
African American/Black	2	—	—	—	26	—	—	—	20
Asian	4	—	—	—	78	—	—	—	4
Hispanic/Latino	16	47	11	0	26	7	33	25	21
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	3	—	—	—	53	—	—	—	10
Native American	—	—	—	—	37	—	—	—	16
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	48	—	—	—	19
White	99	62	50	46	59	5	7	2	6
High needs	54	38	23	11	28	17	23	11	19
Low income ^a	42	—	—	14	29	—	—	12	19
ELs and former ELs	4	—	—	—	17	—	—	—	32
Students w/disabilities	18	21	10	0	15	31	40	17	33

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	269	54	42	54	42	9	16	11	18
African American/Black	8	—	—	—	21	—	—	—	31
Asian	5	—	—	—	65	—	—	—	8
Hispanic/Latino	44	33	27	43	20	21	21	23	33
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	6	—	—	—	48	—	—	—	15
Native American	—	—	—	—	28	—	—	—	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	41	—	—	—	20
White	206	58	45	57	52	7	13	8	10
High needs	130	35	25	29	24	19	28	22	29
Low income ^a	106	—	—	31	23	—	—	24	30
ELs and former ELs	17	18	17	18	18	32	39	24	37
Students w/disabilities	53	22	18	15	15	35	42	32	44

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
All	121	—	—	46	47	—	—	10	14
African American/Black	2	—	—	—	25	—	—	—	25
Asian	4	—	—	—	70	—	—	—	6
Hispanic/Latino	15	—	—	13	23	—	—	27	28
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	3	—	—	—	51	—	—	—	12
Native American	—	—	—	—	38	—	—	—	14
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	45	—	—	—	23
White	97	—	—	49	56	—	—	8	8
High needs	54	—	—	26	26	—	—	17	24
Low income ^a	42	—	—	29	26	—	—	17	25
ELs and former ELs	4	—	—	—	13	—	—	—	43
Students w/disabilities	19	—	—	5	16	—	—	26	37

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	569	40.6	47.1	49.8
African American/Black	9	—	—	48.8
Asian	9	—	—	58.5
Hispanic/Latino	91	39.0	45.5	46.5
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	—	—	51.5
Native American	1	—	—	46.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	51.7
White	447	40.7	47.1	50.0
High needs	279	38.9	44.7	46.7
Low income ^a	219	—	43.3	46.5
ELs and former ELs	44	43.1	44.1	47.7
Students w/disabilities	103	40.9	42.2	41.8

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	119	56.4	43.7	50.0
African American/Black	2	—	—	49.8
Asian	4	—	—	56.0
Hispanic/Latino	16	—	—	47.6
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	3	—	—	50.6
Native American	—	—	—	54.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	49.5
White	94	57.7	44.9	50.1
High needs	53	54.4	40.6	47.7
Low income ^a	41	—	35.5	47.2
ELs and former ELs	4	—	—	50.5
Students w/disabilities	17	56.0	—	45.1

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	567	39.1	44.3	49.9
African American/Black	8	—	—	47.0
Asian	9	—	—	59.8
Hispanic/Latino	89	38.5	41.0	46.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	11	—	—	51.0
Native American	1	—	—	49.5
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	49.9
White	449	38.6	45.4	50.4
High needs	278	40.2	42.9	47.1
Low income ^a	219	—	41.9	46.4
ELs and former ELs	46	41.7	48.4	48.6
Students w/disabilities	102	38.9	37.6	43.3

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	118	62.0	48.0	50.0
African American/Black	2	–	–	45.6
Asian	4	–	–	57.3
Hispanic/Latino	15	–	–	44.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	3	–	–	50.0
Native American	–	–	–	46.6
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	41.2
White	94	62.1	51.6	51.6
High needs	51	52.0	41.5	46.7
Low income ^a	39	–	39.5	45.6
ELs and former ELs	4	–	–	48.9
Students w/disabilities	17	46.7	–	47.3

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Grade	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
3	150	41	45	38	44	7	9	15	15
4	124	56	51	35	38	10	15	16	16
5	149	39	34	30	41	10	20	15	13
6	127	32	47	24	41	23	30	21	22
7	138	35	41	36	41	15	17	19	19
8	121	42	34	43	42	14	22	17	18
3-8	809	41	42	34	41	13	19	17	17
10	128	70	56	46	58	3	4	5	8

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

Grade	N (2022)	Percentages meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
3	146	51	21	32	41	11	33	22	20
4	124	54	31	27	42	11	23	23	17
5	149	37	12	28	36	19	32	27	16
6	126	39	30	33	42	16	20	11	15
7	138	34	38	28	37	14	22	25	19
8	118	32	15	28	36	11	29	16	17
3-8	801	41	25	29	39	14	27	21	17
10	124	60	45	40	50	6	11	5	10

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

Grade	N (2022)	Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
5	149	59	46	52	43	10	14	13	18
8	120	50	38	58	42	8	17	8	18
5 and 8	269	54	42	54	42	9	16	11	18
10	121	—	—	46	47	—	—	10	14

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

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

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	116	51.0	50.2	50.0
5	136	31.7	38.8	49.9
6	109	35.2	47.2	49.8
7	111	41.0	52.2	49.7
8	97	44.0	49.1	49.7
3-8	569	40.6	47.1	49.8
10	119	56.4	43.7	50.0

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

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	114	49.7	44.3	50.0
5	137	20.1	34.7	50.0
6	109	45.4	57.3	49.8
7	112	43.4	40.9	49.9
8	95	35.1	47.1	49.8
3-8	567	39.1	44.3	49.9
10	118	62.0	48.0	50.0

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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	144	95.9	96.6	96.5	90.1
African American/Black	2	—	—	—	86.2
Asian	5	100	—	—	96.2
Hispanic/Latino	23	88.9	93.3	95.7	81.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	—	83.3	—	88.7
Native American	—	—	—	—	82.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	81.3
White	112	96.8	98.3	96.4	93.2
High needs	67	90.2	92.4	92.5	83.9
Low income ^a	61	90.7	93.2	91.8	83.2
ELs	3	—	—	—	73.1
Students w/disabilities	17	76.5	85.7	94.1	78.0

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	146	96.1	97.3	97.3	91.8
African American/Black	5	—	—	—	88.1
Asian	3	—	100	—	97.0
Hispanic/Latino	15	87.5	88.9	93.3	84.0
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	6	—	—	83.3	91.2
Native American	—	—	—	—	84.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	87.7
White	117	97.3	97.6	99.1	94.4
High needs	66	87.8	93.4	93.9	85.8
Low income ^a	59	87.1	92.6	94.9	85.1
ELs	2	—	—	—	78.0
Students w/disabilities	28	87.5	82.4	89.3	80.6

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,839	2.5	—	3.4	1.6
African American/Black	33	—	—	—	2.2
Asian	34	—	—	—	0.4
Hispanic/Latino	317	3.4	—	5.0	2.1
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	50	—	—	—	1.8
Native American	2	—	—	—	2.4
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	0	—	—	—	1.9
White	1,403	2.3	—	3.1	1.4
High needs	894	4.3	—	5.4	2.2
Low income ^a	721	—	—	5.7	2.3
ELs	90	—	—	—	1.4
Students w/disabilities	306	5.6	—	6.9	2.8

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,839	1.7	—	3.2	3.1
African American/Black	33	—	—	—	6.2
Asian	34	—	—	—	0.7
Hispanic/Latino	317	1.7	—	3.8	4.9
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	50	—	—	—	3.5
Native American	2	—	—	—	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	0	—	—	—	3.6
White	1,403	1.6	—	3.1	2.1
High needs	894	3.1	—	4.4	4.6
Low income ^a	721	—	—	4.7	5.2
ELs	90	—	—	—	3.5
Students w/disabilities	306	4.4	—	4.6	5.8

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	545	0.5	1.4	0.7	2.1
African American/Black	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Asian	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Hispanic/Latino	82	0.0	5.3	1.2	4.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
Native American	—	—	—	—	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	1.2
White	429	0.7	0.9	0.7	1.3
High needs	240	1.7	3.4	0.8	3.6
Low income ^a	181	2.2	4.6	1.1	3.8
ELs	21	0.0	5.6	4.8	7.8
Students w/disabilities	87	2.6	2.3	0.0	3.4

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.

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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	272	49.0	51.2	50.0	64.9
African American/Black	7	57.1	28.6	42.9	55.5
Asian	5	60.0	62.5	—	84.9
Hispanic/Latino	41	12.0	33.3	26.8	49.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	7	28.6	44.4	57.1	66.1
Native American	—	—	—	—	50.0
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	65.4
White	212	52.5	54.8	53.8	69.5
High needs	112	24.0	20.6	28.6	49.1
Low income ^a	93	26.8	23.7	28.0	50.1
ELs	10	—	—	0.0	30.0
Students w/disabilities	35	9.8	8.7	20.0	34.3

^a Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a [newly defined low-income student group](#). This change also affects the high needs group.