

# Tewksbury Public Schools

## Comprehensive District Review Report

May 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](http://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](http://www.air.org)

# Contents

- Executive Summary ..... 1
- Tewksbury Public Schools: District Review Overview ..... 4
- Leadership and Governance ..... 8
- Curriculum and Instruction..... 14
- Assessment ..... 20
- Human Resources and Professional Development ..... 23
- Student Support..... 28
- Financial and Asset Management ..... 33
- Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities ..... A-1
- Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures ..... B-1
- Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report..... C-1
- Appendix D. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators .... D-1
- Appendix E. Student Performance Tables..... E-1



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

Jeffrey C. Riley  
Commissioner

**Published November 2022**

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

© 2022 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906  
Phone: 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://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 Tewksbury Public Schools (hereafter, TPS) in May 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.

This report highlights the main strengths and areas for growth for each standard that surfaced from the review by the district review team. In addition, DESE staff provided recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas of growth identified.

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

### Leadership and Governance

District leadership changed during the 2021-2022 school year. Ms. Brenda Theriault-Regan, who was the assistant superintendent in the previous school year, was appointed superintendent in May 2022 by the TPS school committee. The prior superintendent retired in February 2022 after serving for six years in the district. A school committee comprising five members, each elected for a three-year term, governs the district. The district has developed a strategic plan focused on a research-based teaching, learning, and assessment approach that promotes consistent growth among students and staff to achieve academic, social, and emotional success for all students.<sup>1</sup>

### Curriculum and Instruction

TPS supports curriculum and instruction through a districtwide focus on academic standards and documented curricula for all grades and subject areas. The district encourages differentiation in instruction to meet students' needs, and teachers provide hands-on, project-based instruction to increase engagement and access to content. TPS has a wide variety of academic offerings, including a career pathways program, dual enrollment courses, and Advanced Placement (AP) courses for students in high school.

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Tewksbury Public Schools 2021-2022 District Strategy* is at <https://www.tewksbury.k12.ma.us/resources/district/21-22-tps-district-goals-school-improvement-plans-sips/>.

Five observers, focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited TPS in May 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a random sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA (English language arts), and mathematics in seven schools using the Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia.<sup>2</sup> Overall, in the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement (Grades 4-5) and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. In the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization and mixed evidence of consistent emotional support and rigorous instructional support. Instructional observations suggest generally strong student engagement in the 6-8 grade bands and mixed evidence of consistent student engagement in the 9-12 grade bands.

## Assessment

The TPS culture values collecting and discussing data. TPS's assessment inventory includes various assessments that can inform instruction. Although district and school leaders ensure that the systems in place provide for the efficient and purposeful collection of data, use and sharing of data from a variety of assessments differ in guiding decision-making at the district, school, and classroom levels. The district has mechanisms for sharing data with teachers through the Otus system and with students and families through report cards, parent-teacher conferences, and Aspen.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

TPS has systems to maintain personnel records and empowers building administrators to hire and assign staff to meet student needs. Evaluation systems support teachers, but professional development systems need strengthening through deeper teacher involvement in identifying and implementing professional development programs. The district plans for staffing needs by assessing enrollment trends for upcoming years and uses online resources to identify candidates. The district also has a mentoring program in place to support new teachers and consistently uses an evaluation program to support teachers' growth.

A review of the educator evaluation system in place, which is stored using TeachPoint, indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.<sup>3</sup> All summative evaluations of the 10 percent randomly selected for review included feedback for each standard, most evaluations included feedback identifying strengths, and only one evaluation feedback included areas of improvement. The review of evaluation documents also indicated that most educators are developing student learning and professional practice SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goals.

## Student Support

TPS prioritizes a school climate that ensures the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging of its students. The district has a proactive approach and system designed to meet the needs of all students by ensuring that schools use data-driven decision making, progress monitoring, and

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice are at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03/>.

evidence-based supports and strategies with increasing intensity to sustain students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional growth. The district identifies family engagement as a priority in the 2021-2022 strategic plan and engages families and community members through regular communication and events. Several stakeholders reported that the district would benefit from a more robust system for identifying and addressing students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs.

## **Financial and Asset Management**

With oversight from the superintendent, the district's business manager leads TPS's financial management. These district staff members work together with school leaders to estimate and plan for annual staffing needs, based on enrollment data and staff salaries. Finance and asset management staff reported that they meet with the superintendent monthly to discuss the spending data.

# Tewksbury Public Schools: District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by the DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.<sup>4</sup> Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. The design of the comprehensive district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

## Methodology

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

## Site Visit

The site visit to TPS was conducted during the weeks of May 2 and May 9, 2022. The site visit included 20 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 65 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted five teacher focus groups with 14 elementary-school teachers, 17 middle-school teachers, and nine high-school teachers.

The site visit team also conducted 60 observations of classroom instruction in seven schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

Additional information is in the appendices. Appendix A includes details about the site visit review activities. Appendix B provides information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

---

<sup>4</sup> DESE's District Standards and Indicators are at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.pdf>.

The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report is in Appendix C. Appendix D contains additional resources to support implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators. Lastly, Appendix E contains student performance data.

## District Profile

TPS is led by Ms. Brenda Theriault-Regan, who was appointed superintendent in May 2022. The superintendent is supported by the district’s central office team including an assistant superintendent (appointed in June 2022); director of student and family support; business manager; director of special education; director of IT and STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics); and athletic and facilities director. The district has a shared leadership and governance structure, with principals playing active roles in supporting decision-making regarding curriculum and instruction, assessments, human resources, and professional development.

In the 2021-2022 school year, there were 255 teachers in the district, with 3,180 students enrolled in the district’s seven schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

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

School	Type	Grades served	Enrollment
Heath Brook Elementary School	Elementary	K-2	302
John F. Ryan Elementary School	Elementary	5-6	505
John W. Wynn Middle School	Middle	7-8	511
L. F. Dewing Elementary School	Elementary	PK-2	590
Louise Davy Trahan Elementary School	Elementary	3-4	212
North Street Elementary School	Elementary	3-4	258
Tewksbury Memorial High School	High	9-12	802
<b>Total</b>			<b>3,180</b>

Note. Data sourced from [Enrollment Data \(2021-22\) - Tewksbury \(02950000\) \(mass.edu\)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00950000&orgtypecode=5&leftNavId=305&) (October 1, 2021).

Student enrollment has declined during the past five years (from 3,547 in 2017 to 3,180 in 2022). In 2022, students from low-income households comprised 23 percent of the district (state, 43.8 percent). The district served a similar percentage of students with disabilities as the state (19.4 percent versus 18.9 percent), and smaller percentages of English learners (ELs; 3.4 percent versus 11 percent) and students whose first language is not English (8.9 percent versus 23.9 percent).<sup>5</sup> Additional enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high-need populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged, and ELs and former ELs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure in Tewksbury for fiscal year 2020 (\$16,711) was similar to the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for K-12 districts of similar size (\$16,153), and similar to

<sup>5</sup> Data sourced from <https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00090000&orgtypecode=5&leftNavId=305&> (2021).



average state spending per pupil (\$16,963). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B4 in Appendix B.

## Student Performance

The percentage of TPS students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) is higher than the average state rate for all tested grades and subject areas except for Grade 4 ELA and Grades 4 and 7 mathematics. Tables 2-4 provide an overview of student performance in ELA, mathematics, and science by grade level between 2018 and 2021.

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
3	236	64	63	67	3	51	16
4	276	50	68	45	-5	49	-4
5	228	65	55	57	-9	47	10
6	245	53	59	56	-3	47	11
7	264	49	64	49	0	43	6
8	251	59	63	63	4	41	22
3-8	1,500	56	62	56	0	46	10
10	191	—	69	71	—	64	7

Note. Data sourced from [https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement\\_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=02950000&orgtypecode=5&](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=02950000&orgtypecode=5&) (2021).

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
3	236	66	65	42	-24	33	9
4	276	39	61	29	-10	33	-4
5	231	59	50	41	-18	33	8
6	245	52	57	51	-1	33	18
7	263	38	47	28	-10	35	-7
8	251	58	54	41	-17	32	9
3-8	1,502	56	62	38	-18	33	5
10	192	—	73	56	—	52	4

Note. Data sourced from [https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement\\_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=02950000&orgtypecode=5&](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=02950000&orgtypecode=5&) (2021).

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

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2021	3-year change	State	Above/Below
5	231	59	54	-5	42	12
8	217	46	44	-2	41	3
5 and 8	448	52	49	3	42	7
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) tests are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test. Data sourced from [https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement\\_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=02950000&orgtypecode=5&](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=02950000&orgtypecode=5&) (2021).

In addition, the district's four-year graduation rate in 2021 was 93.9 percent (greater than the state average of 89.8 percent), and the district's five-year graduation rate in 2020 was 95.3 percent (greater than the state average of 91.0 percent).

## Leadership and Governance

TPS district leadership changed during the 2021-2022 school year. Ms. Brenda Theriault-Regan, who was the assistant superintendent in the previous school year, was appointed superintendent in May 2022 by the TPS school committee. Ms. Theriault-Regan previously served as assistant superintendent and was named superintendent following the former superintendent's retirement in February 2022. A school committee comprising five members, each elected for a three-year term, governs the district. The district has developed a strategic plan focused on a research-based teaching, learning, and assessment approach that promotes consistent growth among students and staff to achieve academic, social, and emotional success for all students. Table 5 summarizes the key strengths and areas of growth in leadership and governance.

**Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Leadership and Governance Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>School committee governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Collaborative working relationship with all stakeholders</li> <li>■ Opportunities for students to share meaningful input into decision making</li> <li>■ Transparency with clear and appropriate division of roles among municipal leaders to secure adequate funding for the district</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Evaluation process of the superintendent's performance</li> <li>■ System for collective bargaining</li> </ul>
<b>District and school leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Clear lines of internal communication and work to improve student learning</li> <li>■ Use of disaggregated data to improve teacher practice and learning outcomes for students</li> <li>■ Autonomy for school leaders in staffing, scheduling, and budgeting to support improvement strategies and student outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Communication processes between teachers and school and district leadership</li> </ul>
<b>District and school improvement planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Clearly defined district and school improvement plans that cover strategies for addressing teaching and learning needs based on the analysis of disaggregated data</li> <li>■ Representative school council develops school improvement plans</li> <li>■ Clear guidance on the steps for creating and reviewing the school improvement plans</li> </ul>	
<b>Budget development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ School and community stakeholders actively engaged in developing and refining the budget</li> <li>■ Use of student data to review cost-effectiveness of programs</li> <li>■ Regular updates to the capital outlay project list in the budget to ensure resources are allocated based on the needs of all stakeholders</li> <li>■ Funds allocated for staffing and resources to improve outcomes for all students with an emphasis on equity</li> </ul>	

## School Committee Governance

Interviews with TPS leaders and a review of documents, including school committee meeting minutes, indicated that the school committee has established clear processes for approving budgets, securing adequate funding, and advocating in the community for the needs of schools. The review team found that although the school committee has a well-developed system for evaluating the superintendent's performance, recent changes led to modifications in the superintendent evaluation process and raised some concerns among stakeholders. However, stakeholder interviews and a document review reveal that the school committee focuses on improving outcomes for all students; acts as a primary advocate in the community for meeting students' needs; and upholds its responsibilities under the Massachusetts laws and regulations, including the Massachusetts Education Reform Act.

According to the superintendent interview and school committee meeting minutes, the superintendent traditionally receives a formative or midyear evaluation and an end-of-year evaluation by the school committee using the superintendent evaluation rubric. The school committee revised the process for 2021-2022 to evaluate the interim superintendent based on her performance as the assistant superintendent through March 1, 2022. Then, the school committee will review the district's progress toward its improvement goals and will provide feedback at the end of the year in place of the previous evaluation process for the superintendent. District leaders reported confusion regarding the new process for evaluating the superintendent and difficulty following the accompanying rubric for those not in the education field. Even though the superintendent review process will shift to traditional review in the 2022-2023 school year, providing clarity on the superintendent evaluation process and rubric relevant to district stakeholders in 2021-2022 was an area for improvement.

The school committee takes an active role in collective bargaining as evidenced in the executive session meeting minutes. According to the school committee meeting notes from February 22, 2022, the district underwent contentious bargaining in 2021 but has since revised the collective bargaining contract.<sup>6</sup> A municipal representative and a local news source have also reported on contentious bargaining in the district since August 2021. During that time, teachers worked under an expired contract and under a "work-to-rule" process, which refused nonessential work duties. In February 2022, the union voted to cease the work-to-rule process when the interim superintendent stepped in during negotiations. After 13 months of negotiations, the interim superintendent, the school committee, and the Tewksbury Teachers Association (TTA) reached the current contract agreement during a bargaining session in March 2022.

District and school leaders reported that the school committee develops and sustains a collaborative working relationship with the superintendent, staff, municipal leaders, and other stakeholders. According to student support staff, two school committee members serve on a subcommittee with the Tewksbury Special Education Advisory Council that meet with them frequently to discuss areas of concern or to review documents for revisions such as student discipline policy. District leadership described the school committee as responsive to stakeholder needs, which can be considered

---

<sup>6</sup> The Tewksbury school committee's meeting notes from February 22, 2022, are at [https://www.tewksbury.k12.ma.us/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/1191\\_001-2.pdf](https://www.tewksbury.k12.ma.us/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/1191_001-2.pdf).

another area of strength. As demonstrated in the school committee meeting minutes, school committee members provide students with opportunities to share meaningful input into decision-making, such as encouraging student councils to meet with principals regarding initiatives at their school, engaging students to assist with the search for a new school principal and a new superintendent, and encouraging student representatives to ask questions and share their reports during school committee meetings.

The school committee and the municipal representative have also reported that they operate with transparency and with a clear and appropriate division of roles. According to the municipal representative and the financial audit report from 2020, the school committee works with the district finance committee to secure adequate funding. The municipal representative sends out a message to all departments and schools that details expectations for the upcoming fiscal year to consider when developing the budget. The full budget is then presented to the municipal leader to share with the district finance committee. Thereafter, the school committee meets with district finance leaders to approve the budget and conduct a public hearing for the duration of the process.

## District and School Leadership

The superintendent of TPS promotes a culture of collaboration, trust, accountability, and joint responsibility for student learning among the district leadership team (DLT), teachers, and other staff members. The DLT comprises seven building principals, five assistant principals, the business manager, the director of special education, the director of family and student support, the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the athletic director from the high school, and the director of STEM and IT. School-level leaders reported that members of the team have established clear lines of internal communication through biweekly meetings, telephone conversations, and meetings with a subset of team members such as building principals to discuss matters related to the specific school. These subgroups also meet with the superintendent to discuss topics such as staffing issues or to convene as a joint labor relations committee. Human resources and professional development staff reported that they, along with the teachers, meet at the superintendent's office regularly to discuss curriculum topics and break off into smaller working groups based on school level. The assistant superintendent also meets with teachers on a monthly basis to further discuss curriculum topics. Establishing clear and appropriate lines of internal communication among the DLT to cover topics related to improving student learning is an area of strength.

The superintendent engages with the school committee and other DLT members to support the district improvement and school improvement goals using historical and longitudinal data. School and district stakeholders reported that teachers receive relevant professional development opportunities such as a mentorship program that aims to develop and train new teachers. TPS leadership also reported that principals have autonomy when it comes to staffing, scheduling, and budgeting. However, teacher and specialist focus group participants expressed concern about the chain of command issue, in which their input is sent to the principal but fails to reach district leadership, which is an area for improvement.

The superintendent demonstrates instructional leadership by focusing on improving teacher practice and learning outcomes for students according to members of the TTA. One example is developing a connection as a school district with the cross-district science mapping consortium, as evidenced in

the Cross-District Science Mapping Initiative site, where instructional staff can work together to develop curriculum maps that follow the Massachusetts Science Standards. According to the superintendent and school-level leadership, the superintendent works with the school administrative staff and district leadership team to use current and historical disaggregated data to monitor the impact of improvement strategies. The district leadership team holds a summer retreat where they analyze data from MCAS, social-emotional learning data, EL accountability data, DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) data, reading data, benchmark data, and qualitative data from teachers to inform an end-of-year instructional survey to identify areas of success and areas of need. The resulting data and data analysis help in designing training and in revising the goals for the improvement plan. This process also is summarized in the 2016 New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) report.

## District and School Improvement Planning

TPS uses a clear, thoughtful, and inclusive process for developing three- to five-year district improvement goals and works with the school to develop annual school improvement plans aligned with the district improvement goals. These goals drive the development, implementation, and modification of educational programs and practices.

The district improvement plan outlines strategies for improving performance, opportunities, and outcomes for all students, according to the *2021-2022 TPS District Goals & School Improvement Plans (SIPs)* presentation. The district leadership team uses a teacher survey developed using data from MCAS, social-emotional learning data, EL accountability data, DIBELS data, reading data, and qualitative data from teachers to inform training and revision of the district improvement plan. For the 2021-2022 term, the *2021-2022 TPS District Goals & School Improvement Plans (SIPs)* presentation<sup>7</sup> to the school committee during the summer administration retreat highlights one of the superintendent's goals as ensuring "the timely and effective progression of the Elementary School Building Project that will result in a significant educational impact for students in the 2022-2023 school year." The presentation then describes an action plan for successful completion of this goal, such as leading collaboration with stakeholders through the process, ensuring safety, and promoting sound educational decision making. The district also has professional practice and student learning goals focused on responding to COVID-19 pandemic concerns and prioritizing high-quality educational experiences for students.

The *School Improvement Council Annual Training and Orientation Session* presentation from 2021 outlines that the district requires that each school engages a representative school council comprising principals, parents, teachers, community members, and students at the secondary level to develop SIPs. The presentation also includes clear steps for creating and reviewing the SIPs. These steps include structuring the format to focus on the alignment of district and school improvement goals, designating those responsible for actions/tasks, school culture goals, and essential conditions of school effectiveness, such as information from the district's NEASC report. A list of data to consider such as school profiles and internal surveys and assessments data also is mentioned in this presentation. The summary of key points and a strategic plan for achieving goals in

---

<sup>7</sup> The *Tewksbury Public Schools 2021-2022 District Strategy* is at <https://www.tewksbury.k12.ma.us/resources/district/21-22-tps-district-goals-school-improvement-plans-sips/>.

the SIPs is then presented by the principal to the school committee during the summer administration retreat for feedback and reflection. As shown in the *2021-2022 TPS District Goals & School Improvement Plans (SIPs)* presentation to the school committee, the school improvement council provides thorough information regarding progress toward the district improvement goal and school improvement goals and action items to consider going forward.

The elementary and middle schools have clearly articulated SIPs that cover strategies for addressing teaching and learning needs, social-emotional learning needs, and health and safety protocols. The high school has a clearly defined SIP that outlines strategies for transitioning to new leadership, preparations for the opening of the school, and the student experience.

## Budget Development

According to the TPS budget hearing presentation for the 2021-2022 school year, the district works with principals, department heads, elected officials, town officials, teachers, parents, students, and community members to develop and refine the budget. School department members, in particular, can refine the capital outlay project list in the budget, which represents an overview of the current needs in the district. As part of the budget development process, finance and asset management staff reported that they reference student data when reviewing the cost-effectiveness of programs. At the curriculum and instructional level, test scores are assessed for strengths and weaknesses and then used to inform one-to-two-year pilot programs at specified grade levels. Finance and asset management staff use feedback on the pilot programs' effectiveness in meeting educational targets to determine whether the full program will be purchased. Finance and asset management staff also cited using school leader data from a survey that assesses the effectiveness of a digital resource 60 days before the renewal date to determine whether to purchase a new resource.

District leaders supporting human resources and professional development planning reported that the process for annually reviewing staffing and scheduling begins with each school's administrative team convening to review building configurations such as class sizes, enrollment, and other building needs. The administrative team reported the list of needs to the assistant superintendent and superintendent for further consideration. Based on the budget narrative for the 2022-2023 school year, the district regularly updates its capital outlay project list to ensure that resources are allocated based on the needs of building principals, department heads, elected officials, town officials, teachers, parents, and students. The document indicates that the capital outlay project list is constantly updated based on the needs of the district and analyzed for the best use of available and appropriate resources. According to the approved budget for the next three years, the district allocates funds for staffing and resources to improve outcomes for all students with an emphasis on equity. This allocation includes funding for systemwide special education therapists, a new curriculum director, and information systems supplies. Each school building also has a resource allocation document that outlines the supplies needed for each department area.

## Recommendations

- District leadership, in partnership with the school committee, should clearly document changes in the process and rubric used to evaluate the superintendent's performance, and share this information with stakeholders.

- District leadership, in partnership with the teacher's association leadership, should establish a mutually agreed upon process for collective bargaining.
- The district should work with school leaders and staff to develop a process for ensuring that clear lines of communication exist between teachers and school and district leadership.



## Curriculum and Instruction

TPS has a districtwide focus on academic standards and documented curricula for all grades and subject areas. To that end, the district has developed a curriculum map for each grade level aligned with the 2017 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework and requires all new curricular materials and programs to be reviewed and highly rated by CURATE.<sup>8</sup> The district also has a systematic materials adoption timeline with opportunities for teachers to participate in the program process. The district encourages differentiation in instruction to meet students' needs, and teachers provide hands-on, project-based instruction to increase engagement and access to content. TPS also offers a wide variety of academic offerings, including a career pathways program, dual enrollment courses, and AP courses. Table 6 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.

**Table 6. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Curriculum and Instruction Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>Curriculum selection and use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers participate in the selection process</li> <li>Academic standards and curriculum maps guide instruction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater transparency in the selection process</li> <li>Vertical alignment between grade levels across schools</li> </ul>
<b>Classroom instruction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instruction is standards based</li> <li>Project-based instruction engages students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring the curriculum can be delivered during the time allotment available</li> <li>Providing culturally relevant pedagogy</li> <li>Strategies to increase the quality of feedback and instructional dialogue in classrooms</li> <li>Supports for ELs</li> </ul>
<b>Student access to coursework</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Career pathways, dual enrollment, and AP courses available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to higher level coursework</li> </ul>

### Curriculum Selection and Use

According to teachers, school administrators, and district staff, the TPS curricular review process occurs every six years and starts with district leaders reviewing student performance data to identify standards not addressed sufficiently by the current curriculum. Teachers can pilot new curricula and contribute their findings to the decision-making process, which includes a vote from teachers on whether the new curricula should be implemented. Teachers noted that they appreciate having the opportunity to pilot new curricula and to be involved in the decision-making process; however, multiple teachers stated that the elementary- and middle-school curricula selected through this process do not always address the needs of all grade bands because of the voluntary nature of teacher participation in the pilot programs, which can result in uneven representation on selection committees. Teachers reported lack of clarity about how final curriculum selection decisions are made and whether teacher input is weighted sufficiently, which is an area of growth.

<sup>8</sup> Curriculum RATings by TEachers (CURATE): Center for Instructional Support (mass.edu).

According to TPS's completed CURATE table, the district uses mostly district-created curricula, along with Journeys (ELA) and GoMath and enVisionMATH (mathematics) for K-6. The district's curriculum guides for humanities, mathematics, world language, and science for Grades 9-12 illustrate the district's documentation of standards-aligned curriculum. Teacher and specialist responses differed by grade level when asked about curriculum availability and feasibility to implement.

Teachers, administrators, specialists, and district staff reported that maintaining consistent, coherent curriculum is supported by curriculum maps, common assessments, and aligning curriculum with DESE standards. Within these supports, teachers adapt and supplement curriculum with resources maintained on the district website. Teachers said they have some autonomy in instructional decisions, including selecting books to increase relevance for their students. School administrators also noted that individual teachers have professional goals focused on increasing their cultural proficiency to be effective in adapting materials for different students.

Teachers, specialists, and school administrators agreed that vertical alignment of curriculum within each school is strong, resulting from regular professional learning community (PLC) meetings and a districtwide commitment to standards-based instruction. However, these same stakeholders noted that the district does not have a process to ensure alignment between grade levels that operate in different buildings across the district. Middle- and high-school teacher focus group participants said they would like to engage with teachers in other buildings through PLCs, and one elementary teacher said alignment between schools is "one of our weaknesses." Most teachers said that they find opportunities to integrate instruction across subject areas; elementary- and middle-school teachers said they integrate ELA and social studies in project-based instruction; and middle-school students enjoy units such as one that paired fiction and nonfiction reading and another that explored a novel through an economic lens. Conversely, some elementary teachers commented that their mathematics and science topics are not complimentary to allow for interdisciplinary units.

The curriculum review process is noted in the district's instructional materials adoption presentation from March 9, 2022. The district will begin the review cycle for both mathematics and ELA for Grades K-8 during the 2022-2023 school year. Elementary teachers shared that they were comfortable with the current mathematics curriculum, but district leaders noted that they were aware that it did not address some standards sufficiently. Some elementary- and middle-school teachers said the ELA curriculum is a better fit for younger grades. At the high school, teachers use curriculum maps and materials developed by the district over time and teachers said they are comfortable with their documented curriculum. However, some teachers reported they needed more training and support for mathematics instruction.

## Classroom Instruction

Interviews with school staff, students, and parents detailed each group's impressions and experiences of instruction in TPS. Students expressed satisfaction with their learning experiences, describing hands-on, project-based work supported by teachers who provide multiple routes to engaging with content and are available to help students outside of class. Parents also expressed satisfaction with their students' learning experience, seeing TPS as innovating, and keeping up with the times to meet students' needs. Middle- and high-school teachers and school administrators noted that students do project-based work supported by technology to increase student interaction

and discussion of ideas. However, elementary- and middle-school teachers stated they struggle to teach to the standards because they find the curriculum materials to be too detailed. One middle-school teacher said: “We just have so much curriculum. It’s difficult to fit in, in just one year.” To increase student capacity to meet the district’s academic standards, another teacher stated that the teachers focus on a “growth mindset,” emphasizing they may not understand material “yet.”

During teacher focus groups, elementary teachers revealed that their curriculum is designed to be delivered in 90-minute blocks, but they use a traditional 50-minute class schedule; they feel they need to select components to include in the daily lesson, which is an area of growth.

The district has started addressing the instructional needs of their diversifying student population, adding books to the library written by a wider range of authors, and inviting family members from diverse communities in as guest speakers. One district staff member said they are “still wading in the water” of culturally relevant pedagogy; one specialist said some students do not see themselves in class material, one teacher described the high-school curriculum as “Eurocentric,” and one parent reported room for improvement in addressing equity and cultural diversity. Comments by district staff, specialists, teachers, and parents suggested the district may be in an early stage of developing diversity, equity, and inclusion supports, which is an area of growth.

Five observers, focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited TPS during the weeks of May 2 and May 9, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a random sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics in seven schools. The classroom observations were guided by the CLASS protocol. These observations were guided by 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 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 (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.

Classroom observations were scored with the CLASS protocol. The TPS average score for the Instructional Learning Formats dimension was 5.2 on a seven-point scale, or on the high end of the middle range. Scores in the high end of the middle range for the Instructional Learning Formats dimension suggest that teachers often facilitate student engagement using a variety of modalities but not always. The district average score for the Quality of Feedback dimension was 3.7 on a seven-point scale, or on the low end of the middle range. Scores in the low end of the middle range for the Quality of Feedback dimension suggest that teachers sometimes support students with scaffolding, feedback loops, and prompts to expand their thinking, but sometimes these feedback strategies are perfunctory. Also, the district average score for the Instructional Dialogue dimension was 3.0 on a seven-point scale, or on the low end of the middle range. Scores on the low end of the middle range for the Instructional Dialogue dimension suggest that teachers occasionally facilitate content-based discussions in class, but most classes are dominated by teacher talk. These scores suggest that incorporating strategies to improve quality of feedback and instructional dialogue in classrooms across the district are areas of growth.

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

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

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings fell at the high end of the middle range in the K-5 grade band (5.8) and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (4.6 and 4.3, respectively).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings fell in the high range for all grade bands (6.0 for K-5; 6.4 for grades 6-8 and 9-12).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings fell in the middle range for all grade bands (4.2 for K-5; 3.8 for 6-8; 3.3 for 9-12).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grade 4 and up, in which student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings fell at the high end of the middle range in the 4-5 and 6-8 grade bands (5.9 and 5.8, respectively) and in the middle range for the 9-12 grade bands (4.3).

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

TPS is using the Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA), a comprehensive socio-emotional learning system from Aperture Education, to address social-emotional learning in the classroom. Elementary teachers said they are using Zones of Regulation to guide their social-emotional learning efforts and some grade-level PLCs focused on teachers' professional development in social-

emotional learning during the 2021-2022 school year. In addition, middle-school teachers use a student-completed Google form to track how students feel; students can indicate whether they would like to talk with someone about it. At the high-school level, social-emotional learning topics expand from health instruction into the students' advisory periods, using resources from Aperture. Although a social-emotional learning system is in place, evidence suggests that implementation of the social-emotional learning curriculum/system across the district is an area of growth.

Comments from students, teachers, specialists, and district staff indicated that teachers adjust their practices to meet students' needs. Throughout the district, grouping helps to target skill development. Students agreed with teachers and school administrators that they work regularly in different small groups to maximize learning. Learning environments also feature options for students to use, including thematic centers, flexible seating, and diverse ways to access content; district staff and teachers see these options as strategies to increase student ownership over their learning. In the middle and high schools, students have different ways to access content and complete standards-based work. District staff noted that the move to remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic helped advance teachers' use of technology so that students may access content online or in textbooks and have more freedom to develop projects to show their knowledge. Students also observed flexibility, pointing out that most teachers will allow individual students or the class to delay taking a test if they need a little more time to master the material. In addition, high-school students reported their teachers invite feedback on units and activities to better meet students' needs. Students noted that because teachers provide extra support, extra time before taking tests, and engaging, interdisciplinary projects, they feel confident in their learning.

EL and special education specialists reported that they would like to meet with teachers of ELs regularly to provide them with supports for specific newcomers' needs. The specialists prepare information about each student but do not feel that teachers have enough focused time to be introduced to strategies to support ELs' needs.

## Student Access to Coursework

TPS leaders described a variety of academic offerings for students, including multiple reading group levels at the elementary and middle schools, opportunity to join honors mathematics in eighth grade, foreign language classes in the middle school, a career pathways opportunity to work in local companies in high school, dual enrollment courses, and a range of AP courses at the high school. Access to advanced academic courses at the high-school level is provided primarily by teachers and specialists who make recommendations. School administrators did not describe any specific system to ensure underrepresented students have access to more advanced coursework, noting only that students can request placement in the courses.

District staff and principals noted that parent input into placement decisions is an important component to the student placement process in which students may be invited to try a higher level course if requested, despite lower scores on placement tests. Students agreed they can move into higher level courses, but several said it can be "difficult" to convince school administrators and that the initial struggle may result in teachers and administrators pushing students to return to a lower level of coursework. Students would prefer to have access to additional supports and to have more time to adjust to more demanding coursework.

## Recommendations

- District and school leadership should clearly document the process used to make decisions regarding the selection of curriculum, including how teacher input is incorporated into the decision-making process.
- The district should continue its efforts in ensuring that curriculum is vertically aligned between grades and prioritize consistent implementation to ensure alignment across schools.
- The district should ensure that the selected curriculum can be implemented with fidelity, taking into consideration both lesson length and allotted instructional time.
- The district should work to address the instructional needs of a diversifying student population by implementing a culturally relevant pedagogy and developing diversity, equity, and inclusion supports.
- The district should establish consistent expectations for the implementation of its social-emotional learning system across all grades and schools.
- District and school leaders should create consistent opportunities for EL specialists, special education specialists, and classroom teachers to collaborate and share strategies to support specific students' needs.
- District and school leaders should consider ways in which underrepresented students have increased access to, and sufficient supports to succeed in, advanced courses.

## Assessment

---

TPS values collecting and discussing data. TPS’s assessment inventory, submitted for this review, includes various assessments whose results can inform instruction. Although district and school leaders ensure the systems in place provide for the efficient and purposeful collection of assessment data, use and sharing of data from a variety of assessments may differ in guiding decision making at the district, school, and classroom levels. The district has mechanisms for sharing data with teachers through the Otus system and with students and families through report cards, parent-teacher conferences, and Aspen, an online parent portal. Table 7 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

**Table 7. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Assessment Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>Data and assessment systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Established culture of collecting and discussing data to monitor student performance</li><li>Availability of a variety of assessments</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Timely use of data to inform instruction</li></ul>
<b>Data use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Staff at district, school, and classroom levels use data to identify trends in students’ strengths and areas of need</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Professional development on the effective use of data districtwide</li></ul>
<b>Sharing results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Established systems for sharing data and results with staff, students, and families</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Awareness of established systems for sharing data and results</li></ul>

### Data and Assessment Systems

According to TPS’s completed assessment inventory, student performance reports, and district and school leader focus groups, DIBELS, MCAS, Scholastic Next, and report card data help with monitoring student performance. School benchmark schedules indicate when the teachers should administer the DIBELS assessment three times a year: October 1, February 1, and June 1. EL specialists, district leaders, principals, and district and school staff noted that the district uses the Otus database to document the assessments used and access the data from those assessments. Elementary-school staff and district staff reported using the DIBELS assessment as a benchmark of phonemic awareness of student achievement during and at the end of the year. They also noted summative assessments for mathematics that teachers consider when identifying the students’ strengths and weaknesses for a given year.

Elementary-, middle-, and high-school staff described these assessments as “continuously evolving and changing.” Some staff do not feel assessments are always necessary. Those interviewed claimed the data do not get back to them in time for teachers to use it effectively. In addition, they reported receiving too many redundant trainings before enough assessments are available on Otus to be able to use the knowledge gained from the trainings.



## Data Use

According to the 2021-2022 TPS District Goals & School Improvement Plans (SIPs) presentation, TPS staff must use data to drive continuous improvement at all levels and ensure that educators, including district and school leaders, use collected data to guide instructional practice.

District leaders reported several professional development opportunities for data usage and have coaches to facilitate data usage at district, school, and teacher levels. For example, the district provided staff with the opportunity to participate in the STAGR (Standards, Targets, Assessment, Grading & Reporting) virtual conference, where staff could access training materials, videos, and resources on grading and assessment practices. In addition, district leaders reported that teachers receive training whenever new assessments are implemented. However, some elementary teachers reported feeling that the current level of professional development dedicated to assessment and data usage is not sufficient, especially when a new curriculum, such as Heggerty, is introduced.

Title 1 growth spreadsheets demonstrate DIBELS data help with determining students' level of need in Grades K-4, dividing them into "Intensive, Strategic, [and] Core" groups. A district leader reported, "Every person on my evaluation list uses student data to help determine their effectiveness as an educator." EL specialists reported using the results from the mandatory ACCESS test and WIDA model data to determine student learning needs, skill levels, levels of readiness, and cognitive, emotional, and social needs. This process also involves checking in with teachers about students' grades and report cards. School leaders also noted using data to evaluate the next steps after implementing targeted interventions.

## Sharing Results

TPS uses Otus to communicate assessment results to district staff, including building administrators and teachers. Building administrators also reported using email, newsletters, and meetings with staff to share results.

To communicate with families, the district uses midterm reports and report card grades for progress updates. Elementary teacher specialists reported that they send home with the students the results of letter, sound, and sight word assessments to families, as well as review the results in parent-teacher conferences. In addition, elementary teacher specialists reported sharing fluency data with students. School leaders acknowledged that DIBELS scores are shared with parents as well. District leaders also use the open houses held at the beginning of the year where the curriculum expectations are laid out for parents, as well as the three parent-teacher conferences held throughout the year to communicate with families. Aspen is the online grade book used to give parents updates about their child's grade progress throughout the year. School leaders also emphasized the importance of parent feedback and being involved in a culturally responsive conversation, "Every report, every test, everything, goes to a parent 48 hours before, a minimum of 48 hours, before they're even talked about." However, family member focus group participants reported communication as being more variable. Some family members also reported being dissatisfied with the amount of teacher communication, "They only hear about things in the parent-teacher conferences or in the report cards even when their child was seeing a specialist," or they



only hear from teachers when their child performs poorly. Also, some parents expressed dissatisfaction that Aspen shows the cumulative grades only, not individual assignment grades.

## Recommendations

- The district should ensure that the benchmark and summative assessment systems produce data in a timely manner so that it can be effectively used to modify instruction.
- District and school leaders should ensure that educators at all levels have access to high quality professional development related to using data to inform instruction.
- District and school leaders should establish and communicate consistent expectations for sharing information about student performance with parents and families, including a variety of methods for sharing student data.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

TPS has established systems to maintain personnel records and empowers building administrators to hire and assign staff to meet student needs. The district plans for staffing need by assessing enrollment trends for upcoming years and uses online resources to identify candidates. Although district leaders and school committee representatives emphasize the value of having a diverse workforce as a high priority, TPS has not identified a strategy to diversify its staff. Evaluation systems support teachers, but professional development systems need strengthening through deeper teacher involvement. The district has a mentoring program in place to support teachers. Table 8 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.

**Table 8. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District has established systems to maintain and report employment related information</li> </ul>	
<b>Recruitment, hiring, and assignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hiring systems allow principals to select and assign staff to meet individual building needs</li> <li>District based long term planning for staffing needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy to diversify staff</li> <li>Number of staff in support positions</li> </ul>
<b>Supervision, evaluation, and educator development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation systems are used consistently</li> <li>Mentoring program is in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrator evaluation goals and sources of evidence</li> <li>Professional development on new curricula</li> <li>Teacher input into professional development offerings</li> </ul>
<b>Recognition, leadership development, and advancement</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher leadership opportunities</li> </ul>

### Infrastructure

Documents submitted illustrate that TPS maintains accurate employment-related records. For example, the personnel records show the district's listing of instructional and noninstructional staff in each building, and the New Hire Paperwork packet shows available resources for employment recordkeeping and reporting. Other documents shared by the district include letters of interest for posted position, recommendation letters, new teacher interview forms, and staff attendance records from all schools. District staff stated they will provide school administrators with requested information to plan staffing upon request.

## Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

TPS conducts an annual review process to analyze staffing and scheduling across the district, identifying any needed reassignments to address student needs such as a larger-than-average grade level or students' interests among specialized courses in the high school. School committee representatives said they see district leadership empowering building administrators to guide staffing decisions in their schools. District leaders reported that they review enrollment trends to estimate hiring needs for four years. According to additional responses from the district leaders and principals, student assessment data and needs drive the hiring process as well.

Principals reported identifying staffing needs based on input from current staff and review of student assessment and teacher evaluation data, and then requesting a position be posted by the district. The online educator job board, SchoolSpring, alerts principals to appropriately credentialed candidates. Documents on hiring systems shared by the district indicate that school and district hiring committees collaborate on the search and interview process, and principals submit the new teacher interview form to the superintendent, with their comments on the overall application and interview process nominating the candidate to be hired. The principal then meets with the superintendent who approves the new hire and appointment recommendation. The *Hiring Systems* document shows the district's forms for guiding principles in evaluating candidates, as well as for providing sample posted positions. District staff mentioned that open positions are posted internally to invite current staff to apply. District staff noted that the teachers hired have the required credentials for their positions. TPS does hire former students who return to the community after earning their teaching credentials.

Several stakeholder groups discussed the issue of diversity in the district's hiring pool. District leaders and school committee representatives emphasized the value of having a diverse workforce, describing "all kinds of diversity," including by gender, age, background, and experiences, as high priorities. Teacher association representatives pointed out that the district does not have a written plan to increase diversity. District leaders that oversee human resources and professional development programs stated that they rely on SchoolSpring to post positions and receive résumés, but they also reported that the respondent pool lacks diversity. District leaders recognized that TPS competes with other surrounding towns to access a diverse group of new teachers through the website.

Teachers from two focus groups that included teacher association representation raised concerns about staffing in the special education program; both groups stated that more special education paraprofessionals are needed. Teachers' association representatives pointed out that the district does not offer a competitive wage for paraprofessionals, reducing the likelihood that the positions will be filled consistently. Teachers commented that a staffing agency, Delta T, is contracted to send paraprofessionals, but "there is a huge discrepancy between the quality of town aids [paraprofessionals] and Delta T aids." TTA representatives also commented on the district's shift from staffing school psychologists to adjustment counselors. One teacher explained,

Since school psychologists are the only people who can do the testing, they essentially are slowly becoming roving testers in the district, which, while the adjustment counselors are certainly helpful, it's not the same kind of thing . . . it's changing what the kids have access to.

## Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

Principals, specialists, and teachers described the educator evaluation system as consistently applied and fair. Documents provide evidence of TPS's evaluation system, and evaluation rubrics for several positions were provided. Principals said they incorporate teacher's individual professional goals in formal observations and provide teachers feedback on their goals and overall performance. The principal and assistant principal share observations, and each administrator focuses on the same teachers through multiyear observation cycles to better understand each teacher's growth. Specialists commented that some principals also provide informal feedback in supportive, timely conversations shortly after the observations. Teachers stated that they received helpful feedback focused on teacher development. Elementary teachers that participated in focus groups noted that administrators make less informal visits as administrators manage student behavioral challenges after the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, TTA representatives shared their impression that the district awards few top evaluation ratings relative to teachers' performance, with one representative commenting, "They sprinkle them out."

A review of the educator evaluation system stored with TeachPoint indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample of Professional Teacher Status Teachers for the 2020-2021 school year. Of the randomly selected teachers, fifteen participated in the 2020-2021 summative evaluation process and those fifteen summative evaluations were reviewed. Almost all (93 percent) were marked as complete and not missing required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. More than half of the evaluations (60 percent) included multiple sources of evidence such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. All summative evaluations (100 percent) included feedback for each standard, most evaluations (73 percent) included feedback identifying strengths, and only one evaluation feedback included areas of improvement. The review of evaluation documents indicated that most educators are developing student learning and professional practice SMART goals. Eighty-six percent of the evaluations reviewed contained student learning SMART goals and professional practice SMART goals.

TeachPoint also stores administration evaluations. For administrative staff identified in TeachPoint, 10 summative evaluations for 2020-2021 were available for review and complete with performance rating and assessment of progress toward goals. Most summative administrator evaluations (80 percent) included evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback identifying administrators' strengths and areas for improvement. The review of evaluation documents also indicated that no administrators were developing student learning, professional practice, or school improvement SMART goals. None of the evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards, which is an area of growth.

The structure for professional development in TPS was described by district leaders, staff, and teachers as several half and full days of planned sessions across each year aligned with district goals (as shown in the *21-22 PD Schedule* document) with supports for "job-embedded" professional development through instructional coaches and the PLC structure. Teachers can initiate requests for professional development using the online system, as illustrated by the *PD Initiation*

document. District leaders commented that professional development is planned by a district-level committee and recognized the need to have teachers join the committee.

Teachers' comments about professional development at TPS indicated it as an area of growth. Teachers said they need further training in several areas. As an example, elementary teachers stated a need for more training on a recently implemented mathematics curriculum. These comments were underscored by TTA representatives who described trainings that the district provided only to decide against a program, whereas teacher requests for training on new curricula are not fulfilled. Teachers commented that training on DESE's social-emotional learning online resource has been unclear as "the people running the [professional development] are still learning the program." Teachers also said they need further training on culturally responsive teaching. Both teachers and the superintendent said the district-led professional development needs to be differentiated to meet the needs of all teachers and other staff. Teachers commented that since the COVID-19 pandemic, the bulk of available professional development has been recorded webinars, which lack interactive activities (as described in the *Optional PD* document), and training from national organizations not well aligned with teachers' needs. The district provided a set of *PD Evaluation* forms, illustrating a practice of collecting teacher feedback after professional development events. The instructional coaches comprise the most well-regarded component of the district's professional development system, although teachers would like more feedback or model lessons from coaches who often cover classes.

TPS's mentoring program, as described by district leaders, staff, principals, and teachers, and documented in the *TPS Mentoring Program* document, includes training for mentors, four days of in-person orientation and training for new staff prior to the start of a school year, and agendas for topics and logistics supports to guide mentor teachers through the two-year program. The program seeks to match new teachers with a mentor in their building. District leaders and principals also pointed out that new teachers receive support through PLCs with colleagues and from instructional coaches in mathematics and literacy.

## Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

TPS teachers and district leaders identified a few leadership opportunities for teachers, including mentoring new teachers, serving as a department head in the high school, or filling a leadership position in the teachers' association. District leaders reported the PLCs have leaders, but representatives from the TTA commented that the training provided by an outside vendor to become a PLC lead was ineffective, and few teachers who received the training opted to step into PLC leadership roles.

## Recommendations

- The district should design and implement a teacher diversification strategy in service of achievement and equitable outcomes for students.
- The district should continue to analyze staffing needs on an annual basis, and ensure the analysis considers the number of staff needed to fulfill support positions.

- District leadership should ensure that all administrator evaluations contain student learning, professional practice, or school improvement goals and multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards.
- District and school leaders should ensure that educators have input into and access to high quality professional development offerings, especially as it relates to the implementation of new curricula.
- District and school leadership should identify additional opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles.

## Student Support

TPS prioritizes a school climate that ensures the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging of all students. The district has a proactive approach and system designed to meet the needs of all students by ensuring that schools use data-driven decision making, progress monitoring, and evidence-based supports and strategies with increasing intensity to sustain students’ academic, behavioral, and social-emotional growth. The district engages families and community members through regular communication and events. Some stakeholders reported that the district would benefit from a more robust system for identifying and addressing students’ academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs. Table 9 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth for student support.

**Table 9. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Student Support Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>Safe and supportive school climate and culture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcoming environment and structures in classrooms and buildings to support student belonging</li> </ul>	
<b>Tiered systems of support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data use to identify student needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number and quality of special education support staff to address student needs</li> </ul>
<b>Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular communication and events for families and community</li> </ul>	

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

In addressing TPS’s climate and culture, elementary staff mentioned the use of inclusive literature and discussions about various traditions during the December holiday season. Specialists recall, before the COVID-19 pandemic started, cultural nights emphasized the importance of biliteracy and newsletters celebrated the marginalized group months. Students expressed how they felt welcomed when returning in person after the pandemic. Middle-school students described the environment as a “fun and good learning environment” with responsive teachers who “think about their feelings” and that they “feel respected by teachers.” The district also has an intern program in which high school seniors are paired with younger students in other schools, “similar to a Big Sister, Big Brother program,” to build relationships between students in the middle and high schools and provide opportunities for these younger students to learn about high school and beyond.

Middle-school teacher, special education specialist, and high-school student focus group participants reported numerous clubs for all students to join if they need support or wish to build a better sense of community. They also described the initiative of one school to implement a “calming corner” with different activities and fidget toys that students can use when they struggle to focus on the lesson or need to take a break. A comfort dog at the school also provides a soothing environment when needed. Special education specialists reported a substantial amount of talk surrounding using the

correct pronouns for transgender students and the importance of making students comfortable. One special education specialist stated,

We need to nurture that, whether it's with our classroom space or those direct conversations, when that conflict happens. I would say, around equity, it's around making sure that belonging is in the class, in the school, with each other, and that's the way we're really looking at equitable processes.

Feedback for principals speak to, and school curriculum accommodation plans demonstrate, how teachers give students with special needs various options that they can pick to tailor to their strengths regarding individualized education program accommodations, referring to them as “task menus.” Students also receive a student discipline policy meant to provide consistency in the consequences for student violations. In addition, the district is creating inclusion and equity classroom libraries for students in the elementary grades.

When asked about supports for newcomers and currently enrolled ELs in the district, the superintendent reported,

I would say [one of our goals is] really supporting our language learners. Our district is becoming more and more diverse, which is a wonderful thing, but it requires us to differentiate more. I would say that's an area of need. Our teachers are trying very hard, and we have continuously, each year, have had to add more EL support, which is great. And thankfully, for the grant dollars that are out there, we'll be able to add another teacher next year to continue to support our students.

District leaders and specialist focus groups reported the district's commitment to restorative justice practices, reducing suspensions, and alternatives to expulsions, and as a result, the number of expulsions has gone down during the past five to seven years. Parents are much more involved in those decisions, and meetings to discuss these decisions are treated much more like a conversation than in the past. Specialists noted a “strain on student relationships” and “civil disobedience” in the past year after virtual learning. One middle-school student expressed feeling that “once you do something bad, they don't let it go and view you differently.”

The social-emotional learning roadmap and participants in teacher focus groups speak to the districts' desire to implement more social-emotional learning practices in their schools. The 2020-2021 Views of Climate and Learning survey results detail a 63 out of 100 for overall school climate rating, which is slightly higher than the state average of 57.

## **Tiered Systems of Support**

TPS has a proactive approach and system designed to meet the needs of all students by ensuring that schools use data-driven decision making, progress monitoring, and evidence-based supports and strategies with increasing intensity to sustain students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional growth. This approach includes the district's tiered support systems and systematic processes for referring students to appropriate services using their student and instructional support teams.



The school district was found to comply with all criteria reviewed as part of the 2020 Tiered Focused Monitoring annual report. Feedback from specialists and billing receipts show the district's plethora of reading interventions/resources purchased. For example, the SoundsSensible reading intervention is available for first graders struggling in foundation letters and skills in conjunction with SPIRE for readers who are more advanced but still need support. Human resources and professional development staff noted each building has a reading specialist that pulls students out in groups and "they go to CPT, they go to PLC times, and they do review, student's progress, student's struggles," with tiers of support for both those struggling and those at higher levels needing more enrichment.

Instructional support team (IST) and specialist focus group comments, along with the district's referral process diagram, and referral documents, detail the tiered intervention process. First, students with academic, behavioral, or speech and motor concerns are identified, and referrals are submitted to school administrators for approval. Then, the IST meets to discuss data and identify appropriate intervention for each student. An intervention is administered, and if the student meets or exceeds the expected progress, the student will eventually exit the IST process. If the student does not make progress at expected levels, another meeting is set up with the IST to revise the implementation plan. In case of failure of multiple interventions and a suspected disability, a special education referral is made.

EL specialists reported that they also provide additional supports for 45-90 minutes for students needing additional assistance, depending on the level of need for ELs. They also reported collaborating with other teachers to provide differentiation techniques:

Additionally, for the tiered interventions, our behavior specialists don't only work with [students with special needs]. We have them working in the general ed[ucation] setting as a preventative measure to support teachers, classroom management, and specifically for the behavior management of [individual] students.

One principal noted, "There are student support teams who plan every day, and then the administration will sit down with guidance, school psychologists, and go over our caseloads and how the kids are doing." Principals and special education staff reported that student support teams "see where they can intervene to prevent students from going into special ed and whether additional testing is needed." In 2019, the district centralized the team to have a more systematic evaluation process. The process begins with the family reaching out for services, then the school gathering information, the school filling out preregistration forms, and finally the school disseminating this information to make teachers aware of the potential services their incoming students may require or know which evaluations to request. Social workers may also be sent to the home to assist families in the acclimation process and provide more intensive services.

Special education focus group participants reported on a period set aside for tiered service supports. Board-certified behavioral analysts support the highest need students. For behavioral issues, paraprofessionals may be called to help both regular and special education teachers. Students have access to American Sign Language interpreters and "in-house speech, OT [occupational therapy], PT [physical therapy]" staff that are usually outsourced when fewer students need those services. Special education focus group staff reported that they now collaborate with the districtwide board-certified behavioral analysts and develop their own manual of tiered interventions as needed.

Special education staff reported continuous monitoring of students to ensure they enter the more appropriate tier for services so students who are already on 504 plans can begin immediately. The district follows a tiered process. They also praised the staff for being able to identify students on the borderline to make sure they get services.

Members of the TTA reported that the district has not been able to fill enough spots through the outsourcing company and voiced concerns about the quality of their paraprofessionals for providing supports to students with special needs. TTA members shared that the current paraprofessionals serve more to “check the box” of having one-on-one services and are part of a “revolving door.” Regarding mental health services, guidance counselors fill in as a first step, and for more serious situations, programs like the Frontline program, offer assistance. The Frontline program involves police when a child has suicidal ideations. Human resources and social-emotional learning teacher resource guides noted a worsening of mental health in their students and their goal to combat this with social-emotional learning, “working with outside counselors, resources, keeping that connection with the family.” According to principals, the seventh period can be for academic interventions and support, and a team of four academics and two specialists can participate. Their multitiered systems of support (MTSS) include a directed learning center with a block dedicated to special education services.

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

Each TPS school develops strong collaborative relationships with families, students, community partners, and other stakeholders to support students’ academic progress and behavioral, social, emotional, and physical development and well-being. District and school leaders reported that the district offers both virtual and in-person options for participation in conferences and meetings. School staff use ClassDojo and/or Remind Me to communicate with families. School leaders reported they also use Google Classroom so “the parents have access to the teacher’s Google Classroom to know exactly what’s on, so when the teacher calls home, they can talk about X, Y, Z, that’s posted in the Google Classroom.” EL specialists mentioned having an open house to meet the families and present on local community topics such as how the school computers work. They also reported on before and after school programs for parents to learn English.

However, families also noted that many times they did not receive as much communication from teachers as they would like, referring to examples of school websites not being helpful or teachers not communicating enough “day-to-day” activities. Teachers and families reported most information being shared through emails from teachers and the school. Families reported needing more consistency across teachers regarding the amount of updates and communication they give to teachers. Principals noted that “many” teachers keep communication logs and “book communication with parents” using the Smore newsletter. Special education staff reported a program called “Genius Hour” to help students discover their passions. Student support staff developed manuals for families with additional information for special education families that includes links to access translations of the manuals. In addition, TPS has developed a set of written policies regarding Title 1 Program family involvement.

District leaders reported connecting students to summer STEM camps run by Massachusetts universities through Middlesex Community College and trying to make them easy for families to access.

Human resources noted that the district has partnerships with organizations like the MassHire Greater Lowell Workforce Board and Thermo Fisher Scientific to provide educational events for students and families.

## Recommendations

- The district should continue to analyze staffing needs on an annual basis and ensure that the analysis considers qualified support staff who can address the needs of students with disabilities.

## Financial and Asset Management

With oversight from the superintendent, TPS’s business manager leads TPS’s financial management. These district staff members work together with school leaders to estimate and plan for annual staffing needs based on enrollment data and staff salaries. Finance and asset management staff reported that they meet with the superintendent monthly to discuss the spending data. Table 10 presents the key strengths and areas for growth for financial and asset management.

**Table 10. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>Budget documentation and reporting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Concise and accurate budget documents</li> <li>■ Budgeting driven by student and administrative enrollment data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Identification of budget management responsibilities</li> <li>■ Information on opportunity outcomes and gaps</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate budget</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Use of all available funding to support student performance and outcomes</li> <li>■ Staffing reviewed annually to plan for the effective use of people and time</li> </ul>	
<b>Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Efficient business office systems</li> </ul>	
<b>Capital planning and facility maintenance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Appropriate preventive maintenance system</li> <li>■ Long-term capital plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Preventive maintenance system review process for the capital plan</li> </ul>

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

TPS’s budget documents provide accurate and concise information to help guide spending in the district and are connected to district and school improvement planning as cited in the latest budget presentation and school committee meeting minutes from earlier this year. According to the budget proposal document from FY2021, the school budget is organized by salary, operating, and capital outlay costs. The budget proposal from FY2021 and the budget presentation for FY2023 both include historical spending data from three fiscal years prior to the present for comparison. Budget documents on revolving funds from transportation to nutrition services also were included. Student and administrative enrollment data were included in the FY2021 budget proposal and were confirmed by district finance staff to drive budget priorities. However, the budget proposal for FY2023 has no evidence of these data and no information presented on opportunity outcomes and gaps.

Based on the FY2023 budget hearing, the proposal from FY2021, and the latest end-of-year report, the town manages the fixed costs for TPS, which include health, retirement, Medicare, unemployment, insurance, debt nonexempt principal, debt nonexempt interest, and short-term interest costs. The schools oversee the salary, operating, and capital outlay costs. The costs managed by the town are not clearly articulated in the FY2023 budget, which is an area for improvement.

## Adequate Budget

The community provides adequate general appropriation funds each year to meet or exceed required net school spending for TPS and cover other costs such as transportation. The district uses all available funding to support student performance and outcomes such as special education reading support and innovation pathways support. The district also reviews staffing annually to plan for the effective use of people and time.

According to district finance and asset management staff and the budget hearing presentation for FY2023 and FY2022, the district uses all available funding effectively to support student outcomes, such as using the funds from an after-school grant to provide afterschool enrichment opportunities and the funds from the innovation pathways grant to provide internship opportunities and classes related to the industry pathway. The funds for special education reading, reading support, and all other title grants are regularly monitored to ensure that spending falls in accordance with the budget and that the remaining funds are carried over into the next year. Staff members have also used funds from the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund grants to cover COVID-19 expenses and plan to continue using the funds during the next two years to redesign the HVAC systems for schools. Finance and asset management staff have also reported that they regularly review scheduling each year by looking at the enrollment data for each course and coordinating with the department chairs to determine whether they have too few or too many staff and who can teach what. Staffing also is cited as an “ongoing conversation” during meetings to determine how to “fill everybody’s role and support the students the best that they can with the money that they have.” The effective use of funding toward student outcomes and the ongoing review of staffing and scheduling can be considered areas of strength.

## Financial Tracking, Forecasting, Controls, and Audits

TPS school and district leaders reported that they provide financial reports regularly to the superintendent. Staff members generate a year-to-date budget report for each payroll cycle using Eunice, which is the payroll’s financial system, that compares the budget with the salaries, operating accounts to actual spending, and all other encumbrances. Thereafter, the finance and asset management staff meet with the superintendent each month to discuss the spending data. These data along with any proposed revisions are presented to the TPS school committee during its meetings, as evidenced in the budget workshop section of the meeting minutes from January 2022. Finance and asset management staff have also reported that they meet with their payroll representative biweekly to review the payroll for any differences from the previous report and to ensure that proper funding sources are used. One finance and asset management staff member oversees the source of the grant funds, as well as which ones can be rolled over and what the ending dates are each month. Staff members have also reported that the entire town is audited on the federal grants piece annually during the summer and the end-of-year report annually, and implements any audit recommendations. A municipal leader also reported that the district meets end-of-year reporting requirements in a timely and accurate manner.

## Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

According to finance and asset management staff and the 2016 NEASC report, TPS has a preventive maintenance system in place to prolong the effective life of the district's capital assets and ensures that educational and program facilities are safe, secure, and conducive to student learning, including adequate access to technology. However, the preventive maintenance system requires an update to ensure that it captures all aspects of a preventive maintenance request, which can be considered an area for improvement. The district has a long-term capital plan that describes future improvement needs, including adequately sized facilities based on enrollment data. No available data exist on the review and revision process of the capital plan.

The district appointed one staff member dedicated to preventive maintenance to check the exhaust, fans, heater motors, and anything else to do with heating and ventilation in each school building, as well as to maintain recordkeeping through the newly developed work order system. However, according to finance and asset management staff, maintaining preventive maintenance requests through the work order system is not effective as it does not clearly account for the date that the preventive maintenance request was fulfilled, the steps that were taken, and what tools were used, which can be considered an area for improvement. Based on reports from finance and asset management staff, the 2016 NEASC report, and the FY2021 budget proposal, the district ensures program facilities are well maintained, safe, and conducive to student learning, including adequate access to technology. Finance and asset management staff use preventive maintenance logging for technological equipment to proactively monitor the status of a device such as Chromebooks and to determine whether a replacement will be needed, as well as how to factor that into the budget. Using a formal and proactive approach to preventive maintenance for technological devices to ensure accessibility for students can be considered an area of strength.

The district has a long-term capital plan as outlined in the budget hearing for FY2022 and FY2023 that describes the improvement needs for building and maintenance, as well as for technology. According to the budget proposal for FY2021, the capital outlay includes plans for improving the buildings and facilities along with the supporting enrollment data for students and administration. The capital outlay piece is funded every year and left open to projects based on what needs the most support according to finance and asset management staff. No available data exist on the review and revision process of the capital plan.

## Recommendations

- District leadership should ensure that the budget clearly articulates which costs are managed by the town and which are managed by the district.
- District leadership should include student and administrative enrollment data, as well as information related to outcomes and opportunity gaps in budget proposals.
- The district should ensure that its capital plan includes a process for reviewing the preventative maintenance system.

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

---

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in TPS. The team conducted 60 classroom observations between May 5 and May 12, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups between May 4 and May 11, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

- Superintendent
- Town government representative
- District leadership team
- School leaders
- Middle school students
- High school students
- Elementary, middle, and high school teachers
- Elementary, middle, and high school EL staff
- Elementary, middle, and high school special education specialists
- School committee representatives
- Family/community members
- TTA representatives

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

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

## Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

Group	District N	Percentage of total	State N	Percentage of total
All	3,180	100.0%	911,529	100.0%
African American	133	4.2%	84,970	9.3%
Asian	138	4.3%	65,813	7.2%
Hispanic	226	7.1%	210,747	23.1%
Native American	4	0.1%	2,060	0.2%
White	2,602	81.8%	507,992	55.7%
Native Hawaiian	0	0.0%	788	0.1%
Multirace, Non-Hispanic	77	2.4%	39,159	4.3%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

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

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of state
All students with high need	1,231	100.0%	37.9%	512,242	100.0%	55.6%
Students with disabilities	629	51.1%	19.4%	174,505	34.1%	18.9%
Low income households	732	59.5%	23.0%	399,140	77.9%	43.8%
ELs and former ELs	108	8.8%	3.4%	100,231	19.6%	11.0%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high need are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 3,246; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 920,971.



**Table B3. Tewksbury Public Schools: Chronic Absence Rates<sup>a</sup> by Student Group, 2018-2021**

<b>Group</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>4-year change</b>	<b>State (2021)</b>
All	8.1	6.0	7.5	5.7	-2.4	17.7
African American/Black	7.8	5.4	8.6	7.4	-0.4	24.1
Asian	9.4	8.4	10.2	0.7	-8.7	7.2
Hispanic/Latino	11.3	11.6	7.9	12.1	0.8	29.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	5.7	11.4	8.9	12.3	6.6	18.9
White	7.9	5.5	7.3	5.1	-2.8	13.2
High need	15.8	10.9	13.6	12.0	-3.8	26.3
Economically disadvantaged	18.8	12.8	16.7	15.0	-3.8	30.2
ELs	19.4	9.7	14.9	10.4	-9	29.0
Students with disabilities	16.1	10.7	13.8	14.7	-1.4	26.8

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

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

	2019		Fiscal year 2020		Fiscal year 2021	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
<b>Expenditures</b>						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	\$46,652,822	\$47,854,672	\$49,188,486	\$49,185,083	\$50,633,725	\$50,044,211
By municipality	\$21,854,585	\$22,209,475	\$26,594,254	\$30,467,344	\$26,871,769	\$39,063,787
Total from local appropriations	\$68,507,407	\$70,064,147	\$75,782,740	\$79,652,428	\$77,505,494	\$89,107,998
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$6,433,877	--	\$5,226,634	--	\$5,651,876
Total expenditures	--	\$76,498,024	--	\$84,879,061	--	\$94,759,874
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>						
Chapter 70 state aid <sup>a</sup>	--	\$13,224,155	--	\$13,326,215	--	\$13,326,215
Required local contribution	--	\$28,182,890	--	\$29,512,611	--	\$29,577,430
Required net school spending <sup>b</sup>	--	\$41,407,045	--	\$42,838,826	--	\$42,903,645
Actual net school spending	--	\$56,175,746	--	\$57,262,418	--	\$56,655,330
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$14,768,701	--	\$14,423,592	--	\$13,751,685
Over/under required (%)	--	35.7%	--	33.7%	--	32.1%

Note. Data as of June 1, 2022, and sourced from fiscal year 2020 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.  
<sup>a</sup> Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. <sup>b</sup> Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

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

<b>Expenditure category</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>
Administration	\$544.43	\$501.83	\$563.60
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$817.18	\$890.08	\$885.98
Teachers	\$5,826.24	\$6,183.71	\$6,681.89
Other teaching services	\$1,533.16	\$1,471.60	\$1,592.52
Professional development	\$312.48	\$346.50	\$246.91
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$700.77	\$798.91	\$689.65
Guidance, counseling, and testing services	\$380.14	\$449.52	\$457.96
Pupil services	\$1,796.45	\$1,370.02	\$1,531.78
Operations and maintenance	\$2,054.54	\$1,681.01	\$1,931.77
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$2,859.52	\$3,017.71	\$3,153.37
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$16,824.91</b>	<b>\$16,710.89</b>	<b>\$17,735.42</b>

# Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

---



## *Tewksbury Public Schools*

**Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings**

### **Districtwide Instructional Observation Report**

**May 2022**



201 Jones Road  
Waltham, Massachusetts  
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499  
[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)



# Contents

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





## Introduction

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

Five observers visited Tewksbury Public Schools during the week of May 5, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across 7 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"> <li>■ Positive Climate</li> <li>■ Negative Climate</li> <li>■ Teacher Sensitivity</li> <li>■ Regard for Student Perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Behavior Management</li> <li>■ Productivity</li> <li>■ Instructional Learning Formats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Concept Development</li> <li>■ Quality of Feedback</li> <li>■ Language Modeling</li> </ul>

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"> <li>■ Positive Climate</li> <li>■ Teacher Sensitivity</li> <li>■ Regard for Student Perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Behavior Management</li> <li>■ Productivity</li> <li>■ Negative Climate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Instructional Learning Formats</li> <li>■ Content Understanding</li> <li>■ Analysis and Inquiry</li> <li>■ Quality of Feedback</li> <li>■ Instructional Dialogue</li> </ul>
<b>Student Engagement</b>		

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

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

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

Research on CLASS protocol shows that students in classrooms that rated high using this observation tool have greater gains in social skills and academic success than students in classrooms with lower ratings (MET Project, 2010; CASTL, n.d.). Furthermore, small improvements on these domains can affect student outcomes:

“The ability to demonstrate even small changes in effective interactions has practical implications—differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students” (CASTL, n.d., p. 3).

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

## Positive Climate

---

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.2**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	2	6	5	10	24	5.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	2	6	8	0	16	5.4
Grades 9-12	0	1	5	6	4	4	0	20	4.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 16] + [6 \times 17] + [7 \times 10]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

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

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

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

## Teacher Sensitivity

---

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.8**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	6	7	10	24	6.1
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	2	7	5	2	16	5.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	1	8	7	4	20	5.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:  $([4 \times 4] + [5 \times 21] + [6 \times 19] + [7 \times 16]) \div 60$  observations = 5.8

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

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

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

## Regard for Student Perspectives

---

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 3.4**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	2	9	2	7	2	2	24	4.2
Grades 6-8	2	4	5	3	2	0	0	16	2.9
Grades 9-12	1	5	11	1	2	0	0	20	2.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 3] + [2 \times 11] + [3 \times 25] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 2]) \div 60$  observations = 3.4

**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.<sup>1</sup>

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

**Negative Climate District Average\*: 7.0**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	24	7.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	16	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	20	7.0

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:  $([6 \times 3] + [7 \times 57]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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	0	0	0	2	5	17	24	6.6
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	16	6.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	1	3	6	9	20	6.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 1] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 14] + [7 \times 38]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.5$

**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\*: 6.0**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	3	1	7	12	24	6.1
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	5	1	1	8	16	5.6
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	20	6.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 13] + [7 \times 31]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.0$

**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\*: 5.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	4	3	5	5	7	24	5.3
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	5	5	5	1	16	5.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	3	12	3	1	20	5.0

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 5] + [4 \times 11] + [5 \times 22] + [6 \times 13] + [7 \times 9]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

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

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

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

## Concept Development

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Concept Development District Average\*: 4.0**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	3	4	3	2	1	2	15	4.0

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 3] + [3 \times 4] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 2]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 4.0$

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

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

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

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

## Content Understanding

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12*

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

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

**Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.1**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	2	2	4	1	0	9	4.4
Grades 6-8	0	1	7	4	3	1	0	16	3.8
Grades 9-12	0	1	3	7	7	2	0	20	4.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:  $[(2 \times 2) + (3 \times 12) + (4 \times 13) + (5 \times 14) + (6 \times 4)] \div 45 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

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

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

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

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

## Analysis and Inquiry

---

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

### Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	1	0	6	1	0	1	9	4.2
Grades 6-8	0	6	2	6	1	1	0	16	3.3
Grades 9-12	11	3	5	1	0	0	0	20	1.8

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 11] + [2 \times 10] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 1]) \div 45 \text{ observations} = 2.8$

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

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

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

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

## Quality of Feedback

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 3.7**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	1	1	3	5	11	2	1	24	4.4
Grades 6-8	0	2	3	8	1	2	0	16	3.9
Grades 9-12	3	3	12	1	1	0	0	20	2.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 4] + [2 \times 6] + [3 \times 18] + [4 \times 14] + [5 \times 13] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 1]) \div 60$  observations = 3.7

**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\*: 3.7**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	4	3	1	7	0	0	15	3.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 4] + [3 \times 3] + [4 \times 1] + [5 \times 7]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 3.7$

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

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

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

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

## Instructional Dialogue

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12*

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

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

**Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.0**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	2	0	1	2	1	1	2	9	4.2
Grades 6-8	1	6	2	6	1	0	0	16	3.0
Grades 9-12	6	3	5	6	0	0	0	20	2.6

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 9] + [2 \times 9] + [3 \times 8] + [4 \times 14] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 2]) \div 45 \text{ observations} = 3.0$

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

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

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

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



## Student Engagement

---

*Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–12*

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

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

**Student Engagement District Average\*: 5.1**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	9	5.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	1	3	10	2	16	5.8
Grades 9-12	0	0	4	9	5	2	0	20	4.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 4] + [4 \times 11] + [5 \times 10] + [6 \times 15] + [7 \times 5]) \div 45 \text{ observations} = 5.1$

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

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

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

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



## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>5.8</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	1	2	6	5	10	24	5.9
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	24	7.0
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	1	6	7	10	24	6.1
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	2	9	2	7	2	2	24	4.2
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>6.0</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	24	6.6
Productivity	0	0	1	3	1	7	12	24	6.1
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	4	3	5	5	7	24	5.3
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	3	4	3	2	1	2	15	4.0
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	0	2	2	4	1	0	9	4.4
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	0	1	0	6	1	0	1	9	4.2
Quality of Feedback	1	1	3	5	11	2	1	24	4.4
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	4	3	1	7	0	0	15	3.7
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	2	0	1	2	1	1	2	9	4.2
<b>Student Engagement (UE only)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5.9</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 10]) \div 24 \text{ observations} = 5.9$

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 23]) \div 24 \text{ observations} = 7.0$ . In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	0	2	6	8	0	16	5.4
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	2	7	5	2	16	5.4
Regard for Student Perspectives	2	4	5	3	2	0	0	16	2.9
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	16	6.7
Productivity	0	0	1	5	1	1	8	16	5.6
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	16	6.9
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	0	5	5	5	1	16	5.1
Content Understanding	0	1	7	4	3	1	0	16	3.8
Analysis and Inquiry	0	6	2	6	1	1	0	16	3.3
Quality of Feedback	0	2	3	8	1	2	0	16	3.9
Instructional Dialogue	1	6	2	6	1	0	0	16	3.0
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5.8</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([4 \times 2] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 8]) \div 16 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 15]) \div 16 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Positive Climate	0	1	5	6	4	4	0	20	4.3
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	1	8	7	4	20	5.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	5	11	1	2	0	0	20	2.9
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	1	1	3	6	9	20	6.1
Productivity	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	20	6.3
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	20	7.0
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3.3</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	1	3	12	3	1	20	5.0
Content Understanding	0	1	3	7	7	2	0	20	4.3
Analysis and Inquiry	11	3	5	1	0	0	0	20	1.8
Quality of Feedback	3	3	12	1	1	0	0	20	2.7
Instructional Dialogue	6	3	5	6	0	0	0	20	2.6
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.3</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 4]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 4.3$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 19]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

## 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](http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf)
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K–3*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

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

---

**Table D1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB)</a> from Education Resource Strategies	This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs.

**Table D2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Quick Reference Guide: The Case for Curricular Coherence</a>	This guide describes three types of curricular coherence that support student learning: vertical coherence, aligned tiers of instruction, and cross-subject coherence.
<a href="#">Increasing Access to Advanced Coursework</a>	Describes how school districts can use the federal Every Student Succeeds Act to expand access to advanced coursework and increase students' achievement in these courses.
<a href="#">CURATE</a>	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 D3. Resources to Support Assessment**

Resource	Description
DESE's <a href="#">District Data Team Toolkit</a>	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 D4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development**

Resource	Description
<a href="#"><u>Quick Reference Guide: Opportunities to Streamline the Evaluation Process</u></a>	This guide helps districts reflect on and continuously improve their evaluation systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What’s working? What are the bright spots?</li> <li>How can we streamline the process to stay focused on professional growth and development?</li> <li>What do we need to adjust to ensure our system is valuable to educators and students?</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Identifying Meaningful Professional Development</u></a>	A video in which educators from three Massachusetts districts discuss the importance of targeted, meaningful professional development and the ways districts can use the evaluation process to identify the most effective professional development supports for all educators.
<a href="#"><u>The Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice</u></a>	This guide includes tools for districts, schools, and educators aligned to the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework. It promotes evidence-based best practices for inclusion following the principles of Universal Design for Learning, PBIS, and social-emotional learning.
<a href="#"><u>Making Inclusive Education Work</u></a> by Richard A. Villa and Jacqueline S. Thousand	The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is a nonprofit, nonpartisan membership organization that develops programs, products, and services essential to the way educators learn, teach, and lead.

**Table D5. Resources to Support Student Support**

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

**Table D6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management**

Resource	Description
<a href="#"><u>Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets</u></a> (scroll down to Research section)	A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.

## Appendix E. Student Performance Tables

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

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,500	502.6	505.8	502.3	-0.3	496.5	5.8
African American/ Black	57	496.6	502.4	500.7	4.1	486.4	14.3
Asian	50	513.5	519.6	507.1	-6.4	508.5	-1.4
Hispanic/Latino	101	504.4	501.4	495.4	-9.0	484.3	11.1
Multirace	23	505.1	514.9	511.2	6.1	499.7	11.5
White	1,269	502.3	505.6	502.6	0.3	501.3	1.3
High need	538	490.6	493.8	490.3	-0.3	485.9	4.4
Economically disadvantaged	314	497.6	499.3	493.6	-4.0	485.2	8.4
ELs and former ELs	77	495.2	496.4	492.9	-2.3	482.8	10.1
Students with disabilities	287	480.2	482.8	479.9	-0.3	478.1	1.8

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

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,502	500.1	501.6	493.0	-7.1	489.7	3.3
African American/ Black	59	491.4	494.2	491.0	-0.4	477.3	13.7
Asian	50	516.6	515.6	503.2	-13.4	508.6	-5.4
Hispanic/Latino	104	501.8	496.9	479.7	-22.1	476.5	3.2
Multirace	23	496.0	512.7	504.8	8.8	492.1	12.7
White	1,266	499.9	501.6	493.6	-6.3	494.3	-0.7
High need	540	487.6	489.4	481.0	-6.6	479.0	2.0
Economically disadvantaged	314	492.8	494.5	481.6	-11.2	477.4	4.2
ELs and former ELs	82	499.1	493.6	485.2	-13.9	477.8	7.4

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
Students with disabilities	285	478.0	479.2	473.2	-4.8	472.5	0.7

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

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,500	56%	62%	56%	0%	46%	10%
African American/ Black	57	47%	58%	51%	4%	28%	23%
Asian	50	77%	75%	62%	-15%	66%	-4%
Hispanic/Latino	101	59%	53%	45%	-14%	26%	19%
Multirace	23	53%	89%	70%	17%	51%	19%
White	1,269	56%	62%	56%	0%	54%	2%
High need	538	32%	39%	33%	1%	28%	5%
Economically disadvantaged	314	47%	49%	39%	-8%	27%	12%
ELs and former ELs	77	43%	51%	38%	-5%	24%	14%
Students with disabilities	287	13%	18%	17%	4%	16%	1%

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	1,502	52%	55%	38%	-14%	33%	5%
African American/ Black	59	37%	41%	39%	2%	14%	25%
Asian	50	79%	75%	56%	-23%	64%	-8%
Hispanic/Latino	104	60%	44%	13%	-47%	14%	-1%
Multirace	23	40%	79%	61%	21%	37%	24%
White	1,266	51%	56%	39%	-12%	40%	-1%
High need	540	28%	29%	19%	-9%	16%	3%
Economically disadvantaged	314	39%	37%	21%	-18%	14%	7%
ELs and former ELs	82	55%	36%	23%	-32%	17%	6%
Students with disabilities	285	10%	11%	8%	-2%	10%	-2%



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

Group	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below
All	191	513.2	507.3	5.9	192	503.9	500.6	3.3
African American/ Black	8	—	494.6	—	8	—	486.7	—
Asian	7	—	518.2	—	7	—	520.9	—
Hispanic/Latino	8	—	491.9	—	8	—	485.3	—
Multirace	3	—	510.6	—	3	—	503.9	—
White	164	513.5	512.5	1.0	165	504.7	504.9	-0.2
High need	58	503.9	493.3	10.6	59	492.7	486.5	6.2
Economically disadvantaged	43	506.0	493.7	12.3	44	494.0	486.6	7.4
ELs and former ELs	2	—	477.9	—	2	—	477.6	—
Students with disabilities	28	490.5	487.2	3.3	28	482.3	479.6	2.7

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

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

Group	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below	N (2021)	2021	State	Above/ below
All	191	71%	64%	7%	192	56%	52%	4%
African American/ Black	8	—	41%	—	8	—	27%	—
Asian	7	—	80%	—	7	—	80%	—
Hispanic/Latino	8	—	39%	—	8	—	26%	—
Multirace	3	—	67%	—	3	—	55%	—
White	164	73%	73%	0%	165	55%	60%	-5%
High need	58	52%	39%	13%	59	37%	26%	11%
Economically disadvantaged	43	60%	41%	19%	44	41%	27%	14%
ELs and former ELs	2	—	19%	—	2	—	15%	—
Students with disabilities	28	21%	25%	-4%	28	18%	14%	4%

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

Group	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	Above/below
All	448	52%	49%	42%	7%
African American/Black	19	42%	37%	19%	18%
Asian	15	80%	40%	62%	-22%
Hispanic/Latino	31	33%	29%	20%	9%
Multirace	7	—	86%	47%	39%
White	376	53%	51%	50%	1%
High need	160	26%	31%	23%	8%
Economically disadvantaged	96	34%	34%	21%	13%
ELs and former ELs	25	—	32%	18%	14%
Students with disabilities	91	14%	20%	15%	5%

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

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/below
3	236	64%	63%	67%	3	51%	16
4	276	50%	68%	45%	-5	49%	-4
5	228	65%	55%	57%	-8	47%	10
6	245	53%	59%	56%	3	47%	9
7	264	49%	64%	49%	0	43%	6
8	251	59%	63%	63%	4	41%	22
3-8	1,500	56%	62%	56%	0	46%	10
10	191	—	69%	71%	—	64%	7

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/below
3	236	66%	65%	42%	-24	33%	9
4	276	39%	61%	29%	-10	33%	-4
5	231	59%	50%	41%	-18	33%	8
6	245	52%	57%	51%	-1	33%	18
7	263	38%	47%	28%	-10	35%	-7
8	251	58%	54%	41%	-17	32%	9

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/below
3-8	1,502	52%	55%	38%	-14	33%	5
10	192	—	73%	56%	—	52%	4

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

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
5	231	59%	—	54%	-5	42%
8	217	46%	—	44%	-2	41%
5 and 8	448	52%	—	49%	-3	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

**Table E11. Tewksbury Public Schools: ELA and Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-10, 2019-2021**

Grade	ELA				Mathematics			
	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)
3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4	—	49.9	—	—	—	42.4	—	—
5	214	50.9	41.4	34.9	216	52.9	30.9	31.9
6	230	43.6	36.8	37.3	229	41.6	29.6	26.3
7	249	68.6	44.8	36.1	248	48.4	27.6	35.8
8	236	65.9	51.1	34.8	235	71.3	35.3	27.4
3-8	929	56.1	43.6	35.8	928	51.6	30.8	30.4
10	177	36.4	48.7	52.5	177	37.6	33.3	36.5

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

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Dewing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Heath Brook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Street	65%	47%	—	—	—	—	55%	—
Ryan	—	—	58%	57%	—	—	58%	—
Trahan	72%	44%	—	—	—	—	57%	—
Wynn Middle	—	—	—	—	50%	63%	56%	—

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Tewksbury Memorial High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	74%
District	67%	45%	57%	56%	49%	63%	56%	71%
State	51%	49%	47%	47%	43%	41%	46%	64%

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

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Dewing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Heath Brook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Street	39%	36%	—	—	—	—	37%	—
Ryan	—	—	42%	52%	—	—	47%	—
Trahan	48%	24%	—	—	—	—	35%	—
Wynn Middle	—	—	—	—	28%	42%	35%	—
Tewksbury Memorial High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	59%
District	42%	29%	41%	51%	28%	41%	38%	56%
State	33%	33%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%	52%

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

School	5	8	5 and 8	10
Dewing	—	—	—	—
Heath Brook	—	—	—	—
North Street	—	—	—	—
Ryan	55%	—	55%	—
Trahan	—	—	—	—
Wynn Middle	—	44%	44%	—
Tewksbury Memorial High	—	—	—	—
District	54%	44%	49%	—
State	42%	41%	42%	—

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

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

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Dewing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Heath Brook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Street	55%	28%	36%	13%	32%	50%	73%	47%	—	56%
Ryan	58%	38%	47%	19%	26%	41%	45%	40%	—	60%
Trahan	57%	45%	45%	27%	67%	—	—	62%	—	55%
Wynn Middle	56%	29%	35%	15%	29%	50%	67%	48%	—	57%
Tewksbury Memorial High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	56%	33%	39%	17%	38%	51%	62%	45%	70%	56%
State	46%	28%	27%	16%	24%	28%	66%	26%	51%	54%

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

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

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Dewing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Heath Brook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Street	37%	18%	17%	5%	37%	43%	55%	11%	—	39%
Ryan	47%	29%	35%	11%	27%	53%	55%	15%	—	49%
Trahan	35%	18%	20%	14%	13%	—	—	23%	—	35%
Wynn Middle	35%	13%	13%	7%	14%	35%	61%	15%	—	35%
Tewksbury Memorial High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	38%	19%	21%	8%	23%	39%	56%	13%	61%	39%
State	33%	16%	14%	10%	17%	14%	64%	14%	37%	40%

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

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

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Tewksbury Memorial High	74%	59%	70%	29%	—	—	—	—	—	75%
District	71%	52%	60%	21%	—	—	—	—	—	73%
State	64%	39%	41%	25%	19%	41%	80%	39%	67%	73%

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

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

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Tewksbury Memorial High	59%	43%	49%	24%	—	—	—	—	—	57%
District	56%	37%	41%	18%	—	—	—	—	—	55%
State	52%	26%	27%	14%	15%	27%	80%	26%	55%	60%

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

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

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Dewing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Heath Brook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Street	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ryan	55%	38%	40%	27%	44%	67%	33%	33%	83%	56%
Trahan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wynn Middle	44%	24%	26%	13%	25%	27%	50%	27%	100%	46%
Tewksbury Memorial High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	49%	31%	34%	20%	32%	37%	40%	29%	86%	51%
State	42%	23%	21%	15%	18%	19%	62%	20%	47%	50%

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

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	228	92.6	94.9	94.9	93.9	1.3	89.8
African American/Black	9	—	71.4	—	100	—	84.4
Asian	10	—	100	100	90.0	—	96.1
Hispanic/Latino	13	100	83.3	100	92.3	-7.7	80.0
Multirace	4	—	—	—	—	—	88.8
White	192	92.1	95.7	94.3	94.8	2.7	93.2
High need	83	79.1	85.2	86.8	85.5	6.4	82.4
Economically disadvantaged	64	81.4	87.5	85.2	87.5	6.1	81.7
ELs and former ELs	8	—	100	—	62.5	—	71.8
Students with disabilities	44	67.4	74.4	78.0	79.5	12.1	76.6

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

Group	N (2020)	2017	2018	2019	2020	4-year change	State (2020)
All	234	94.9	91.0	96.1	95.3	0.4	91.0
African American/Black	4	—	—	71.4	—	—	87.2
Asian	9	—	—	100	100	—	95.8
Hispanic/ Latino	10	—	100	83.3	100	—	81.0
Multirace	1	—	—	—	—	—	90.8
White	210	94.7	90.3	97.0	94.8	0.1	94.4
High need	76	89.5	74.4	88.9	88.2	-1.3	84.5
Economically disadvantaged	54	87.1	78.0	89.3	87.0	-0.1	84.1
ELs and former ELs	3	—	—	100	—	—	74.7
Students with disabilities	41	88.9	58.7	82.1	80.5	-8.4	79.3

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.3
African American/Black	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.3
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.0

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

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	3.0	2.2	1.2	0.4	-2.6	0.5
African American/Black	5.3	—	—	—	—	0.6
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Hispanic/Latino	4.7	—	—	—	—	0.5
Multirace	—	—	—	—	—	0.7
White	2.8	2.1	1.1	0.5	-2.3	0.5
High need	4.7	4.0	1.9	0.6	-4.1	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	5.1	4.6	2.5	—	—	0.7
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Students with disabilities	6.5	4.2	1.1	—	—	1.1

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	819	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.0	1.5
African American/Black	31	4.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	-4.3	1.8
Asian	38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	47	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	3.2
Multirace	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	1.4
White	690	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.1	-0.3	1.0
High need	218	1.4	1.0	2.3	0.5	-0.9	2.7
Economically disadvantaged	139	1.6	0.8	3.2	0.7	-0.9	2.9
ELs and former ELs	4	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	5.8
Students with disabilities	101	2.8	1.0	2.6	0.0	-2.8	2.4



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

Group	N (2020)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
All	444	77.1	76.0	71.8	-5.3	65.3
African American/Black	17	70.0	61.5	41.2	-28.8	54.9
Asian	20	88.2	88.2	90.0	1.8	84.3
Hispanic/Latino	30	44.4	63.6	76.7	32.3	50.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	—	—	—	—	65.5
White	373	78.3	77.2	72.1	-6.2	69.6
High need	133	47.6	42.7	43.6	-4.0	47.7
Economically disadvantaged	95	59.4	52.3	49.5	-9.9	49.0
ELs and former ELs	5	—	—	—	—	28.1
Students with disabilities	57	13.0	19.2	17.5	4.5	33.1