

# Dartmouth 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
- Dartmouth Public Schools: District Review Overview ..... 4
- Leadership and Governance ..... 8
- Curriculum and Instruction..... 14
- Assessment ..... 19
- Human Resources and Professional Development ..... 22
- Student Support..... 27
- Financial and Asset Management ..... 32
- 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 Dartmouth Public Schools (hereafter, Dartmouth) in May 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of the district’s continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.

The following text 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

Dartmouth is led by a superintendent in her seventh year in the role, as well as central office staff, including an assistant superintendent of finance and operations, a director of teaching and learning, a pupil support services administrator, an assistant pupil support services administrator, and a chief technology officer. The district is governed by a school committee composed of five members who are elected for staggered three-year terms. The District Improvement Plan, presented to the school committee in 2021, reflects the priorities laid out by DESE in its Acceleration Roadmap, including sense of belonging, monitoring understanding, and strong instruction. The superintendent recently converted the director of learning position and a vacant assistant superintendent position into two new directors of teaching and learning (elementary and secondary) and noted that these individuals will support a “re-imagining” of the *District’s Strategic Improvement Plan* to guide ongoing work, particularly focused on equity and access. In addition, in July 2020, the school committee voted to establish an equality and diversity committee (EDC) to include school, district, and community stakeholders.

### Curriculum and Instruction

Interviews with district and school leaders indicate that the district has structures in place to support the implementation of curricula designed to meet Massachusetts standards and prepare all students for college, career, and civic participation. The majority of curricular programs used in Dartmouth have not been reviewed or rated by CURATE; however, the district recently implemented Bridges for K-5 Math, which received a CURATE rating of *partially meets expectations*. District and school leaders

noted interest in increasing vertical alignment across disciplines throughout the district and described recent efforts to map out digital learning standards for K-12 as an exemplar that they would like to see expanded to other departments and disciplines. Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong emotional support, high classroom organization and student engagement (Grades 4-5), and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, strong classroom organization and student engagement, and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of strong emotional support, strong evidence of classroom organization, and mixed evidence of student engagement or consistently rigorous instructional support.

## Assessment

Information collected throughout this district review indicates that Dartmouth staff consistently use the following assessments to measure and monitor student progress and performance: Acadience (K-2) and Renaissance Star (K-8) for mathematics and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS; K-3) and Renaissance Star (K-8) for English language arts (ELA). At the high school, departments have developed common assessments to support benchmarking and collaborative planning. Staff indicated familiarity with these standard assessments and described that data are reviewed in grade-level meetings and throughout the student support process. However, grade-level teaming structures vary by school, and district staff noted ongoing efforts to formalize the structures to better support the ongoing use of assessment data during grade-level team meetings. Schools and teachers share inconsistent information with parents regarding student assessment results, with some sharing formal reports with score details and others simply indicating a description of students' scores as either at, below, or above grade-level standards.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

Dartmouth's human resources infrastructure is limited with no dedicated human resources staff or department. Human resources work is primarily carried out by assistants within the superintendent's office who have additional duties beyond human resources. The district has multiple programs in place to support new teachers and evaluate in-service teachers. District-level staff describe high levels of both teacher and administrator retention and are interested in identifying strategies to recruit and hire more diverse candidates throughout the district. Simple random sampling was used to select a sample of the 280 Professional Teacher Status teachers with summative evaluations for the 2020-2021 school year. The review of evaluations indicated that nearly all educators were developing student learning and professional practice SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goals. Ninety-four percent of the evaluations reviewed contained student learning SMART goals and professional practice SMART goals. However, a review of seven summative evaluations for administrators for 2020-2021 indicated that the administrators were not developing student learning, professional practice, or school improvement SMART goals. Of the summative evaluations reviewed, more than half of the evaluations (57 percent) included student learning goals, more than two thirds (71 percent) included professional practice goals, and none of the evaluations included school improvement goals. None of the evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. All summative

administrator evaluations (100 percent) reviewed included evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback identifying administrator strengths and areas for improvement.

## Student Support

Dartmouth prioritizes a school climate that ensures the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging of its students. The district uses a response to intervention (RTI) approach that integrates academic and nonacademic supports along a continuum of student need. School-based teams follow a protocol to refer students who may benefit from additional support. District staff note that all schools use positive behavioral interventions and support (PBIS), and the district has partnered with consultants who provide direct support to school-based teams for developing social, emotional, and/or behavioral support plans for students. District staff noted that although protocols and teams exist to support the RTI process, systems for progress monitoring, including entry and exit criteria for different supports are not yet codified across the district. Interviews with school-based staff indicated that although protocols exist, some staff note that protocols are not always followed and identified areas for growth concerning the RTI process.

## Financial and Asset Management

Dartmouth leaders traditionally base their budget on the *Strategic Improvement Plan*; however, the update to the current *Strategic Improvement Plan (2016-2019)* was delayed due to the districts' response to COVID-19, and as a result the district's most recent budget was aligned with the district improvement plan, which is grounded in DESE's Acceleration Roadmap. To develop budget proposals, school leaders make budget requests that a district leadership team reviews for consideration in the final budget request. District leaders and documents suggested that Dartmouth has sufficient funds to exceed net school spending. The district participates in the school choice program, which provides additional revenue to support district initiatives. The school committee develops and approves the district's five-year capital plan. Budget documents are presented by function, including instruction, administration, maintenance and utilities, tuition, and other services; however, the budget documents do not include expenses broken down by school.

# Dartmouth Public Schools: District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.<sup>1</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 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> 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 Dartmouth was conducted during the week of May 4, 2022. The site visit included 19 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 71 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted six teacher focus groups with 11 elementary-school teachers, 11 middle-school teachers, and 10 high-school teachers.

The site team also conducted 59 observations of classroom instruction in six schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

---

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

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

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. 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

Dartmouth is led by a superintendent in her seventh year in the role, as well as central office staff, including an assistant superintendent of finance and operations, a director of teaching and learning, a pupil support services administrator, an assistant pupil support services administrator, and a chief technology officer. The district is governed by a school committee composed of five members who are elected for staggered three-year terms.

In the 2021-2022 school year, there were 272 teachers in the district, with 3,411 students enrolled in the district’s six schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

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

School	Type	Grades served	Enrollment
Andrew B. Cushman Elementary School	Elementary	PK-K	131
Dartmouth High School	High	9-12	1,032
Dartmouth Middle School	Middle	6-8	810
George H. Potter Elementary School	Elementary	PK-5	392
James M. Quinn Elementary School	Elementary	K-5	672
Joseph Demello Elementary School	Elementary	1-5	374
<b>Totals</b>			<b>3,411</b>

Note. [Enrollment Data \(2021-22\)–Dartmouth \(00720000\) \(mass.edu\)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&leftNavId=305&) as of October 1, 2021.

Between 2018 and 2022, overall student enrollment decreased by 7 percent. In 2022, students from low-income families made up 33.0 percent of the district’s enrollment (state average is 43.8 percent). The district served a similar percentage of students with disabilities as the state (18.2 percent versus 18.9 percent), a smaller percentage of English learners (ELs) (1.7 percent versus 11 percent), and a smaller percentage of students whose first language is not English (3.0 percent versus 23.9 percent).<sup>3</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 in Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was less than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for K-12 districts of similar size in fiscal year 2020: \$14,766 versus with \$16,153. 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.

<sup>3</sup> Source: <https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&leftNavId=305&>



## School and Student Performance

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) is greater than the average state rate for all tested grades and subject areas. 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	46%	57%	55%	9	51%	4
4	251	55%	51%	56%	1	49%	7
5	232	56%	67%	52%	-4	47%	5
6	272	63%	69%	59%	-4	47%	12
7	266	59%	56%	52%	-7	43%	9
8	291	62%	56%	45%	-17	41%	4
3-8	1,548	57%	59%	53%	-4	46%	7
10	230	—	67%	73%	—	64%	9

Note. Data sourced from [https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement\\_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00720000&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	237	43%	49%	37%	-6	33%	4
4	251	44%	47%	47%	3	33%	14
5	232	50%	50%	40%	-10	33%	7
6	272	54%	61%	44%	-10	33%	11
7	266	57%	55%	41%	-16	35%	6
8	290	54%	55%	37%	-17	32%	5
3-8	1,548	51%	53%	41%	-10	33%	8
10	230	—	69%	60%	—	52%	8

Note. Data sourced from [https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement\\_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&) (2021).

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

Grade	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
5	232	54%	—	47%	-7	42%
8	273	50%	—	40%	-10	41%
5 and 8	505	52%	—	43%	-9	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test. Data sourced from [https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement\\_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=00720000&orgtypecode=5&) (2021).

In addition, the district’s four-year graduation rate<sup>4</sup> was 92.3 percent in 2021, which is greater than the state rate of 89.8 percent. The district’s five-year graduation rate was 94.8 percent in 2020, which is greater than the state rate of 91 percent.

<sup>4</sup> [Cohort 2021 Graduation Rates -Dartmouth \(00720000\) \(mass.edu\)](#)

## Leadership and Governance

---

At the time of data collection, the superintendent had served in Dartmouth for nearly seven years. She reports directly to the school committee and works closely with district and school leaders to develop and implement strategic planning, budget items, and improvement work related to equity, curriculum and instruction, and more. The superintendent's current focus is on equity initiatives, including increased diversity with hiring and strengthening instructional practices in the wake of pandemic-related disruptions. The *Dartmouth Public Schools District Improvement Plan*, presented to the school committee in 2021, reflects the priorities laid out by DESE in its Acceleration Roadmap, including sense of belonging, monitoring understanding, and strong instruction. The superintendent recently appointed two new directors of teaching and learning, one for elementary schools and one for secondary schools to begin in summer 2022 and noted that these individuals will support a “re-imagining” of the district’s *Strategic Improvement Plan* to guide ongoing work, particularly focused on equity and access.

The district is governed by a school committee consisting of five members who serve overlapping terms of three years each. The chair of the committee has served for 31 years. The committee has multiple responsibilities, with the primary ones being “policy and budget.” The two members interviewed agreed that their role is one of support in terms of district policies and budgetary concerns; they also discussed the importance of navigating school and community issues, such as a politicized conversation about the district logo. The committee expressed support for the superintendent, including decisions such as the creation of two new director positions, rather than refilling a vacated assistant superintendent role—a decision that some school leaders questioned. The committee meets twice monthly and holds public discussions about their oversight, decision-making, and policy processes.

Currently, the Dartmouth Master Plan is undergoing revision, and various working drafts are available online for public comment. Master Plans, as stated in Massachusetts General Law are “designed to provide a basis for decision making regarding the long-term physical development of the municipality” (M.G.L. ch.41 §81D). . Section four of the draft focuses on town infrastructure, and includes planning information regarding town services and facilities, including schools. District leaders also discussed the importance of ongoing changes related to the pandemic, pointing out that the development of the new master plan was interrupted when the pandemic began and efforts to develop it have restarted.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for 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>■ Establishes a culture of collaboration with district and school leaders.</li> <li>■ Draws on input of multiple stakeholders.</li> </ul>	
<b>District and school leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Establishes a culture of collaboration among district and school leaders.</li> <li>■ Responsiveness to changes, including new initiatives related to diversity, the COVID-19 pandemic, and curriculum and instruction.</li> </ul>	
<b>District and school improvement planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Public processes for new initiatives and community issues.</li> <li>■ Use of public input to inform planning and policy efforts.</li> </ul>	
<b>Budget development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Clear budget development process.</li> <li>■ School committee members and district leaders seek to inform and encourage buy-in from community stakeholders regarding budget issues, priorities, and procedures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Use of data to inform budget decisions, in particular disaggregated student data.</li> </ul>

## School Committee Governance

The school committee collaborates with district leaders and local community members to fulfill its legal and fiduciary responsibilities. Much of the committee’s work in recent years has been very public, including responses to the COVID-19 pandemic and a controversy surrounding the “Dartmouth Indian logo,”<sup>5</sup> which the committee voted to uphold following a non-binding town referendum vote on the matter. Although this issue was not a planned area of focus for the school committee, it became a highly publicized issue within the community. Therefore, the committee presided over several public conversations about this topic to inform their decision to retain the logo. Similarly, the committee, along with district leaders, devised ways of sharing communication with the community—such as robocalls, online postings, and meeting agendas—to provide more information about popular issues such as the logo, COVID-19 protocols, and the district planning.

In terms of collaboration, the committee collects and shares considerable information with district leaders and the local community. Public processes for information sharing include not only district personnel but also the local community and policy leaders. A student representative attends school committee meetings and provides an update on behalf of Dartmouth students. The student representative is invited to stay and participate in the entirety of the meeting. The necessary collaboration between the school committee and the town’s finance committee is evidenced through town finance committee meeting minutes in which multiple discussions about the district’s expenditures per pupil are documented. According to committee members, when collaborating with the community and district leaders, school committee members take the role of a facilitator rather

<sup>5</sup> [20220425agendaschcommmin.pdf \(dartmouth.ma.us\)](https://www.dartmouth.ma.us/20220425agendaschcommmin.pdf)

than as active participants with their own agendas—often bringing up issues the community raises with the superintendent.

The school committee's approach to improvement is mostly a support role. One member said that the committee prefers not to get "into the weeds" regarding improvement initiatives, and another member stated that they prefer having the superintendent drive improvement. When there are new policies or budget items for improvement, it is the committee's job to work with district leadership to facilitate that process, not to develop or implement it. The committee provides oversight of district leadership, but members expressed preference for a process guided more by the superintendent's improvement goals than by committee agendas. The committee expressed considerable trust in the superintendent, including her expertise, leadership, and decision making.

At the time of the district review, district leaders noted that the current *Dartmouth Public Schools District Strategic Improvement Plan* needs updating, with the most recent strategic improvement plan spanning the years 2016 to 2019. The existing strategic improvement plan identified three main priorities, including teaching and learning, access and equity, and community engagement. The *Dartmouth Public Schools District Strategic Improvement Plan* includes documentation regarding the plan development process, including the teams and individuals involved, as well as how the plan will inform other district plans and activities. District leaders noted that they have plans to develop an updated strategic improvement plan, which will include input from two newly appointed directors of teaching and learning and emphasize equity and access.

## District and School Leadership

A leadership team consisting of district-level administrators and school leaders supports the superintendent. They meet regularly to discuss initiatives such as improvement related to equity, curriculum and instruction, the budget, and COVID-19 pandemic responses. The leadership team collaborates on strategic planning at both the district and school levels. The school committee also evaluates the superintendent. Together with district leaders and school committee input, she sets SMART goals for her annual performance evaluation and provides updates on progress and status within each goal. Much of the superintendent's work is guided by *2021 District Improvement Plan*, which is used to frame school improvement plans for each school that reflect the same overarching priorities of sense of belonging, monitoring understanding, and strong instruction. The superintendent described various initiatives related to district and school improvement plans as well as her own performance evaluation. She highlighted issues related to equity and instructional improvement as particularly important, given current social contexts and the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, the superintendent noted that increasing employee diversity was a goal for the district and welcomed suggestions on strategies to support this goal.

District leaders draw on data and information when making decisions. Several indicators undergo review, including multiple tests and sets of student data, observations, notes from school leaders, and formative and summative evaluation tools for district and school leaders. These leaders highlighted the importance of observations and dialogue, as well as student data, when undertaking new initiatives and planning for the future. Leadership groups described extensive efforts to create and provide documentation about progress to the school committee. One district leader emphasized walkthroughs as being critical to monitoring progress toward instructional goals throughout the

district. Leaders also described a proactive approach of planning out professional development, including opportunities provided through DESE.

Leaders at the school level have similar structures, forming committees or other leadership teams when faced with decisions about the direction of their schools. They described this approach as less formal than the district leadership team, and teacher leaders asserted that school leaders are responsive to their needs.

## District and School Improvement Planning

District and school leaders described formal and collaborative processes that are typically followed to develop district and school improvement plans, but they noted that this year's improvement plan process was slightly less formal because of capacity constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The *Dartmouth Public Schools District Improvement Plan*, presented to the school committee in 2021, aligns district priorities with the priorities outlined in DESE's Acceleration Roadmap, including sense of belonging, monitoring understanding, and strong instruction. School improvement plans outline school-specific activities that relate to each priority, aligning work across the district to these larger priorities. Across focus groups and interviews, there was a general agreement that improvement planning and processes are open, dialogical, and based on genuine need. The superintendent described an in-depth data collection and analysis process involving the examination of teacher evaluation and survey data, the coding of qualitative data into themes, and follow-up in terms of budget requests or professional development. Teaching staff responses demonstrated familiarity with both school and district plans, indicating the existence of follow-up in professional development sessions to align schools and classrooms with improvement processes. Parents from the community described participating in the planning process through various teams and committees, including school councils, parent teacher organizations, and school committee. From the district's long-term master plan—which is currently in development and undergoes a public review process—to individual school plans, improvement plans are presented publicly to the school committee. School improvement plans are developed each year, although some ongoing initiatives are included in multiple plans. For example, the district has sponsored professional development about blended, personalized, and project-based learning for multiple years through a partnership with the Highlander Institute Consulting Group, and work is ongoing to vertically align digital literacy and social studies curricula. Several sources referred to district plans as “live document[s],” open to the public and district leaders.

Numerous school and district leaders described an involved process of using extensive data from schools, school leaders, and the district when making plans for improvement. Interviews of district administrators and school leaders indicated formal meetings between these stakeholders to support improvement plans, as well as alignment between professional development protocols, strategic plans, and proposed budgets. Although school committee members mentioned the collection and use of student data, they expressed greater reliance on observations and dialogue to make determinations about improvement initiatives. The interviews of committee members identified many examples of dialogical processes and collaboration to inform improvement initiatives. In the future, there is an opportunity to formally include a newly established committee in district and school improvement planning processes. In July 2020, the school committee voted to establish the EDC, which will include two school committee members, two Dartmouth faculty or staff, two high-

school students, two community members, and two Dartmouth administrators. In December 2020, the school committee unanimously voted to approve an official charge for the EDC: to “make recommendations to the school committee on equity, diversity and inclusion throughout the district with regard to allocation of resources, ongoing activities and strategic investments to shape future direction” (School Committee Minutes, December 7, 2020).

## Budget Development

Members of the school committee explained that the budget is their most important charge. They described an involved process by which district and school leaders identify budget priorities, which the committee then attempts to reconcile with existing budget constraints. The school committee coordinates with district leadership to finalize the budget, and committee members act as intermediaries between the district and the town’s budgetary arms, including the finance committee and the select board. School leaders and community stakeholders frequently referenced long-term plans that connect to each yearly budget. The committee also works with district administrators and the local community, including the parent teacher organization, to raise additional funds. Along with district leaders, they use grants, federal funds, and fundraising with community stakeholders to supplement the budget. For this reason, the committee described a budget that is tight but well spent, efficient, and responsive to educator-identified needs. One district leader suggested that the budget was sufficient for current initiatives, but that sentiment was not consistent across other district or school leaders. Several leaders and teachers described the budget as limited.

The district’s budget is based on identified needs from district- and school-level leaders and practitioners. Teachers, school leaders, and district leaders all expressed some degree of agency about asking for funds when needed. The school committee described requests as educationally sound, and not frivolous. Because requests go through multiple leaders, there is accountability to help determine the merit of requests. Although district and school leaders used dialogue, observational data, and input from stakeholders to determine budget needs, one area that interview data and documents do not clearly explain is the relationship between budget needs and student data use. School committee members, district leaders, and school leaders agreed that the needs were real and well justified but rarely provided specifics about student data. These participants did not describe how data helped determine funding priorities; they noted only that data informed the planning process.

The district provided budget proposals going back several years, each of which provided significant detail about the process, oversight, and relationship to strategic priorities, including short- and long-term planning. There is considerable documentation and detail about the budget and how it relates to district priorities (e.g., student-centered instruction, student well-being), which are determined through the qualitative processes described in the District and School Improvement Planning section.

## Recommendations

- District and school leaders should ensure that improvement planning processes include input from the EDC.

- The district and the school committee should establish a formalized process and clear expectations for the use of data, including disaggregated student data, to inform budget decisions.



## Curriculum and Instruction

Interviews with district and school leaders indicated that the district has structures in place to support the implementation of curricula aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and prepare all students for college, career, and civic participation. The majority of curricular programs used in Dartmouth have not been reviewed or rated by CURATE<sup>6</sup>; however, the district recently implemented Bridges for K-5 Math, which received a CURATE rating of *partially meets expectations*. Feedback from teachers revealed some degree of familiarity with curriculum selection processes in the district, as well as critical feedback of some curricular materials currently in use. School and district leaders spoke highly of specific examples of curricular alignment, including K-5 ELA and mathematics across four schools, social studies, and digital literacy standards (K-12); however, ongoing vertical alignment within each content area was frequently noted as an area for growth.

Four observers conducted 59 observations using the CLASS protocol in a sample of classrooms across all six Dartmouth schools, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong emotional support, high classroom organization and student engagement (Grades 4-5), and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, strong classroom organization and student engagement, and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of strong emotional support, strong evidence of classroom organization, and mixed evidence of student engagement or of consistently rigorous instructional support.

Table 6 summarizes 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>Vertical alignment of the K-12 digital literacy curriculum.</li> <li>Instructional alignment across all elementary schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curriculum review and selection processes.</li> <li>Vertical alignment across all disciplines.</li> </ul>
<b>Classroom instruction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classroom organization.</li> <li>Long-term systemic support for personalized, blended, and project-based learning.</li> </ul>	
<b>Student access to coursework</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of barriers to enroll in Advanced Placement (AP) coursework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rigor in non-AP courses for Grades 9-12.</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> CURATE: CUrriculum RATings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>.

## Curriculum Selection and Use

Dartmouth most recently adopted a new K-5 mathematics curriculum with support from a curriculum instruction and assessment (CIA) committee that reviewed multiple curricular resources. In focus groups, some teachers expressed familiarity with the CIA committee and the curricular selection process; however, some noted that the process was somewhat unclear as a result of conducting the review process asynchronously and virtually because of COVID-19 restrictions. District leaders shared a *Dartmouth Textbook Adoption and Instructional Materials Plan* from 2017, which no district- or school-based staff mentioned in any interview. The plan includes a checklist for evaluating new instructional materials and programs, guidelines for replacing and/or removing existing materials, and a protocol for raising concerns about existing instructional materials. The school committee recently created the EDC, whose charge includes providing feedback on current curriculum, policies, and resource allocation; however, multiple staff noted that this committee and work “has not gotten off the ground yet.”

A document review and interviews indicated that curricula in the district did not consistently meet CURATE expectations. CURATE has not reviewed any district-used curricula, except for the K-5 mathematics curriculum, *Bridges*, which was introduced this school year and received a CURATE rating of *partially meets expectations*. Curricula for K-5 science and history/social science, 6-8 mathematics, and grade 10 chemistry are teacher created. The director of teaching and learning convenes two committees that support the selection and implementation of new curricular materials. These committees include Leveled Literacy Leaders (L3), which focuses on ELA, and the CIA, which focuses on mathematics and science. Both the L3 and CIA teams includes a total of 18 educators, with one teacher from each grade level from prekindergarten to Grade 5 from each elementary school. Educators can indicate their interest to participate on the team, and if selected receive a \$750 stipend for their participation. During the 2021-2022 school year, the CIA team reviewed the Bridges K-5 mathematics curriculum and its implementation.

The district ensures that staff have access to the documented curriculum. Instructional staff and school leaders reported that scope and sequence documents are accessible through Rubicon Atlas and Google Drive. District leaders and school-based staff spoke highly of specific examples of curricular alignment, but also noted some opportunities for improvement. Staff spoke positively of horizontal and vertical alignment of ELA and mathematics curricula across all four elementary schools. The *Scope and Sequence Report for Curriculum Frameworks and Standards 2021-2022* outlines the units taught by week, aligning ELA and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subject standards as well as assessments. Additionally, focus group participants identified the vertical alignment of the digital literacy curriculum as a district strength. Instructional staff and school leaders explained the digital literacy alignment process: “We’re aligning the computer science standards, digital literacy, and informational technology.” Instructional staff, school leaders, and the superintendent remarked on the district’s work toward horizontal and vertical alignment across the schools and grade levels in this area. The resulting efforts are documented in the *Computing and Society* course outlines for Grades 6-8 and 9-12, which include the standards, units of study, pacing, and accompanying documents and/or projects to be used in the classroom.

These examples support focus groups comments that more collaboration across disciplines is the focus of the director of teaching and learning. However, staff described challenges with vertical

alignment across content areas as well. For example, despite efforts to designate certain curricular topics for high-school courses, students frequently reported that the material was covered in their middle-school courses, leading one teacher to note that “there’s a bit of an overlap and no vertical alignment.” Multiple teachers also noted a desire for high-quality curricular materials aligned to state standards. For example, one teacher noted various strengths of the district’s elementary ELA program but noted “[b]ut in regards to phonics and how to teach maybe grammar, I think there’s a lacking in that.” Another teacher added that the newly adopted mathematics curriculum appeared to work well for students who were at grade level but noted “I would like to see . . . some more opportunities for differentiation. I just don’t feel like it has enough to meet the needs of students who are above and below grade level.”

There is evidence that the district communicates with families about curriculum and instruction. Family and community members who participated in a focus group were familiar with the curricular materials and instructional approaches and could describe Dartmouth’s recent adoption of a new mathematics curriculum.

## Classroom Instruction

Classroom observations across all schools and all grade levels provide evidence of strong classroom organization. Instructional staff, school committee members, and school leaders all reported implementation of project-based learning as well as coteaching to address populations needing additional support or challenges to have access to rigorous instruction. Focus groups and interview participants all noted that students and teachers needed time to readjust during the COVID-19 pandemic because social distancing made student collaboration challenging at the beginning of the 2021-2022 school year.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the district partnered with the Highlander Institute for professional development on personalized, blended, and project-based learning. Instructional staff, school leaders, and family community focus group participants all reported the use of these strategies, but they noted challenges during the pandemic especially early in the 2021-2022 school year with physical distancing. School leaders said personalized, blended, and project-based learning is a change in mindset because it “involves the learning taking place through doing the project,” observing that instruction throughout Dartmouth looks different than it did five years ago because of this professional development and partnership.

Instructional staff, school leaders, and committee members reported coteaching as a strategy to support all students within a classroom, including those receiving EL or special education support services. The District Curriculum Accommodation Plan outlines strategies for teacher, student, and family supports and accommodations. Student focus group participants also described some teachers asking for feedback via Google forms. Some secondary students reported that teachers adjusted practice as a result of student feedback.

Four observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Dartmouth during the weeks of May 3 and May 19, 2022. The observers conducted 59 observations in a sample of classrooms across six schools in all grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The

CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

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

In summary, findings from district observations were as follows:

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were at the high range for the K-5 (6.0 out of 7.0) and in the higher end of the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (4.9 out of 7.0 for both grade bands).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (6.5, 6.5 and 6.4 out of 7.0).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (4.5, 3.9, and 4.0 out of 7.0).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the high range for the 4-5 grade band (6.2 out of 7.0), in the higher end of the middle range for the 6-8 grade band (5.1 out of 7.0), and in the middle range for the 9-12 grade band (4.8 out of 7.0).

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

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

Elementary-school instructional staff said, “I think we have a good combination of working with tech and non-tech-related materials; having kids work independently in pairs, collaboratively in groups. I think we have a good balance” and “I think you find a lot of station, small-group work in elementary classrooms.” Finally, a school leader remarked that

most classrooms at the elementary level that you [walk] into, you see a solid workshop model at this point where we’re really emphasizing that mini lesson where the kids are getting that modeled whole-group lesson in a short amount of time, and then they’re off and they’re doing things.

## Student Access to Coursework

Dartmouth does not offer any advanced courses in the elementary and middle schools; instead, the district aims to ensure that all students have access to rigorous coursework in every classroom through differentiation. At the high school, students have the option to enroll in college and career readiness coursework, honors courses, or AP courses. The district partnered with Mass Insight in previous years to develop policies to support expanded access to rigorous coursework for all students. Through this partnership, enrollment policies at the high school no longer require teacher recommendations or prerequisites. Instead, all students and families receive information about the various types of courses and related expectations; students and families may then select their courses based on what they believe is the best fit. District and school leaders expressed a vision that every student take at least one AP course before they graduate. High-school staff noted that 21 AP courses are offered at the high school, and some staff indicated concern about students building their schedules around as many AP courses as possible. One teacher expressed interest in developing additional elective courses that reflect diverse perspectives (e.g., African American history or women’s history), but noted that scheduling constraints may make it difficult to fill these courses, due to the emphasis on AP coursework in students’ schedules. Multiple teachers stated that in addition to offering AP coursework, they would like to see the school increase rigor in college and career readiness coursework.

## Recommendations

- The district should document and clearly explain to all teachers and instructional staff the process for reviewing and adopting high quality curriculum, including the roles of both CURATE and the district’s CIA and EDC committees.
- District and school leaders should establish a process that ensures curriculum are aligned across disciplines and grade spans, including at the high school level.
- District and school leaders should ensure that students in high school grades experience rigorous curriculum in all courses, not just in AP courses.

## Assessment

Information collected throughout the district review indicates that Dartmouth staff consistently use the following assessments to measure and monitor student progress and performance: Acadience (K-2) and Star (K-8) for mathematics and DIBELS (K-3) and Star (K-8) for ELA. At the high school, departments have developed common assessments to support benchmarking and collaborative planning. The review of student assessment data varies among schools, as does the systems for sharing the results of student assessments with parents and families. Table 7 summarizes 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>■ K-12 benchmarking systems in place for ELA and mathematics.</li> <li>■ Progress monitoring systems aligned to benchmarks for K-8 ELA and mathematics.</li> </ul>	
<b>Data use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Frequent use by school-level staff and teams.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Protocols and expectations for the review and use of data during school team meetings.</li> </ul>
<b>Sharing results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ District supports communication of assessment results internally among educators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Consistent structures and expectations for sharing assessment data externally with parents and families.</li> </ul>

### Data and Assessment Systems

According to the district’s completed assessment inventory, district and school staff use the following assessments to measure and monitor student progress and performance: Acadience (K-2) and Star (K-8) for mathematics and DIBELS (K-3) and Star (K-8) for ELA. MCAS is another key assessment for the district. A district leader and instructional staff also mentioned using Fountas & Pinnell, but they noted that it is not on the district’s official assessment calendar. According to the assessment inventory, the district uses district-developed, standards-aligned assessments in the secondary grades for mathematics, ELA, science, and social studies. Information gathered throughout the interviews and focus groups confirmed that these measures are consistently administered as planned and used to guide decision-making at both the district and school levels.

District leaders use data from benchmark assessments to refine the district’s assessment calendar. For example, the district previously used DIBELS assessments up through Grade 5; however, this practice was discontinued based on data that most fourth- and fifth-grade students were meeting end-of-year performance targets at the beginning-of-year administration. In response, the district discontinued DIBELS for universal benchmarking in Grades 4 and 5 but reserved the measure for progress monitoring when needed to check on students’ progress throughout interventions.



## Data Use

Interviews and focus groups with school-based staff provided evidence that assessment data are used formally and informally by teachers and school teams to guide instruction at various levels. Teachers described reviewing data during common planning time (CPT) and/or professional learning community (PLC) meetings. These two terms are used interchangeably throughout the district. Agendas and documents shared by the district provide further evidence that these meetings regularly occur and include a review of student assessment data. At the district level, the curriculum council reviews a variety of data sources, including student data, to plan professional development.

At the elementary- and middle-school levels, benchmarking testing occurs at least twice per year for every student in ELA and mathematics, and additional progress monitoring is conducted for students receiving interventions. Student assessment data are reviewed to systematically provide supports for students as needed. At the elementary-school level, student assessment data are reviewed at the grade level to ensure that students with the most risk are paired with designated interventionists. Students with lower levels of risk receive interventions from their classroom teacher so that targeted or intensive interventions are equitably distributed according to need. Similarly, at the middle-school level, student assessment data are reviewed to systematically pair students with appropriate supports, including regularly scheduled support classes that are incorporated into individual students' schedules, an as-needed student support classroom that students can drop into for shorter-term support, and online support activities available after school.

At the high school, teachers described the frequent use of common assessments, with dedicated time during CPT/PLC meetings to review results collaboratively to revise and plan instruction, as well as revise assessments as appropriate.

Facilitation of the CPT/PLC meetings varies across schools. At some elementary schools, instructional coaches facilitate the meetings, and school administrators attend the meetings as well; in other elementary schools, CPT/PLCs were described as entirely teacher led, with instructional coaches and/or school administrators only occasionally sharing an agenda item. At the middle school, instructional coaches facilitate CPT/PLC meetings, and school administrators regularly attend. At the high-school level, lead teacher roles were recently created to provide instructional coaching supports within departments, including the facilitation of CPT/PLC meetings. One high-school staff member noted a lack of clarity about the lead teacher role, suggesting that facilitation across high-school CPT/PLCs may still be somewhat inconsistent as this new role is clarified. District administrators spoke to a goal of more consistency in the facilitation and structure of CPT/PLC meetings to systematically review student data and appropriately plan and/or adjust instruction.

At the district level, the Dartmouth curriculum council reviews student assessment data to plan professional development opportunities for the following year. The council reviews student assessment data alongside other data, including trends from teacher evaluation data and surveys administered throughout the year. Themes are identified across datasets, and professional development to address each theme is planned for the following year.

## Sharing Results

According to interviews with district leaders, the district leadership team reviews student data as part of its district and school improvement planning processes. Likewise, school-based instructional coaches reported meeting together at the district level to review districtwide data to inform professional development and coaching across all schools. In addition, strategies for structuring the facilitation of CPT/PLC meetings have been discussed and implemented throughout the district to support data use, as previously described. However, limited evidence was available regarding the district's vision for sharing data with families and students. Instead, these practices are mostly developed at the school level, with inconsistencies across buildings.

Parents described accessing information about their students' progress via Google Classroom, Aspen, and report cards. At the elementary-school level, some teachers noted that they share official Star Reading reports with families, whereas others described simply giving parents an indication of whether their student reads at, below, or above grade-level expectations. Middle- and high-school students described accessing information about grades and assignments via Google Classroom but noted some inconsistencies in how teachers use Google Classroom. For example, students generally appreciated when teachers used Google Classroom to communicate assignment details, but they noted that only some teachers enter due dates into Google Classroom.

## Recommendations

- District and school leaders should develop protocols for the facilitation of CPT/PLC meetings and communicate protocols and expectations for the review and use of data during these meetings.
- The district should establish and communicate consistent structures and expectations for sharing student progress and assessment information with families and students.



## Human Resources and Professional Development

Dartmouth’s human resources infrastructure is limited because there is no dedicated human resources department (or staff). This work is primarily carried out by administrative assistants within the superintendent’s office who have additional duties beyond human resources. There is a human resources webpage for applicants with information about the application process, including employment forms and job openings. The hiring process varies depending on the position, but school leaders generally guide teacher hiring. A district leadership team makes final decisions about staffing needs, and ultimate hiring authority rests with the superintendent. The two assistants keep track of hiring documents such as applications and CORI (Criminal Record Information) forms.

The district has multiple programs in place to support new teachers and evaluate in-service teachers. According to administrators, teachers have multiple professional development and mentoring opportunities. The district’s professional development website offers a variety of district-led opportunities. The district also provides teachers with funds to pursue their own professional development interests. These opportunities are specifically about instructional growth and implementing new curricula, with less information available about developing teachers as leaders within their schools or the district. Areas for growth identified by numerous leaders include creating a pipeline to grow and diversify candidate pools for positions of need; several teachers also suggested improving clarity about hiring practices for leadership positions and opportunities for upward mobility.

**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>Communication between staff members.</li> </ul>	
<b>Recruitment, hiring, and assignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hiring and assignment practices tailored to school leaders’ needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous evaluation and revision of hiring systems and practices.</li> <li>Recruitment systems for diverse candidates.</li> </ul>
<b>Supervision, evaluation, and educator development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional development systems.</li> <li>Breadth and depth of data used for evaluation.</li> <li>Walkthroughs and observations built into school cultures as part of a dialogical supervision and evaluation process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity in school structures to support the use of student data to improve instruction and educator development.</li> </ul>
<b>Recognition, leadership development, and advancement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for teachers to take on leadership opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening, clarifying, and communicating processes for teachers’ career advancement.</li> </ul>

## Infrastructure

Currently, Dartmouth relies on two assistants to the superintendent for human resources roles, including recruitment, staffing, and more, because there is no dedicated department or staff. School leaders attributed this lack to budgetary constraints and noted that the previous assistant superintendent historically coordinated human resources activities for the district. The superintendent did not suggest that human resources was an area of high need but recognized that the district has less infrastructure compared with others. In terms of specifics, the two assistants responsible for most human resources procedures provided details of their processes for maintaining employment records, which include using Google folders for the hiring process and a locked record room for additional paperwork. There are procedures for hiring, intake, and, when necessary, staff turnover. District leaders stated that because the district lacks dedicated human resources personnel, several central office staff support these activities for the district.

Documentation in support of human resources was extensive and detailed, with feedback reports about professional development and mentoring offerings, copies of professional development plans, a handbook on employee civil rights, and a dedicated professional development website. Although Dartmouth's human resources capability is limited in terms of personnel, the responsibilities are diffused across district and school leaders, and district leaders have processes in place for hiring, record keeping, and compliance.

## Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

Recruitment was a commonly discussed issue for district and school leaders, with most agreeing that they wanted to improve in this area. Multiple district leaders spoke about Dartmouth's high retention rate among both teachers and administrators. However, leaders also acknowledged that the applicant pool has dwindled in recent years, which has presented challenges for the recruitment of diverse candidates. More than one district leader identified recruitment as an area for growth and noted that new positions often are filled by existing school or district staff. District and school leaders involved in hiring described networking, calling universities, and posting to several job boards to reach external candidates and indicated interest in learning new strategies that the district could use to improve on this approach. It was not clear through interviews, focus groups, or document reviews that the district is systematically collecting data to support the continuous evaluation and revision of hiring systems and practices.

Despite smaller pools of applicants in recent years, Dartmouth generally meets staffing needs effectively through existing recruitment and networking strategies. District and school leaders expressed strong desires to diversify staff but have not identified strategies for diversifying the district's applicant pool. The staffing process also runs into budget limitations. One community leader suggested that part of the issue related to recruitment also involved compensation and benefits. However, most stakeholders agreed that the school committee and district leaders work to give schools the staffing support they need.

There was general agreement across all layers of leadership that teacher assignments and master schedules result in an equitable distribution of educator skill across grades and content areas, and

each school site feels supported to make hiring and assignment decisions that meet their unique student needs.

## Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

Multiple levels of educators and leaders indicated that Dartmouth provides ample supervision, evaluation, and professional development for educators. In particular, staff have numerous professional development opportunities to align curriculum and instruction with current initiatives, such as student-centered and project-based work, as well as becoming more proficient on strategies to promote social-emotional learning. In addition, district and school leaders are very present. District and school leaders, as well as teachers, agreed that walkthroughs and observations are common practices built into the culture of the schools. Teachers described walkthroughs and observations as a positive process, noting that the specific feedback they receive throughout the process supports improvements in teaching and learning. As previously described, the district has mechanisms to leverage student assessment data and staff evaluation data to inform district level professional development planning; however, school level structures for the review of student assessment data to improve instruction during CPT is less formal.

Dartmouth provides surveys following professional development opportunities to get feedback from staff on the effectiveness of each training. In addition, the district surveys staff each year about preferences for professional development topics and formats prior to building out the schedule. Survey feedback from mentoring trainings, professional developments, and other learning opportunities for teachers was generally positive—with virtually all respondents indicating that the training sessions were effective at increasing content knowledge and skills that benefit students. The district provides varied offerings for teacher development, as well as funding up to \$1,000 per year for teachers’ “self-directed PD [professional development].” These offerings are linked to broader district improvement goals, which themselves connect with state initiatives, according to district leaders. Dartmouth does not collect any information from staff regarding the implementation of learned skills and/or effectiveness of outside professional development trainings attended.

The district provides a mentoring and induction program to all new staff. The program includes training on Dartmouth-specific policies and procedures and building-based mentors who are matched based on content area and expertise to support new Dartmouth staff.

A review of the educator evaluation system, which is stored using 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 a sample of the 280 Professional Teacher Status teachers with summative evaluations for the 2020-2021 school year. Of the evaluations reviewed, all (100 percent) were marked as complete and not missing required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. A majority of the evaluations (88 percent) included multiple sources of evidence, such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. Nearly all summative evaluations (93 percent) included feedback for each standard, more than half of the evaluations (69 percent) included feedback identifying strengths, whereas less than one third of evaluation feedback (19 percent) included areas of improvement. The

review of evaluations indicated that nearly all educators (94 percent) were developing student learning and professional practice SMART goals.

Administrative evaluations also are stored using TeachPoint. Of the administrative staff, seven summative evaluations for 2020-2021 were available for review and complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. The review of evaluation documents indicated that not all of the administrators developed student learning, professional practice, or school improvement SMART goals. Of the summative evaluations reviewed, more than half of the evaluations (57 percent) included student learning goals, more than two thirds (71 percent) included professional practice goals, but none of the evaluations included school improvement goals. None of the evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. All summative administrator evaluations reviewed (100 percent) included evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback identifying administrator's strengths and areas for improvement.

## Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Dartmouth has a few opportunities available for teachers to fill leadership roles. These leadership roles provide a mechanism through which educator voice is incorporated into district-level decision-making; however, these roles do not lay out clear advancement opportunities for teachers within the district.

Multiple opportunities for teacher leadership exist. The CIA and Leveled Literacy Leaders teams both provide stipends for teachers who are interested in reviewing curricular material and supporting the implementation of newly selected curricula. Teachers can participate on the Dartmouth Curriculum Council, which reviews district-level data to identify professional development priorities. At the high school, lead teacher positions recently have been developed to support CPT/PLC facilitation and provide instructional coaching supports within department areas. Additional stipends are available to teachers who are interested in supporting afterschool and/or summer programming needs. District leaders also described forming ad hoc committees to lead curriculum work, including vertical alignment initiatives. Across the school-level interviews, staff were most familiar with opportunities to participate on the CIA and Leveled Literacy Leaders teams. Some school-based staff expressed feeling that although leadership opportunities were available, they were not equitably distributed. For example, one staff member described some colleagues receiving multiple stipends for serving in multiple leadership roles, while other staff members applied for leadership (and stipend) opportunities but ultimately were not selected, while also not receiving feedback for growth or to improve future chances of selection. Both school- and district-level staff agreed that the pool of people interested in leadership opportunities was limited, resulting in the same people sometimes filling multiple leadership roles.

Together, the activities described provide a breadth of leadership opportunities for staff across content areas and grade levels; however, they do not contribute to an articulated career ladder or clear advancement path designed to retain effective professional staff and maximize their impact.

## Recommendations

- District and school leadership should engage in the continuous evaluation and revision of recruitment and hiring systems and practices to promote a larger applicant pool consisting of diverse, high-quality candidates.
- District and school leaders should establish and implement formal processes for ensuring that student data are used to improve instruction and educator development.
- The district should consider options for strengthening, clarifying, and communicating processes for teachers' career advancement.

## Student Support

Dartmouth prioritizes a school climate that ensures the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging of its students. The district uses a response to intervention (RTI) approach that integrates academic and nonacademic supports along a continuum of student need. School-based teams follow a protocol to refer students who require additional support based on student data. District staff noted that all schools use PBIS, and the district also has partnered with consultants who provide direct support to school-based teams for developing social, emotional, and/or behavioral support plans for students. District staff noted that although protocols and teams exist to support the RTI process, systems for progress monitoring, including entry and exit criteria for different supports, are not yet codified across the district. Interviews with school-based staff indicated that although protocols exist, the protocols are not always followed, and they identified areas for growth related to the RTI process. Table 9 summarizes key strengths and areas of growth in student support.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<b>Safe and supportive school climate and culture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Behavior management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of the RTI system.</li> <li>Consistent implementation of RTI.</li> </ul>
<b>Tiered systems of support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal assessments to support identification and progress monitoring for students struggling in ELA or mathematics.</li> <li>Support from external consultants regarding tiered systems particularly for social-emotional learning and behavior.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Systemic structures to support social-emotional learning and behavior interventions (e.g., screening, entry/exit criteria, progress monitoring).</li> </ul>
<b>Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent communication to families.</li> <li>A recently created EDC.</li> <li>Partnerships to support students and families.</li> </ul>	

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

From stakeholder interviews, surveys, and a review of district documents, Dartmouth prioritizes the physical, intellectual, and emotional safety of its students and staff members. The district provides ongoing professional development and technical assistance to support social-emotional learning and PBIS. The district has provided professional development related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) to all district staff, and the school committee established the EDC to help further develop and support school and classroom environments that are welcoming, culturally responsive, and inclusive of all student backgrounds.

Several relevant data sources provide evidence about the extent that the district promotes a safe and supportive school climate and culture. Survey data from the 2020-21 Views of Climate and Learning student survey provides one lens. Student ratings of school climate varied by grade level.

For Grades 4 and 5, the survey results indicate a relatively strong school climate. For Grades 8 and 10, the survey results indicate a typical school climate.

Instructional observation scores for the Teachstone CLASS protocol also provide evidence on the extent that the district promotes a safe and supportive school climate and culture. Average scores for the positive climate dimension were in the middle range across all grade bands (5.8, 5.2, and 5.1 out of 7.0), which suggests that some teachers and students share warm and supportive relationships, but some students may be excluded from this relationship, either by the teacher or the students. Average scores for the teacher sensitivity dimension varied by grade level. For Grades K-5, average scores were in the high range (6.2 out of 7.0), which suggests that teachers' awareness of students and their needs is consistent and accurate. For Grades 6-12, average scores were in the middle range (5.7 out of 7.0), which suggests that teachers are sometimes aware of student needs or aware of only a limited type of student needs (or teachers may be aware of some students and not others). Finally, average scores for the behavior management dimension of the CLASS protocol were in the high range across all grade bands (6.9, 6.4, and 6.3 out of 7.0, which suggests that rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and consistently reinforced by teachers.

Interview and focus group data, supplemented by documents, provide further evidence of the extent the district promotes a safe and supportive school environment. Families knew that district funding supported signs around schools to promote DEI issues and diversify the book collections in school libraries. High-school students spoke positively about the district's unified sports teams, which bring together students with and without disabilities to participate together on inclusive sports teams.

District staff noted that all Dartmouth schools implement PBIS, which was evidenced across interviews, focus groups, school handbooks, and professional development content. According to instructional staff and district leaders, teachers receive professional development on PBIS, trauma-informed and therapeutic practices, and student safety. Families were aware of behavioral expectations as outlined in student handbooks to ensure a safe and supportive school climate across Dartmouth schools. Middle-school students described the school's core values and reinforcement system, but they noted not receiving a formal introduction to either. Some middle-school students expressed frustration that the systems currently in place were not always effective in preventing negative behaviors.

In addition to universal PBIS systems, Dartmouth district staff described a partnership that pairs consultants with the district's schools to support school teams in identifying appropriate social, emotional, and/or behavioral supports for students. District staff also shared that these consultants led school-based professional development about multitiered systems of support for social, emotional, and behavioral well-being.

District- and school-level staff spoke about ongoing efforts to increase the district's work related to DEI. In January 2021, all district staff completed a training related to implicit bias. A districtwide DEI keynote address was provided by Adolph Brown in October 2021. Additional documents and feedback from school-based staff who participated in focus groups confirmed additional efforts at both the school and district levels to ensure that instruction is culturally responsive and inclusive of all student backgrounds. District leaders described efforts to increase the number of texts in school libraries and classrooms that reflect diverse student backgrounds. All elementary-school teachers



received a memo outlining new texts they will receive that are aligned to their ELA curriculum and will support teachers to “further enhance background for the Units of Study and, more importantly, provide titles that help diversify your library.” The memo also references texts purchased for each school library, which “tackle the problems of racism, social injustice, and diversity.” District leaders and high-school students discussed efforts by the school committee to convene the EDC to further examine district policy and curricula to ensure that school and classroom environments are welcoming, culturally responsive, and inclusive of all student backgrounds. High-school students mentioned being included on this committee, describing their experiences sharing feedback with school and district staff regarding DEI. District leaders and high-school students both noted that, although this committee is being formed, the work is still in the initial phases. Focus group participants described infrequent meetings and a desire for regularly scheduled meetings that will allow the committee to be proactive in their approach.

## Tiered Systems of Support

Dartmouth uses RTI to support students with academic and/or nonacademic (e.g., social, emotional, behavioral) needs. The RTI process involves developing an individualized support plan for each identified student, as well as reviewing the plan and students’ progress to guide adjustments as necessary. School improvement plans clearly identify the staff participating on school RTI teams and across each level, Dartmouth teachers reference RTI as a familiar structure. However, some staff, particularly at the elementary-school level, noted challenges with the RTI process, which prevent all staff from following established protocols and procedures to refer students. Teachers described reviewing incoming student data and being surprised that a previous teacher had not already begun the RTI process based on the existing data. One teacher remarked, “They say there’s an RTI process, and I know there is, but I have never fully, in my [. . .] years here, fully experienced a full RTI process.”

Another teacher noted inconsistencies in the implementation of Tier 2 supports for students:

I think a lot of times it’s a lot of Tier 1 instruction. And then when the Tier 1 instruction doesn’t work, they throw them to a reading specialist or throw them to a math specialist. With data, but I don’t know if all teachers are doing Tier 2 intervention.

At the elementary-school level, instructional coaches who support each Dartmouth elementary school play an important role in the RTI process. According to district staff, they support school administrators with reviewing schoolwide assessment data to identify students who most need support. For concerns in ELA or mathematics, students with the highest levels of need are paired with interventionists to access targeted (e.g., Tier 2) interventions and progress monitoring, whereas students with lower levels of need receive targeted supports and progress monitoring from their classroom teachers. Across interviews, multiple participants noted that some interventionists see the same students all year, suggesting a need to more frequently review interventions and student progress data. For concerns about social, emotional, and/or behavioral functioning, school teams meet with external consultants to develop appropriate supports and progress monitoring plans. Detailed descriptions of supports for “behavioral and social-emotional learning” across each tier at the elementary-school level are described in the *System of Student Supports PK-5* document provided by the district. However, the document does not include clear entry or exit criteria or progress monitoring supports.



At the middle- and high-school levels, Dartmouth schools do not have the same instructional coach and interventionist positions. In the middle school, RTI teams meet weekly to discuss students who need support, and students access supports through a variety of structures, including regularly scheduled classes that embed student support into student schedules, support classrooms where students can drop in as needed to access supports, and online support services that are available after school. District staff also described a transitional program at the middle school to support students who are returning to school following a prolonged absence. This program goes beyond the required services that schools must provide for students at home or in the hospital, with dedicated staffing at the middle school to support students on-site when they return. This program is open to all students who experience a prolonged absence, regardless of special education or other status. At the high-school level, staff can refer students who need additional support to the student support team, which meets to discuss concerns and develop and revise plans. Any student can access supports during Personalization, Advisory, Support, and Enrichment periods. During these periods, students are responsible for scheduling time to meet with teachers or support staff as needed; however, staff develop support schedules for students who are a part of the RTI during this time.

The RTI process for academic areas of concern is primarily coordinated by the director of curriculum and instruction, whereas pupil support administrators serve as primary contacts for nonacademic (e.g., social, emotional, behavioral) concerns. District staff noted that for ELA and mathematics, the district's formal benchmark and assessment measures provide a helpful array of tools to support the identification of student needs, as well as progress monitoring throughout interventions. District staff noted interest in identifying more formal measures related to social, emotional, and behavioral functioning. District staff also described supporting building principals and school-based staff as needed with RTI issues; however, neither the focus groups nor the interviews identified a formal method for systematically evaluating RTI processes.

The *2020 Tiered Focused Monitoring Report for Dartmouth Public Schools* indicated not only general compliance but also two areas for improvement. The first regards Special Education Standard 56, the evaluation of special education programs and services. At the time of the 2020 report, the district was not regularly evaluating its special education programs and services. In response to this finding, the district sanctioned a special education preschool program evaluation and report dated December 2020. The second area for improvement was Civil Rights Standard 25, involving institutional self-evaluation. At the time of the 2020 report, the district was not evaluating all aspects of its K-12 program annually to ensure that all students have equal access to all programs. By October 2020, the district planned to complete a self-evaluation of its K-12 programs. The extent that progress has been made based on the action plans in the *Tiered Focused Monitoring Report* was unclear at the time of this district review.

## Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Stakeholder interviews and focus groups and a review of documents indicated that district and school leaders recognize the importance of engaging families, students, and the broader community. The current district- and school-level improvement plans emphasize family and student engagement through the first tenant of fostering a sense of belonging. In addition, the school committee recently convened the EDC, which includes students, families, and community members. The district has partnered with various community agencies to support its instructional vision.

Families also mentioned open houses and parent-teacher conferences, in addition to home visits for preschool students. District leaders mentioned the district has a very active Special Education Parent Advisory Council, and bylaws are provided by the district. District leaders also mentioned the use of translation services for communication as needed. Families highlighted parent teacher organizations, school councils, and school committee meetings as opportunities to engage and provide feedback on school and district improvement plans. Dartmouth staff also noted that schools hold regular ceremonies or “rallies” to celebrate students’ positive behavior and invite parents and families to attend.

A range of methods for communication and engagement with families was highlighted in focus groups. Families mentioned weekly emails from both the school and the district, which include information about school and community events, athletics, and services such as free meals, as well as the ability to sign up for each teacher’s Google Classroom for updates. The district provided example documents for messages from principals and schools to families. Families noted that staff (including teachers and nurses) are very accessible and responsive to email communication. Families also mentioned the Remind app as another method of two-way communication between families and individual teachers. Some parents noted that consistency in the frequency of school communications (e.g., weekly vs monthly) across buildings would be helpful.

District leaders described that the school committee recently convened the EDC, which brings together district staff, students, families, and community members. The superintendent noted that one of the things this committee will support is reviewing curriculum and instruction in light of the school committee’s recent vote to uphold the logo: “We have some work to do about ensuring that it has a place of honor and respect. And that the history and culture of the Native Americans is really emphasized in our district.”

District leaders have established multiple community partnerships to support students’ academic, behavioral, and mental well-being. The district recently partnered with the Cook Center for Human Connections, which provides resources for parents and families related to mental health. In addition, the district has sponsored ongoing professional development through the Highlander Institute to support expanded access to personalized, blended, and project-based learning, as described earlier in the Curriculum and Instruction section of this report.

## Recommendations

- District and school leaders should formally document processes and expectations related to the consistent implementation of the of the RTI system across all grade levels.
- The district should establish formalized, systemic structures to support social-emotional learning and behavior interventions, including screening, entry and exit criteria, progress monitoring.

## Financial and Asset Management

Dartmouth leaders traditionally base their budget on the district strategic improvement plan; however, the update to the current *Strategic Improvement Plan (2016-2019)* was delayed due to the districts' response to COVID-19, so the district's most recent budget was aligned with the district improvement plan instead, and grounded in DESE's Acceleration Roadmap. To develop budget proposals, school leaders make budget requests that a district leadership team reviews for consideration in the final budget request. District leaders and documents suggest that Dartmouth has sufficient funds to exceed net school spending. The district participates in the school choice program, which provides additional revenue to support district initiatives. The school committee develops and approves the district's five-year capital plan. Budget documents are presented by function, including instruction, administration, maintenance and utilities, tuition, and other services; however, they do not include expenses broken down by school. Table 10 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in 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>■ Budget documents are easily accessible on the district website.</li> <li>■ The budget is based on district and building goals.</li> <li>■ Partnerships exist with community organizations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Communication of budgeting processes.</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate budget</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Budget development is based on input from a variety of sources of information and stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Budgeting for replacement of Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds.</li> </ul>
<b>Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Consistent monitoring is used to ensure efficient and effective use of budgeted funds.</li> </ul>	
<b>Capital planning and facility maintenance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district considers and budgets for the ongoing cost of incorporating technology into the curriculum.</li> <li>■ Five-year capital improvement plan.</li> <li>■ Stakeholder input.</li> </ul>	

### Budget Documentation and Reporting

Dartmouth maintains clear and accurate budget documents that include information about all sources of funds and the allocation of resources. The current district budget is readily accessible to the public on the district website.

Dartmouth’s budget documents include pertinent information to guide spending in the district. According to district leaders, the challenges with COVID-19 made the current budget preparation difficult, but discussions relative to funding priorities remained student centered and dedicated to academic as well as social-emotional learning. The development of the budget involved data collection and analysis, communication and collaboration, a strong understanding of the goals and objectives of the district’s strategic improvement plan, negotiations, assumptions, historical analysis, and forecasting. Budget documents are presented by function, including instruction, administration, maintenance and utilities, tuition, and other services; however, they do not include expenses broken down by school. According to district leadership, information included in budget documents and reports is primarily based on enrollment figures that include fixed costs related to salaries and benefits and broken down to an appropriate level of detail.

A town leader remarked on the lack detail of within the district budget, “. . . the more detail, the better . . . Metrics and data are important to us, and we use those to make a lot of decisions. So, we want to see that, particularly on the school side.” The budget narrative provides some overarching information on how the fiscal year 2022 budget tries to address priorities from the district’s strategic improvement plan, but it is not clear how student performance data and equity factors were used to set those priorities. Town leaders expressed a desire to have increased collaboration with the school committee and district leaders and to better understand how data are used to inform the school budget.

Dartmouth has a substantial amount of grant funding for staffing, special education tuition, and professional development. A district leader described that entitlement grants (e.g., Title I and special education) represent the largest part of the budget and are generally stable amounts of money from year to year. In addition, district leaders actively pursue other grant opportunities that provide smaller amounts of money to support things such as professional development and student support activities.

According to district leadership, the school district and the town of Dartmouth have formal agreements in place for the following services: insurance (health, dental, life), pension, sewer and water, and property insurance. A set methodology is used to calculate each item and the exact cost the municipality covers. Services the district has received from the town at no charge include salting (prior to snowplowing) and library services (the librarian comes to schools, and children visit the library regularly). The town and district generally work separately on vendor contracts and bidding, and, according to the town manager, they follow stringent state procurement guidelines.

## Adequate Budget

According to both key stakeholders and budget documents, Dartmouth has adequate funds each year to exceed net school spending and other costs. District leaders reported the district never had to fund a deficit budget. They attribute their overall success with the budget to town buy-in and a strong administrative team. The town manager explained the district generally consumes “all of their budget, down to the dollar. So there’s not a lot that gets turned back.” School leaders stated that being a “school choice” district allows them to bring students in from neighboring communities, which brings additional funding per pupil to the district. A district leader interviewee stated that “I think that that’s done in part so that if the operating budget can’t meet every need, there is a revenue stream that can sometimes support additional needs. I think that’s been beneficial to the

district.” A school leader clarified that only the high school participates in school choice; however, the funds generated can be used to support initiatives districtwide. For example, funds brought in from the school’s participation in school choice were used to initially fund a one-to-one technology initiative prior to COVID-19. One school leader shared, “I found the budget process to be supportive and sufficient autonomy to create what we need or to at least present what we need.”

The district incorporates the personnel evaluation piece into its budget process and annually meets with school administrators to report on staffing and enrollment. Factors that drive staffing include enrollment, retirements, and attrition. One district leader added, “We’re pretty fortunate here that we have a pretty stable workforce.” This process is incorporated into the budget process to forecast, as a district leader explained,

so this year we’re going to do this, but we know we have a retirement coming next year, and it might be an area in which we could share with another building or we could, or we need to do something different.

The school committee explained their use of funds by “stretching that dollar as far as we can to make sure everything is as equal in that,” but they have concerns about relying too heavily on

ESSER funds to fill some gaps and create some supports. But when that goes away, it’s really concerning because the service[s] that we put in place are really necessary. And it’s clear that when those go away, we’re going to have some kids that are going to suffer and so [the district is] trying to find a place to replace that money.

Members of the school committee also stated that school budgets have been reasonable, “they’re certainly not asking for the sun and the moon; it’s just trying to supply their teachers with \$100 for the year for new supplies.” Although Dartmouth receives adequate funds, multiple leaders shared some challenges with budgetary constraints because the district has “one of the lowest pupil expenditures in the state.” These challenges include the ability to hire quality staff (because of low wages) and limited resources, but student needs are prioritized, and all major projects have been supported, including the “day to day.”

## Financial Tracking, Forecasting, Controls, and Audits

The team under the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, including the accountant, the payroll administrator, and accounts payable staff member, meet weekly in the last 2.5 months of the fiscal year to go through the entire budget, reviewing expenditures line by line. This process helps identify unused funds; repurpose funds; and create awareness of expenditures, challenges, or needs. Changes can be made to the original budget with the support of the superintendent if it is within the instruction umbrella; otherwise, it needs to go to the school committee for approval. Outside the end-of-fiscal-year review, the same process is applied but less frequently. At the start of the school year, the budget is looked at in detail monthly. Tracking and reporting on the budget is through the accounting software, Infinite Visions. It is used to run payroll accruals and budget reports; principals also have the capability to run reports. Reporting on specific initiatives typically come out via budget presentations. In the past, budget proposals have been directly linked to the district’s strategic goals. However, since the pandemic began, the district strategic improvement plan has not been revised, so budget proposals were aligned to the district improvement plan. At the

school level, principals track their budget along with the superintendent, which eventually is reported to the school committee.

The assistant superintendent of finance and operations is responsible for grants and collaborates with district leaders to regularly monitor spending and reporting. Although a grants manager is on the municipal side, this person does not monitor grant spending for the district. On rare occasions, the district has had to return minor amounts of grant funding; however, district leaders described regularly monitoring grant activities and filing amendments as needed to avoid having to return funds. There are \$3 million in grants that the district is currently using for the next budget cycle. Dartmouth has been awarded more than that because of ESSER funds, but those are spread out across multiple years.

As part of the town charter, end-of-year reporting requirements include the budget and an overall annual report. District leaders reported that the assistant superintendent of finance and operations prepares the report, and there have been no challenges with meeting the requirement. The town is audited every year, and the district and town work collaboratively when it comes to reconciling the district budget. According to district leaders, for payroll-related issues, the town will handle it; if it is very school specific, the district is responsible.

## Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

Dartmouth has a maintenance department that maintains district buildings. The department includes a facilities manager and two full-time and one part-time maintenance staff members; the district is in the process of hiring two additional staff. District leaders explained being understaffed, and that it has been a challenge to hire because of low wages. The assistant superintendent of finance and operations oversees the team to help maintain facilities that are clean and safe. During the COVID-19 pandemic, grant funding was used to replace HEPA filters in all classrooms, and the HVAC systems were upgraded. In terms of accessibility, the district plans on purchasing equipment used to evaluate hearing because they need replacements. The purchase of additional needed equipment will occur based on budget analysis results.

District leaders explained that a technology plan is incorporated into the capital improvement plan. Prior to the pandemic, the entire high school and part of the middle school was operating with a one-to-one technology structure. There are a lot of resources for technology, and the plan drives their purchases. Included in the capital improvement plan are annual supports for replacement and maintenance of technology, along with additional long-term projects (e.g., internet connectivity).

According to school committee members, Dartmouth puts together a rotating five-year capital plan that goes to the school committee for approval. The plan includes building maintenance (e.g., new roofs, new windows, paint, lighting), security information, student technology, updated telephone systems, and more. In the fall, principals are asked to propose capital expenses within their buildings, and various departments weigh in on those proposals. The plan then goes to the capital improvement committee of the town and then the finance committee at the town meeting for final approval. District leaders reiterated, “We’ve been very fortunate that the town has been very supportive of things that we need that we’re able to do.” In terms of improvements, one district leader stated, “We have made a lot of improvements in areas like transportation and food service

and facilities . . . We have a lot of old buildings that need to be addressed.” Twice a year, in October and June, the district capital plan goes to the town meeting for a vote. Capital improvements can be funded at either meeting, but the June meeting is the main one.

## Recommendations

- The district should document its decision-making process regarding the budget and communicate it clearly to town leadership.
- District and town leadership should work together to consider alternative funding sources that may support the continuation of services and programs that have been implemented using timebound ESSER funds.



## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

---

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Dartmouth. The team conducted 59 classroom observations during the weeks of May 3 and May 19, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups between May 4 and 5, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

The review team analyzed multiple data sets 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 New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability.
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district's end-of-year financial reports
- All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations



## Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	3,411	100.0%	911,529	100.0%
African American	57	1.7%	84,970	9.3%
Asian	34	1.0%	65,813	7.2%
Hispanic	201	5.9%	210,747	23.1%
Native American	1	0.0%	2,060	0.2%
White	2,877	84.3%	507,992	55.7%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.0%	788	0.1%
Multirace, Non-Hispanic	240	7.0%	39,159	4.3%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

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

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of state
All students with high needs	1,518	100.0%	43.9%	512,242	100.0%	55.6%
Students w/disabilities	629	41.4%	18.2%	174,505	34.1%	18.9%
Low-income households	1,125	74.1%	33.0%	399,140	77.9%	43.8%
ELs and former ELs	58	3.8%	1.7%	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 needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 3,455; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 920,971.

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	6.2	7.0	6.7	16.6	10.4	17.7
African American/Black	11.9	5.4	5.3	24.6	12.7	24.1
Asian	5.3	0.0	12.5	15.0	9.7	7.2
Hispanic/Latino	9.7	11.7	9.8	22.4	12.7	29.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	7.0	11.0	8.9	16.4	9.4	18.9
White	5.8	6.6	6.4	16.0	10.2	13.2
High need	10.6	12.0	11.7	23.4	12.8	26.3
Economically disadvantaged	12.2	13.1	12.9	25.8	13.6	30.2
ELs	10.3	8.7	8.5	12.1	1.8	29.0
Students with disabilities	12.2	13.3	13.0	22.5	10.3	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. Dartmouth 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	\$43,085,964	\$42,972,472	\$44,170,179	\$43,419,727	\$45,586,736	\$45,223,688
By municipality	\$16,846,159	\$18,189,002	\$16,428,661	\$16,572,202	\$17,527,074	\$15,957,359
Total from local appropriations	\$59,932,123	\$61,161,475	\$60,598,840	\$59,991,929	\$63,113,810	\$61,181,046
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$4,291,525	--	\$4,224,291	--	\$4,989,319
Total expenditures	--	\$65,453,000	--	\$64,216,220	--	\$66,170,366
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>						
Chapter 70 state aid <sup>a</sup>	--	\$9,841,531	--	\$9,948,121	--	\$9,948,121
Required local contribution	--	\$30,999,934	--	\$31,675,420	--	\$31,997,701
Required net school spending <sup>b</sup>	--	\$40,841,465	--	\$41,623,541	--	\$41,945,822
Actual net school spending	--	\$46,007,447	--	\$47,188,762	--	\$49,151,871
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$5,165,982	--	\$5,565,221	--	\$7,206,049
Over/under required (%)	--	12.6%	--	13.4%	--	17.2%

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

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	\$386.35	\$454.95	\$454.66
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$975.60	\$1,046.44	\$1,125.20
Teachers	\$5,895.39	\$6,262.84	\$6,594.24
Other teaching services	\$965.34	\$1,004.91	\$1,138.20
Professional development	\$294.14	\$224.38	\$205.64
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$341.46	\$311.69	\$719.84
Guidance, counseling, and testing services	\$551.96	\$588.29	\$617.57
Pupil services	\$1,480.40	\$1,366.70	\$1,489.55
Operations and maintenance	\$1,030.69	\$979.33	\$1,089.58
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$1,613.14	\$1,693.01	\$1,767.95
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$13,534.47</b>	<b>\$13,932.54</b>	<b>\$15,202.43</b>

Note. Any discrepancy between expenditures and the total is because of rounding. Data are from [Per-pupil expenditure reports on DESE website](#).

# Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

---



## *Dartmouth 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.

Four observers visited Dartmouth Public Schools during the weeks of May 3 and May 19, 2022. The observers conducted 59 observations in a sample of classrooms across 6 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\*: 5.4**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	2	3	8	6	20	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	5	6	7	1	19	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	0	2	6	2	8	2	20	5.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 23] + [7 \times 9]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

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

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

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

# Teacher Sensitivity

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

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

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	0	1	1	6	11	20	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	1	5	12	1	19	5.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	8	11	1	20	5.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 29] + [7 \times 13]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 5.8$

**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\*: 4.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	1	0	0	5	6	6	2	20	5.1
Grades 6-8	0	4	3	5	6	1	0	19	3.8
Grades 9-12	0	7	2	2	7	1	1	20	3.8

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 11] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 12] + [5 \times 19] + [6 \times 8] + [7 \times 3]) \div 59$  observations = 4.2

**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\*: 6.7**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	20	6.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	19	6.6
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	20	6.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:  $([5 \times 2] + [6 \times 11] + [7 \times 46]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 6.7$

**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	0	3	17	20	6.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	19	6.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	20	6.3

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:  $([5 \times 4] + [6 \times 21] + [7 \times 34]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 6.5$

**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\*: 6.3**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	0	2	3	14	20	6.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	19	6.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	4	10	6	20	6.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 24] + [7 \times 28]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 6.3$

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

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

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

## Instructional Learning Formats

---

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

### Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 5.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	1	1	1	3	13	20	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	0	12	6	0	19	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	6	11	3	0	20	4.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 2] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 24] + [6 \times 12] + [7 \times 13]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

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

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

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

## Concept Development

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Concept Development District Average\*: 4.9**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	1	1	4	3	4	2	15	4.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 3] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 2]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

\*\*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\*: 4.3**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	5	3.4
Grades 6-8	0	1	2	6	9	1	0	19	4.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	4	5	8	3	0	20	4.5

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 8] + [4 \times 12] + [5 \times 18] + [6 \times 4]) \div 44 \text{ observations} = 4.3$

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

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

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

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

## Analysis and Inquiry

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12*

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

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

### Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 3.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	5	3.4
Grades 6-8	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19	3.2
Grades 9-12	1	6	5	6	2	0	0	20	3.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 2] + [2 \times 10] + [3 \times 15] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 3] + [6 \times 1]) \div 44 \text{ observations} = 3.2$

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

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

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

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



## Quality of Feedback

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 4.1**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	3	2	3	4	3	5	20	4.9
Grades 6-8	1	0	12	2	4	0	0	19	3.4
Grades 9-12	0	2	8	1	8	1	0	20	3.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 5] + [3 \times 22] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 16] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 5]) \div 59 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

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

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

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

## Language Modeling

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Language Modeling District Average\*: 4.8**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	0	1	6	5	1	2	15	4.8

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 2]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 4.8$

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

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

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

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

## Instructional Dialogue

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12*

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

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

**Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.5**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	5	3.2
Grades 6-8	0	3	8	6	2	0	0	19	3.4
Grades 9-12	0	4	4	9	2	1	0	20	3.6

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 9] + [3 \times 12] + [4 \times 15] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 2]) \div 44 \text{ observations} = 3.5$

\*\*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	0	1	2	2	5	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	4	9	6	0	19	5.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	3	6	4	6	1	20	4.8

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 14] + [7 \times 3]) \div 44 \text{ observations} = 5.1$

\*\*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>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>6.0</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	1	2	3	8	6	20	5.8
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	20	6.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	1	0	1	1	6	11	20	6.2
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	0	0	5	6	6	2	20	5.1
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>6.5</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	20	6.9
Productivity	0	0	1	0	2	3	14	20	6.5
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	1	1	1	1	3	13	20	6.2
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	1	1	4	3	4	2	15	4.9
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	5	3.4
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	5	3.4
Quality of Feedback	0	3	2	3	4	3	5	20	4.9
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	0	1	6	5	1	2	15	4.8
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	5	3.2
<b>Student Engagement (UE only)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.2</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 3] + [6 \times 8] + [7 \times 6]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 5.8$

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment:  $([5 \times 1] + [7 \times 19]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 6.9$ . In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	0	5	6	7	1	19	5.2
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	1	5	12	1	19	5.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	4	3	5	6	1	0	19	3.8
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>6.5</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	19	6.4
Productivity	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	19	6.4
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	19	6.6
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	1	0	12	6	0	19	5.2
Content Understanding	0	1	2	6	9	1	0	19	4.4
Analysis and Inquiry	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19	3.2
Quality of Feedback	1	0	12	2	4	0	0	19	3.4
Instructional Dialogue	0	3	8	6	2	0	0	19	3.4
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5.1</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([4 \times 5] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 1]) \div 19 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment:  $([5 \times 1] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 13]) \div 19 \text{ observations} = 6.6$

## 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>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	2	6	2	8	2	20	5.1
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	0	8	11	1	20	5.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	7	2	2	7	1	1	20	3.8
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	20	6.3
Productivity	0	0	0	0	4	10	6	20	6.1
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	20	6.7
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	0	6	11	3	0	20	4.9
Content Understanding	0	0	4	5	8	3	0	20	4.5
Analysis and Inquiry	1	6	5	6	2	0	0	20	3.1
Quality of Feedback	0	2	8	1	8	1	0	20	3.9
Instructional Dialogue	0	4	4	9	2	1	0	20	3.6
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.8</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 2] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 8] + [7 \times 2]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 5.1$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 6] + [7 \times 14]) \div 20 \text{ observations} = 6.7$

## 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 publish 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="#">Quick Reference Guide: Opportunities to Streamline the Evaluation Process</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="#">Identifying Meaningful Professional Development</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.

Resource	Description
<a href="#"><i>The Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice</i></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="#"><i>Making Inclusive Education Work</i></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/">https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/</a>	A multitiered system of support 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="#"><i>Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets</i></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. Dartmouth 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	1,548	503.4	505.5	501.7	-1.7	496.5	5.1
African American/ Black	25	501.0	504.9	493.4	-7.6	486.4	7.0
Asian	11	—	509.6	510.6	—	508.5	2.0
Hispanic/Latino	77	496.3	500.7	499.1	2.8	484.3	14.8
Multirace	99	505.1	507.3	501.4	-3.7	499.7	1.7
White	1,335	503.6	505.6	501.9	-1.7	501.3	0.6
High need	674	494.0	495.7	492.5	-1.5	485.9	6.6
Economically disadvantaged	458	496.3	498.3	494.4	-1.9	485.2	9.2
ELs and former ELs	96	494.0	494.1	492.1	-1.9	482.8	9.3
Students with disabilities	310	482.8	484.5	482.4	-0.4	478.1	4.3

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. Dartmouth 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	1,548	500.4	501.3	494.9	-5.5	489.7	5.2
African American/ Black	25	492.8	497.4	486.4	-6.4	477.3	9.1
Asian	11	—	498.2	498.3	—	508.6	-10.3
Hispanic/Latino	78	492.5	494.4	490.4	-2.1	476.5	13.9
Multirace	99	504.9	507.4	497.5	-7.4	492.1	5.4
White	1,334	500.6	501.3	495.1	-5.5	494.3	0.8
High need	676	492.3	491.9	485.8	-6.5	479.0	6.8
Economically disadvantaged	458	492.9	492.5	486.2	-6.7	477.4	8.8
ELs and former ELs	96	492.6	490.7	488.1	-4.5	477.8	10.3
Students with disabilities	312	484.8	483.5	479.3	-5.5	472.5	6.8

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 E3. Dartmouth 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	1,548	57%	59%	53%	-4	46%	7
African American/ Black	25	35%	46%	36%	1	28%	8
Asian	11	—	60%	64%	—	66%	-2
Hispanic/Latino	77	41%	48%	51%	10	26%	25
Multirace	99	61%	66%	52%	-9	51%	1
White	1,335	58%	60%	53%	-5	54%	-1
High need	674	37%	38%	37%	0	28%	9
Economically disadvantaged	458	43%	43%	41%	-2	27%	14
ELs and former ELs	96	34%	41%	39%	5	24%	15
Students with disabilities	310	15%	18%	22%	7	16%	6

**Table E4. Dartmouth 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	1,548	51%	53%	41%	-10	33%	8
African American/ Black	25	32%	38%	40%	8	14%	26
Asian	11	—	50%	55%	—	64%	-9
Hispanic/Latino	78	29%	41%	29%	0	14%	15
Multirace	99	53%	61%	46%	-7	37%	9
White	1,334	52%	54%	41%	-11	40%	1
High need	676	31%	32%	24%	-7	16%	8
Economically disadvantaged	458	33%	34%	25%	-8	14%	11
ELs and former ELs	96	25%	28%	27%	2	17%	10
Students with disabilities	312	19%	18%	14%	-5	10%	4

**Table E5. Dartmouth 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	230	513.4	507.3	6.1	230	503.7	500.6	3.1
African American/Black	7	—	494.6	—	7	—	486.7	—
Asian	—	—	518.2	—	—	—	520.9	—
Hispanic/Latino	14	506.5	491.9	14.6	14	492.4	485.3	7.1
Multirace	21	516.1	510.6	5.5	21	510.6	503.9	6.7
White	188	513.9	512.5	1.4	188	503.9	504.9	-1.0
High need	79	502.0	493.3	8.7	79	491.0	486.5	4.4
Economically disadvantaged	54	505.6	493.7	11.9	54	493.6	486.6	7.0
ELs and former ELs	3	—	477.9	—	3	—	477.6	—
Students with disabilities	38	491.5	487.2	4.3	38	481.6	479.6	2.0

**Table E6. Dartmouth 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	230	73%	64%	9	230	60%	52%	8
African American/Black	7	—	41%	—	7	—	27%	—
Asian	—	—	80%	—	—	—	80%	—
Hispanic/Latino	14	64%	39%	25	14	36%	26%	10
Multirace	21	81%	67%	14	21	62%	55%	7
White	188	74%	73%	1	188	63%	60%	3
High need	79	49%	39%	10	79	29%	26%	3
Economically disadvantaged	54	59%	41%	18	54	35%	27%	8
ELs and former ELs	3	—	19%	—	3	—	15%	—
Students with disabilities	38	26%	25%	1	38	16%	14%	2

**Table E7. Dartmouth 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	505	52%	43%	42%	1
African American/Black	6	50%	33%	19%	14
Asian	6	—	50%	62%	-12
Hispanic/Latino	28	45%	36%	20%	16
Multirace, non-Hispanic/ Latino	35	69%	40%	47%	-7
White	430	51%	43%	50%	-7
High need	221	33%	26%	23%	3
Economically disadvantaged	141	39%	32%	21%	11
ELs and former ELs	39	24%	26%	18%	8
Students with disabilities	104	17%	15%	15%	0

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. Dartmouth 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	46%	57%	55%	9	51%	4
4	251	55%	51%	56%	1	49%	7
5	232	56%	67%	52%	-4	47%	5
6	272	63%	69%	59%	-4	47%	12
7	266	59%	56%	52%	-7	43%	9
8	291	62%	56%	45%	-17	41%	4
3-8	1,548	57%	59%	53%	-4	46%	7
10	230	—	67%	73%	—	64%	9

**Table E9. Dartmouth 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	237	43%	49%	37%	-6	33%	4
4	251	44%	47%	47%	3	33%	14
5	232	50%	50%	40%	-10	33%	7
6	272	54%	61%	44%	-10	33%	11

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/below
7	266	57%	55%	41%	-16	35%	6
8	290	54%	55%	37%	-17	32%	5
3-8	1,548	51%	53%	41%	-10	33%	8
10	230	—	69%	60%	—	52%	8

**Table E10. Dartmouth 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	232	54%	—	47%	—	42%
8	273	50%	—	40%	—	41%
5 and 8	505	52%	—	43%	—	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

**Table E11. Dartmouth 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	—	57.0	—	—	—	50.5	—	—
5	221	65.2	42.8	34.9	222	55.1	38.3	31.9
6	251	63.9	48.4	37.3	251	55.3	40.9	26.3
7	249	50.0	39.5	36.1	248	53.4	43.0	35.8
8	268	47.1	31.5	34.8	263	50.9	22.4	27.4
3-8	989	56.3	40.3	35.8	984	53.0	35.9	30.4
10	191	51.1	51.5	52.5	192	47.2	25.7	36.5

**Table E12. Dartmouth 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
Cushman	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Demello	60%	52%	62%	—	—	—	57%	—
Potter	59%	53%	36%	—	—	—	49%	—
Quinn	52%	63%	57%	—	—	—	57%	—

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Dartmouth Middle	—	—	—	60%	52%	46%	53%	—
Dartmouth High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	74%
District	55%	56%	52%	59%	52%	45%	53%	73%
State	51%	49%	47%	47%	43%	41%	46%	64%

**Table E13. Dartmouth 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
Cushman	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Demello	47%	43%	42%	—	—	—	44%	—
Potter	38%	36%	37%	—	—	—	37%	—
Quinn	31%	60%	41%	—	—	—	44%	—
Dartmouth Middle	—	—	—	45%	42%	38%	42%	—
Dartmouth High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	62%
District	37%	47%	40%	44%	41%	37%	41%	60%
State	33%	33%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%	52%

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

School	5	8	5 and 8	10
Cushman	—	—	—	—
Demello	54%	—	54%	—
Potter	34%	—	34%	—
Quinn	49%	—	49%	—
Dartmouth Middle	—	41%	41%	—
Dartmouth High	—	—	—	—
District	47%	40%	43%	—
State	42%	41%	42%	—

Note. Grade 10 results for 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. Dartmouth 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
Cushman		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Demello	57%	46%	50%	29%	37%	—	—	46%	72%	57%
Potter	49%	38%	43%	17%	53%	—	—	—	—	48%
Quinn	57%	43%	48%	27%	57%	—	—	67%	48%	57%
Dartmouth Middle	53%	34%	38%	19%	30%	20%	—	50%	46%	54%
Dartmouth High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	53%	37%	41%	22%	39%	36%	64%	51%	52%	53%
State	46%	28%	27%	16%	24%	28%	66%	26%	51%	54%

Note. High need = students with high needs; 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. Dartmouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent 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
Cushman ES	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Demello	44%	26%	26%	22%	26%	—	—	15%	56%	44%
Potter	37%	28%	26%	17%	47%	—	—	—	—	34%
Quinn	44%	29%	28%	21%	50%	—	—	42%	43%	44%
Dartmouth Middle	42%	22%	25%	10%	14%	30%	—	27%	43%	43%
Dartmouth High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	41%	24%	25%	14%	27%	40%	55%	29%	46%	41%
State	33%	16%	14%	10%	17%	14%	64%	14%	37%	40%

Note. High need = students with high needs; 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. Dartmouth 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
Dartmouth High	74%	51%	63%	30%	—	—	—	64%	84%	76%
District	73%	49%	59%	26%	—	—	—	64%	81%	74%
State	64%	39%	41%	25%	19%	41%	80%	39%	67%	73%

Note. High need = students with high needs; 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. Dartmouth 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
Dartmouth High	62%	30%	37%	18%	—	—	—	36%	63%	64%
District	60%	29%	35%	16%	—	—	—	36%	62%	63%
State	52%	26%	27%	14%	15%	27%	80%	26%	55%	60%

Note. High need = students with high needs; 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. Dartmouth 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
Cushman	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Demello	54%	46%	52%	40%	25%	—	—	—	—	56%
Potter	34%	17%	17%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	35%
Quinn	49%	37%	48%	16%	—	—	—	—	40%	49%
Dartmouth Middle	41%	20%	25%	12%	23%	—	—	29%	44%	42%
Dartmouth High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	43%	26%	32%	15%	26%	—	—	36%	40%	43%
State	42%	23%	21%	15%	18%	19%	62%	20%	47%	50%

Note. High need = students with high needs; 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. Dartmouth 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	272	93.2	93.3	91.8	92.3	-0.9	89.8
African American/Black	7	—	—	—	100	—	84.4
Asian	1	—	—	—	—	—	96.1
Hispanic/Latino	10	83.3	85.7	63.6	80.0	-3.3	80.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	21	100	100	95.0	90.5	-9.5	88.8
White	233	92.8	93.4	93.9	92.7	-0.1	93.2

High need	86	83.0	81.0	78.9	77.9	-5.1	82.4
Low income	79	81.2	81.3	78.1	79.7	-1.5	81.7
ELs	3	—	—	—	—	—	71.8
Students with disabilities	35	73.8	66.7	67.6	60.0	-13.8	76.6

**Table E21. Dartmouth 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	268	91.0	93.5	94.0	94.8	3.8	91.0
African American/Black	5	—	—	—	—	—	87.2
Asian	1	—	—	—	—	—	95.8
Hispanic/ Latino	11	100	83.3	85.7	81.8	-18.2	81.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/ Latino	20	100	100	100	100	0	90.8
White	231	91.3	93.2	94.2	95.7	4.4	94.4
High need	90	80.2	84.0	83.3	86.7	6.5	84.5
Low income	73	80.2	82.6	81.3	84.9	4.7	84.1
ELs	4	—	—	—	—	—	74.7
Students with disabilities	37	67.6	76.2	71.8	78.4	10.8	79.3

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.3
African American/Black	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic or Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.4
White	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.3
High need	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.3	-0.4	0.4
Economically disadvantaged	1.0	0.1	0.7	0.1	-0.9	0.3
EL	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Students with disabilities	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.5	-0.2	0.6

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.6	-0.1	0.5
African American/Black	—	—	—	—	—	0.6

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.5
Multirace, non-Hispanic or Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.7
White	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.5	-0.1	0.5
High need	1.4	1.6	0.9	0.9	-0.5	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	1.8	2.0	0.8	1.2	-0.6	0.7
ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Students with disabilities	1.8	1.4	1.1	0.6	-1.2	1.1

**Table E24. Dartmouth Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2018–2021**

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	1,045	0.7	1.5	1.0	0.7	0.0	1.5
African American/Black	29	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Asian	1	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	54	3.6	5.4	0.0	1.9	-1.7	3.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	80	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.3	1.3	1.4
White	881	0.6	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.0	1.0
High need	319	2.0	4.3	3.6	1.6	-0.4	2.7
Economically disadvantaged	225	2.3	5.1	4.3	1.8	-0.5	2.9
ELs	6	0.0	11.1	—	0.0	0.0	5.8
Students with disabilities	134	2.6	6.5	6.8	2.2	-0.4	2.4

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

Group	N (2020)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
All	541	64.7	68.8	68.2	3.5	65.3
African American/Black	14	—	30.0	57.1	—	54.9
Asian	1	—	—	—	—	84.3
Hispanic/Latino	23	50.0	68.4	52.2	2.2	50.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	41	71.9	85.0	80.5	8.6	65.5
White	462	64.4	68.3	68.2	3.8	69.6
High need	157	36.2	48.7	45.2	9.0	47.7
Economically disadvantaged	117	41.8	55.4	47.0	5.2	49.0
ELs	3	12.5	—	—	—	28.1
Students with disabilities	63	12.7	30.4	23.8	11.1	33.1

