

Westwood Public Schools

Targeted 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

American Institutes for Research

Education Systems and Policy

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

Contents

- Executive Summary 1
- Westwood Public Schools: District Review Overview 3
- Curriculum and Instruction..... 7
- Assessment.....13
- Student Support.....16
- Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities.....A-1
- Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, ExpendituresB-1
- Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation ReportC-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 October 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



Executive Summary

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

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

Westwood is led by Emily Parks who is in her fifth year as superintendent. Parks has served in the district in various roles for the last 27 years. She has served in various roles, including teacher, assistant principal, high school principal, and assistant superintendent. The central office team is also led by the assistant superintendent; director of student services; director of finance and operations; director of equity, integration, and community partnerships; director of technology, learning, and innovation; and other various director and assistant director positions in support roles.

Curriculum and Instruction

Westwood conducts regular curriculum reviews and makes necessary updates to curriculum that is responsive to the needs of students and teachers. Curriculum is consistently analyzed to ensure vertical alignment and alignment to grade-level standards. Curricula documents are stored on Aspen, which is the district's learning management system. High school curriculum is primarily teacher created, and curriculum at the middle and elementary levels is a mixture of published curriculum and teacher-created curricular materials. The district engages in ongoing curricular updates, which include a focus on culturally diverse materials. Students are offered a variety of courses, and the high school has created a unique schedule that allows for more flexibility for students to explore their interests.

Classroom instruction is a strength for the district based on stakeholder interviews and classroom observation data. Seven observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Westwood during the week of May 23, 2022. The observers conducted 64 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest mixed evidence of consistently strong language modeling (grades K-3), as well as high emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement (Grades 4-5). For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization and mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional

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

Assessment

Westwood has a well-documented assessment system adopted districtwide. Westwood elementary and middle schools administer STAR 360 benchmark assessments three times per year to assess progress of student learning. The high school uses AP (Advanced Placement), SAT, MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System), and teacher-created formative and summative assessments to determine student progress. District priorities focused on the use of assessments and data to inform instruction and support students have created a positive culture in regard to data use throughout Westwood. Elementary and middle school improvement plans explicitly call out goals regarding the use of data. The child study teams (CSTs) throughout the district have systems embedded into their operations that ensure holistic data are collected and submitted as part of the student referral process. The CST uses data to inform the selection of interventions, monitoring student progress, and determining next steps. Data also are reviewed regularly by teachers districtwide. Teachers use a data analysis protocol to look at student work, review student assessment data, and make necessary adjustments to instruction. In addition, teacher and school leader focus groups reported a shared understanding of the importance of progress monitoring and the frequent collection of formative data to drive instruction. Students and parents agree that communication regarding data are shared with them frequently and clearly.

Student Support

Classroom observation scores in the middle and high range districtwide indicated evidence of safe and supportive classrooms, and middle and high school students reported feeling safe and supported at school. Creating safe and inclusive school environments for school communities remains a priority for Westwood. Teachers throughout the district have added more diverse texts and are intentional about including a variety of perspectives in lessons and lesson materials. Westwood began an equity audit in the spring of the 2021-2022 school year. Findings from the resulting report, which the district expects to receive by the end of the calendar year, will inform future goals in this area. In addition, Westwood has supported teachers in implementing culturally responsive teaching practices by providing ongoing focused professional development and coaching. Furthermore, Westwood continues to partner with community organizations to provide mental health services and access to social workers.

Westwood Public Schools: District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by the DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.¹ The Westwood review focused only on the three student-centered standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. The design of the targeted district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The on-site visit to Westwood was conducted from May 23 to May 27, 2022. The site visit included 14 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 58 stakeholders, including district administrators, school staff, students, and students' families. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with nine elementary school teachers, nine middle school teachers, and six high school teachers.

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

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

The site team also conducted 64 observations of classroom instruction in seven schools.³ The observation-trained and certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

Additional information can be found 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 contained 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

Westwood is led by Emily Parks who is in her fifth year as superintendent. Parks has served in the district in various roles for the last 27 years. She has served in various roles, including teacher, assistant principal, high school principal, and assistant superintendent. The central office team is also led by the assistant superintendent; director of student services; director of finance and operations; director of equity, integration, and community partnerships; director of technology, learning, and innovation; and other various director and assistant director positions in support roles.

In the 2021-2022 school year, there were 235.3 teachers in the district with 2,894 students enrolled in the district's eight schools and early education program. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

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

School	Type	Grades served	Enrollment
Deerfield School	ES	K-5	182
Downey	ES	PK-5	306
E. W. Thurston Middle	MS	6-8	662
Martha Jones	ES	K-5	272
Paul Hanlon	ES	K-5	189
Westwood High	HS	9-12	952
Westwood Integrated Preschool	PK	PK	43
William E. Sheehan	ES	K-5	288
Totals			2,894

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

Between 2019 and 2021, overall student enrollment decreased by 190 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high-need populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

³ DESE exempted the early childhood center from instructional observations.

Student Performance

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

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

Grade	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
3	217	76%	86%	81%	5	51%	30
4	205	82%	81%	81%	-1	49%	32
5	222	87%	86%	82%	-5	47%	35
6	241	77%	83%	74%	-3	47%	27
7	211	65%	61%	71%	6	43%	28
8	220	65%	65%	63%	-2	41%	22
3-8	1,316	75%	77%	75%	0	46%	29
10	237	—	84%	84%	—	64%	20

Note. Data sourced from

https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=03350000&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	217	70%	79%	68%	-2	33%	35
4	205	78%	83%	69%	-9	33%	36
5	221	76%	77%	67%	-9	33%	34
6	240	69%	73%	50%	-19	33%	17
7	211	64%	75%	65%	1	35%	30
8	220	71%	67%	52%	-19	32%	20
3-8	1,314	71%	76%	62%	-9	33%	29
10	239	—	89%	80%	—	52%	28

Note. Data sourced from

https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=03350000&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	221	84%	—	76%	-8	42%
8	202	69%	—	62%	-7	41%
5 and 8	423	76%	—	70%	-6	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=03350000&orgtypecode=5 & (2021).

In addition, the district's four-year graduation rate⁴ was 98.0 percent in 2021, above the state rate of 89.8 percent. In addition, the district's five-year graduation rate was 97.5 percent in 2020, above the state rate of 91 percent.

⁴ [Cohort 2021 Graduation Rates—Westwood \(03350000\) \(mass.edu\)](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=03350000&orgtypecode=5)

Curriculum and Instruction

Westwood engages in regular curriculum reviews and involves multiple stakeholders in the process. Curriculum is documented and stored on the district’s learning management system, Aspen. A system is in place to ensure continuous work toward vertical alignment across content and grade levels. Multiple interview and focus group respondents explained that a particular focus on high-quality instruction has been set throughout Westwood, supported by ongoing professional development, instructional coaching, and observation feedback.

High school curriculum is primarily teacher created. Curriculum at the middle school is a mixture of teacher-created curriculum and curricular resources. Elementary teachers have access to published curriculum for all subject areas; however, teachers and leaders identified social studies as a subject area in need of an adopted curriculum.

The district offers a variety of courses and has created a unique schedule that allows high school students to access more interest-based courses. Stakeholders identified two areas for growth—expanding secondary pathway options and disaggregating student participation data in advanced courses.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Curriculum selection and use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular curriculum reviews conducted Curriculum is documented and easily accessed Focus on alignment to state standards Focus on antiracist practices and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of CURATE to evaluate curricula
Classroom instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student-centered inquiry learning focused on small-group instruction and collaboration Teachers consistently adjust their practice to meet the needs of all students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of social-emotional learning competencies analysis and inquiry, quality of feedback, and instructional dialogue at the secondary levels
Student access to coursework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intentional focus on student enrollment data in programs to ensure equitable access Creative scheduling allows for students to explore their interests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis that ensures equitable access to rigorous courses Secondary pathway exploration and options for students

Curriculum Selection and Use

Overall, curriculum selection and use is a strength for Westwood. Curriculum reviews are regular and inclusive, curricular materials are documented and easily accessible, and school and district leaders are taking steps to ensure vertical alignment across all curricula. One area for growth for the district

is that most curricula used is not rated according to CURATE,⁵ and the only curricula rated, the Investigations Math for grades K-5, is rated as “partially meets expectations.”

Curriculum reviews occur regularly and include a variety of stakeholders. Westwood has developed a curriculum review team, which includes teachers, students, parents, principals, and district leaders. Teachers noted that “teachers’ voices are always sought out anytime there is a curriculum review.” Teachers also noted that not only do those reviews allow for alignment to state standards, but they also allow the district to examine and improve vertical alignment. Although many curricula are not rated by CURATE, school and district leaders explained that alignment to state standards is paramount when reviewing and creating curriculum. District and school leaders explained that the curriculum review team uses student data, such as STAR 360 data, MCAS data, and data from peer districts to guide decisions. In addition, the district focuses on DEI in the curriculum reviews and intends to use findings from the ongoing equity audit to support this work. Through this DEI work, the district has made changes to its curriculum at all grade levels, as highlighted in a 2021 memo on antiracist curricular changes. These changes include adding more texts from diverse authors, expanding the countries and societies studied in social studies, and ensuring that foundational texts at the elementary level are more inclusive.

Curricular materials are effectively documented and accessible to teachers. Curricular maps are stored on Aspen, the district’s learning management system, and on Google Drive, for all teachers and school leaders to access. Curriculum maps are consistent, with unit titles, essential skills and understandings, guiding questions, formative assessments, summative assessments, and benchmark assessments included. Middle and high school teacher focus groups indicate they continually work to improve their curriculum based on “relevance, alignment to standards, alignment to essential questions, and ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment.” According to interviewed district leaders, the district works to ensure vertical alignment. Department heads from all schools meet regularly with the assistant superintendent to “look at the big picture and then within a school . . . to look at vertical alignment.” Many stakeholders discussed the importance of vertical alignment and the push the district makes to ensure it.

The high school uses primarily teacher-created curricula. Middle school curriculum is a mixture of teacher-created and published curriculum. Math teachers in the middle school use the Big Ideas Math curriculum, but the curriculum is currently under review. The district intends to pilot programs in 2022-2023, with the plan of adopting new resources. Science teachers at the middle school use the 2017 Integrated Science curriculum by McGraw Hill. Social studies teachers use a published curriculum by Primary Source in eighth grade, and the district is looking to adopt a curriculum for the sixth and seventh grades. English language arts (ELA) curricula is teacher-created and, as a result of teacher feedback, the middle school ELA content area is making the shift to adoption of published curriculum resources. One district leader explained that not one common adopted curriculum for ELA exists; however, several teachers are currently piloting different programs intending to adopt one for 2022-2023. Elementary schools have published materials and clear curriculum maps for science, ELA, and social-emotional learning. Multiple teacher focus group respondents indicated they like having a published curricular resource as a foundation for their classes because it allows them to

⁵ [Curriculum RATings by TEachers \(CURATE\): Center for Instructional Support \(mass.edu\).](#)

spend more of their time supplementing and modifying curriculum to meet the needs of their students.

Curriculum implementation is a strength for the district as well. Common planning time (CPT) is provided and used to discuss curriculum across grade levels and content areas. A strength for the district is the districtwide expectation regarding modification of instruction and materials to meet student needs. Aside from a robust special education program, specialist teachers noted several times how general education teachers consistently supplement and modify instruction to meet the needs of all students. According to the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP), the district has six goals, with explicit strategies to reach those goals—all intending to create classroom environments inclusive of all learners. These goals include focusing on professional development, using assessment data to inform instruction, and applying positive behavioral supports, among others. The district also uses literacy and mathematics specialists to coach teachers with the goal of creating consistent learning experiences across classrooms.

Classroom Instruction

Seven observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Westwood during the week of May 23, 2022. The observers conducted 64 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

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

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

In Westwood, 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.** Average scores (out of 7.0) were in the high range for the K-5 grade band (6.3) and in the middle range for 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (5.2 and 5.4, respectively).
- **Classroom Organization.** Average scores were in the high range for all grade bands (6.6 for grades K-5, 6.3 for grades 6-8, 6.4 for grades 9-12).
- **Instructional Support.** Average scores were in the middle range for all grade bands (5.2 for grades K-5, 4.0 for grades 6-8, 4.5 for grades 9-12).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, scores were in the high range for the 4-5 grade band (6.8) and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (5.4 and 5.5, respectively).

Overall, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization at all grade spans and mixed evidence of consistent emotional support, rigorous instructional support, and student engagement across grade bands. For the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest strong emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement (Grades 4-5). For both the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization and mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, student engagement, and rigorous instructional support. Among the areas for improvement, scoring an average below 4.0 at the 6-8 grade band, were three instructional support dimensions: analysis and inquiry, instructional dialogue, and quality of feedback.

Classroom instruction is a strength for the district based on stakeholder interviews and classroom observation data. When discussing common instructional practices, teacher focus group participants described student-centered learning and inquiry-based instruction as priorities for the district. Teachers also discussed the use of small-group instruction and collaboration. Student focus groups participants explained that teachers use “lots of different learning techniques and teaching techniques,” including discussions, notes, presentations, and group work. Students also mentioned that teachers “make sure you understand everything concrete before you move on to anything else.” Some students noted, however, that classes can be “note heavy.” Although students discussed some variations across classes and teachers, many felt that classes are generally taught by teachers using similar instructional methods. Parent focus group participants described mostly positive experiences. Teachers, school leaders, district leaders, parents, and students all noted that teachers consistently adjust their practice to meet the needs of all students, with teachers and school leaders referencing the DCAP as a tool to guide their work. Teachers and school leaders mentioned that they want students to be challenged at all levels, not just in an honors and AP course, which is something the district is working on.

Westwood engages in a formal practice to monitor the quality of instruction and provide feedback to teachers to improve instruction. Teachers and school leaders described a regular evaluation process that includes department heads, principals, assistant principals, and special education team chairs. School leaders explained that nonprofessional status teachers have scheduled formal observation,

and professional status teachers have “mini observations and follow-up conversations.” All members of the evaluation team are trained in a district-developed evaluation tool. Instructional coaches and curriculum leads also offer coaching, modeling, and feedback for teachers. In addition, teachers discussed receiving ongoing professional development focused on effective instruction.

Two areas consistently discussed for growth by teacher and student support focus group participants were including more social-emotional learning competencies into the curriculum and ensuring students take more risks in the classroom. Teachers described a need for more professional development regarding how to include and implement social-emotional learning, a consistent English as a second language (ESL) curriculum, and the desire for more social-emotional learning support in the form of another school psychologist for the district. In terms of students taking risks in the classroom and taking ownership over their learning, teachers explained that “students are very good at being students,” but suggest they do not feel students take many risks. Teachers also explained they teach students study skills to support students in taking more ownership of their learning.

Data from the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report in Appendix C supports stakeholder claims of inclusive, rigorous, student-centered classrooms. The district scored in either the middle or the high range for all indicators in the emotional support domain, demonstrating that classrooms throughout the district are safe, inclusive, and positive spaces. In addition, the district scored in the middle or high range for every indicator in the instructional support domain, illustrating strong classroom instruction that regularly engages students in challenging learning activities. The district scored well (5.0 or higher for all grade bands) in the instructional learning formats dimension, meaning instruction is engaging, teachers use a variety of modalities and methods, and learning objectives are clear. At the middle school, scores were lower for the analysis and inquiry dimension, corroborating students’ claims that some classes are focused on note taking and rote instruction. All grade levels recorded medium-to-high scores for student engagement. Overall, Westwood’s scores on the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report show that classroom instruction is a strength.

Student Access to Coursework

Documents and stakeholder interviews show that Westwood has a wide variety of educational offerings for students and that the district is conscious of reviewing student enrollment data to ensure equitable access. According to the high school program of studies, students have numerous elective choices, including creative writing classes, journalism classes, coding classes, and several different social studies and social science classes. Most of those classes are reserved for juniors and seniors. In addition, students can take several AP classes, available in all content areas. Teachers also described a Senior Independent Project Program, “Students are identifying an area of particular interest and constructing their own course with a mentor and a project in a team of faculty, who[m] they meet with to give them feedback over the arc of their project.” Teacher focus group participants explained that special education students can pursue vocational interests, where students work community-based summer jobs and internships through the Flex Program, as described in the high school program of studies. One school leader explained, freshman, sophomores, and juniors can also enroll in a “J-Term” in which teachers “suspend traditional instruction and are offering immersive courses over a four-to-five-day period where kids are really doing a deep dive into a particular subject.” At the middle school, teachers described opportunities such as TedTalks, a seventh-grade writers conference, and participating in a Harvard Forest Study. In

addition, school leaders discussed an effort to align middle- and high school schedules to allow middle school students the opportunity to take higher level courses. District leaders explained that many elementary schools have “outdoor classrooms” that allow students to learn science in a hands-on, exploratory way.

Although teachers and school leaders noted that any student may enroll in higher level classes, teachers explained that “Tracking is a big problem . . . it’s harder for kids once they’re in a particular track to move up [a level].” Teacher focus group participants described wanting to create more pathways and opportunities for students that may not be interested in college. Similar issues of equity were discussed by district leaders, who will be examining student data regarding “equity and outcomes” to ensure that all students have access to rigorous course work moving forward.

Recommendations

- The district should use CURATE to evaluate existing and any potential new curricula.
- District and school leaders should provide teachers with professional development related to social-emotional learning competencies, quality of feedback, and instructional dialogue at the secondary levels.
- The district should establish a data analysis process that examines and ensures equitable access to rigorous courses.
- The district should provide secondary pathway exploration and options for all students.

Assessment

Westwood has created and sustained a positive culture regarding the consistent collection, monitoring, and use of data throughout the district. MCAS results are used to set and track districtwide goals. School-level data are collected through the use of STAR 360 benchmark assessments for grades K-8 and through the use of unit and teacher-created assessments at the high school. Data are consistently reviewed during CPT and used to guide decisions at the district, school, and classroom levels. Teacher, parent, and student focus groups agree that data results are consistently and clearly communicated. Table 6 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Data and assessment systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Benchmark assessments administered three times per year for grades K-8 ■ Newly adopted STAR 360 assessment for grades 6-8 ■ Grade-level standards prioritized while creating common assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A
Data use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ STAR 360 benchmark data used systematically three times per year to modify instruction ■ MCAS data used to set goals and monitor progress ■ Elementary- and middle school improvement plans include goals regarding data use ■ Holistic data collection and analysis during CST ■ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A
Sharing results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Progress reports sent home quarterly ■ Students' progress available via Aspen or Google Classroom ■ MCAS results shared districtwide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A

Data and Assessment Systems

According to documents and school leaders, district leaders, and teacher interviews, the district uses multiple assessment types to monitor student progress and performance. Westwood relies on MCAS data to better understand how the district is performing, and teachers use these data to track student performance. The district also administers STAR 360 benchmark assessments for ELA and mathematics three times per year in grades K-8; this gives teachers individual student data and the ability to monitor student progress multiple times during the school year. The 2021-2022 school year was the first time that STAR 360 was administered in grades 6-8; in previous years, the assessment was administered only in grades K-5. The progress and performance of ELs is also assessed using ACCESS testing and WIDA screeners. Teacher focus group respondents described using many different formative and summative assessments, like unit tests. Student work often is used as an informal dataset when looking for a comprehensive picture of student learning. Teacher focus group

participants indicated that at the high school, teaching teams and department teams meet often during CPTs to develop standards-aligned common assessments and to review student data to ensure alignment across different courses. Data from AP and SAT tests are also used at the high school to examine progress and performance on a broader scale, according to district leaders. Teacher focus group participants noted that alignment to state standards is a priority when developing common assessments. District leaders, school leaders, and teachers described how the district has made it a priority to examine multiple and complimentary data sources when collecting data. School staff highlighted that students in the elementary grades have a “running record” into which teachers input formative and summative assessment data. This record can be accessed by teachers, specialists, and principals to ensure that multiple sources of data are used when examining a student’s progress and performance. Overall, the district has a clear purpose and system for collecting and reviewing data.

Data Use

According to Westwood documents and stakeholder interviews, consistent and effective expectations exist in regard to data use. School leaders, teachers, and district leaders must use many sources of data often to drive decision-making. During focus groups and interviews, school and district leaders described a process for looking at data that includes looking at MCAS data with all grade levels, focusing on using both formative and summative assessment data, and providing professional development for teachers to support data literacy to make informed decisions regarding instructional practices. Teachers explained that school leaders regularly and collaboratively review STAR 360 data with teachers and work to assist teachers in using assessment results to inform instruction. Data is reviewed during CPT, dedicated data review meetings, and instructional coaching sessions. District documents show that the leaders compare year-to-year MCAS results to set and track districtwide goals, and school leaders mentioned they look at data from peer districts as well. Teachers, specialists, and school leaders also explained that data from ELs and students receiving special education services are collected “all the time” and they are constantly analyzing that data to monitor student progress.

Elementary- and middle school improvement plans clearly show a district focus on data use, with goals specifically targeting the use of formal assessment data, as well as informal data, to determine interventions, supports, and adjustments to practice. These goals also describe using CPT for teachers to examine student data as well as highlight changes made to the CST process that includes the use of more data. Teachers and school leaders explained that the use of STAR 360 benchmark assessment data, MCAS data, and informal data like student work are expected to be included when referring a student to the CST. The CST procedure document includes a section for presenting work and data samples, as well as a section on how to appropriately use data to monitor interventions. The DCAP also specifically mentions a data analysis goal, with strategies outlining “internal and external data use to assess academic programs and student learning.” In addition, teachers and school leaders mentioned the use of CPT to review student data, and teachers noted that observing data is an integral part of their practice. District leaders also noted that the district has done “a major overhaul” of the student evaluation system and has shifted the focus away from only looking at one set of data to now looking at multiple sources of data, including formal, informal, summative, and formative data when reviewing student, school, or district progress. Teachers

explained the shift in culture regarding the use of data and the types of data used helps them better understand student’s needs and can add context to conversations about interventions rather than relying solely on MCAS or STAR 360 data. This claim is supported by the *Protocol for Discussing Student Work* document, which allows teachers to describe and interpret student work data and make a plan for adjustments, modifications, and interventions they can make to support the student. Furthermore, district and school staff use a Collaborative Data Protocol to spark conversations about data during meetings. Data use, and the support of, are both clear strengths for the district.

Sharing Results

Based on interviews with teachers, school leaders, and families, Westwood shares assessment results with students, teachers, and families in clear, timely, and easily understood ways. According to school and district leaders, the district is intentional about reviewing MCAS data. District leaders explained that MCAS data are shared and examined during districtwide professional development time and schoolwide CPTs. The 2021 districtwide *MCAS Memo* shows that MCAS data summaries are sent to staff throughout the district, with reported changes, yearly comparisons, and observed trends. School leaders explained that data from benchmark assessments, like STAR 360, can be shared during a parent teacher conferences but it is not a formal expectation. Additionally, STAR 360 results are not included in progress reports or sent home to parents in a formal way. However, school leaders noted that should those results lead to referral for an intervention, they “always make sure [to have] a conversation with [the] parent.” School leaders explained that parent-teacher conferences happen twice per year at the elementary and middle school levels and are “student led” at the middle school level—which ensures that students are aware of their progress and feedback from teachers. Parents noted that communication about students’ progress is good, with parents of students enrolled in special education explaining they get “very frequent” updates. Parents reported having access to both Aspen and Google Classroom so they can monitor their child’s progress. Many parents noted that, at the high school, an increased feeling of independence exists, but teachers will make sure to check in if the student is struggling. Students also described feedback as effective and timely and said that many teachers provide comments on assignments through Google Classroom or use rubrics to provide specific feedback. Some students felt that how they receive feedback varies between teachers and subjects, but, overall, teachers make sure to keep students up to date on their progress. Students also explained that most feedback on assignments is formal, but they can receive informal feedback during additional dedicated blocks of time, or if a teacher pulls a student aside during class. Overall, sharing results is a strength for the district.

Student Support

Westwood has taken several steps to increase cultural competence districtwide with the goal to create and sustain safe and supportive schools. Teachers have audited curriculum resulting in the addition of more diverse texts and prioritizing the inclusion of diverse voices and perspectives across curricula. The district also has made adopting culturally responsive teaching practices a priority. In addition, Westwood chose to undergo an equity audit intending to use the data to inform practice and goals for the 2022-2023 school year. Students reported their classes represent diverse perspectives, and the overall consensus was they feel safe and supported at school. Furthermore, Westwood maintains several community partnerships to support programming and students districtwide. Table 7 summarizes the key strengths and areas for growth for student support.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Safe and supportive school climate and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pursuing an equity audit and will use the data to plan for the 2022-2023 school year ■ Offering professional development to improve cultural responsiveness ■ Districtwide Instructional Observation Report scores in the middle and high ranges for safe and supportive classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Districtwide restorative practices to ensure timely and effective response to disciplinary issues
Tiered systems of support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The use of the CST to provide differentiated targeted support to students ■ A variety of universal supports and interventions available ■ Special education programming 	
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The district, schools, and teachers provide consistent and frequent communication home ■ Partnership with Westwood Youth and Family services to provide mental health services ■ Maintain a partnership with Lesley University to provide access to provide access to special education interns and to increase the candidate pipeline for special education teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Inclusive practices to increase engagement of families from diverse backgrounds

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

According to stakeholder interviews and district documents, Westwood prioritizes the physical, intellectual, and emotional safety and well-being of students and adults. Westwood creates an environment that helps students develop social, emotional, and academic competencies. The district has hired a director of safety, who works with other district and school leaders to develop safety

plans to ensure schools remain safe spaces for teachers and students. One lever Westwood has committed to strengthening is growing the cultural competence of the staff to create a welcoming, engaging, and safe environment for all stakeholders. Teachers and school leaders described an immense effort placed on culturally responsive teaching practices, from diversifying books in the library to including diverse voices and histories in curriculums, as well as to engaging in several professional development opportunities to develop cultural responsiveness. School leaders noted that increasing cultural responsiveness has been an intentional district goal for “five to seven years.” In addition, district leaders explained that the district began an equity audit in the spring of the 2021-2022 school year and intends to use findings from the audit to inform future work in this area.

Data from the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report in Appendix C show that teachers and school leaders have created safe and supportive classrooms, with all grade levels scoring in the middle and high ranges for the emotional support domain, and all grade bands scoring, on average, above 5.0 for the positive climate and teacher sensitivity dimensions. Student focus group respondents described feeling safe and respected at their schools and felt teachers make a concerted effort to bring diversity into “every aspect” of the classes. They also mentioned opportunities to be involved in school leadership with activities like the school council. District and school leaders described how schools use positive behavior interventions and supports to manage student behaviors. Recently the district conducted a review of student discipline data to examine whether discipline is enforced consistently and equitably. They found no disparities in discipline referrals and responses when comparing student demographics. Although no disparities were found, district leaders explained that the district is looking into adopting restorative justice practices as a foundation to responding proactively to disciplinary issues. Training student-facing instructional and support staff in restorative practices would help build capacity in adults to support students in gaining conflict resolution skills as well as encourage equity as school personnel respond consistently to discipline issues. Participants in middle and high school staff focus groups indicated there is a clear discipline policy in place. However, middle school focus group participants explained that discipline is not always timely, teacher expectations differ from class to class, and discipline can be ineffective at mitigating undesired behaviors. Despite there being room for growth, students still felt their schools were safe and welcoming.

Tiered Systems of Support

Westwood has a proactive approach and system designed to meet the needs of all students, which based on stakeholder interviews and documents is a strength for the district. One district leader explained that Tier 1 “general education instruction is supplemented by literacy specialists, math specialists, science specialists, as well as a coexisting mental health model.” Within Tier 1, teachers modify instruction for students using strategies outlined in the district’s DCAP, which specifically outlines the goals and processes for accommodating students. In addition, teachers and school leaders described how they use data from their benchmark assessment, STAR 360, and other summative and formative assessments to determine the appropriate supports and modifications needed. Students at all levels, K-12, can receive support from a mathematics or ELA specialist, guidance counselors, school adjustment counselors, and school psychologists. School leaders and specialists also explained how benchmark data are used in the districtwide CST process when a child is referred for additional interventions and potentially special education. The CST team includes

school leaders and student support specialists. The goal of the CST is to analyze data from classroom teachers, student support specialists including but not limited to progress data, assessment data, and behavior data, determine an appropriate intervention, and monitor student progress. If a student does not make adequate progress toward goals, then the CST increases the frequency or intensity of the intervention or modifies the intervention. Teachers and school leaders explained that parents are involved in the process as well to ensure open communication.

In addition, the document titled, *Westwood Program Overview Guide* outlines Westwood's robust special education services that are divided into learning center resource support and districtwide programs located in specific buildings. The special education programs are a strength for the district, with multiple programs designed to meet the various needs of students. Student support specialists described learning centers for students with moderate academic and emotional needs, a small-group instruction program for students needing separate instruction in ELA and mathematics classes, a FLEX program for students with social-emotional challenges; students with severe learning disabilities are taught life and vocational skills in a substantially separate classroom. Teachers, parents, and district leaders all lauded the success of these programs.

According to a district leader, Westwood elementary students have access to the learning center model. Students who qualify have mild-to-moderate learning needs and can receive support in general education classrooms or through a consultation model. Elementary schools also use the resource room model in which students with moderate learning needs receive support in separate special education settings using specialized curricula. Sheehan Elementary School offers the Language Based Learning Disability program for students grades 2-5. Students qualifying for this program typically have specific learning disabilities and/or communication disorders. One district leader explained that these students receive "direct specialized instruction with strategies and/or modifications embedded throughout the day." Sheehan Elementary School also provides the STAR (Strategic, Therapeutic, Academic, Response) program for students who have significant emotional, behavioral, and academic challenges. According to the *Westwood Program Overview Guide*, Deerfield Elementary School offers the Focus program for students who "require intensive, direct, specialized instruction for the majority of the school day." Downey Elementary School provides the PEER (Promoting Education & Effective Relationships) program for students with moderate autism spectrum disorders. This program is tailored to meet the needs of individual students.

Thurston Middle School offers a variety of programming to meet the needs of individual students. Programs include the learning center model, resource rooms, specialized reading services, the Therapeutic Learning Center program, the Social Learning Center program, the Communication Learning Center program, the Developmental Learning Center program, and the Westwood Applied Behavior Application program. In these programs, students often receive other supplementary services including but not limited to speech and language therapy, physical therapy, occupational therapy, counseling, vision services, and orientation and mobility training. Students with higher levels of need also can take adapted physical education or musical therapy class.

At the high school, a framework is provided in the document titled, *Guide to Student Services Supports*, which outlines interventions and supports that increase in intensity as students move along the continuum of tiered supports. In-class supports are provided during general education

instruction and include accommodations and modifications. If students need more support, they receive Learning Center Services, which consist of English, mathematics, science, and social studies pull-out and pull-in classes. The next tier offers students support using Resource Room Courses, which include reading comprehension and decoding instruction for mathematics, science, and social studies. In the last tier are Specialized Programs, which provide supports, interventions, and services including applied behavior analysis, communication connections, the extended learning center, the transition program, and the FLEX therapeutic program. The tiered framework also outlines various services and mental health supports available to students, including but not limited to speech and language pathology, occupational therapy, physical therapy, guidance counseling, social workers, school psychologists, and the Westwood Youth and Family Services program.

In addition, a culture of collegiality exists throughout Westwood in which collaborative problem solving is a routine part of school leader, school specialists, and teacher practice. One district leader and teacher focus group participants agreed that teachers and specialists consult on potential interventions for individual students. Teachers at all levels explained they meet often and focus conversations on improving instruction and individual student needs. Schools also have formal systems in place to ensure teachers have the time to collaborate. For example, the middle school operates using a team model in which reading specialists and special educators belong to each team and can offer expertise in terms of possible supports and interventions during CPT.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Westwood has developed strong collaborative relationships with families, students, community partners, and other stakeholders to support students' academic progress and behavioral, social, emotional, and physical development and well-being. Teacher and school leader focus group respondents noted that frequent parent communication is expected. Teachers explained that involving parents early on helps to develop strong support systems for students, especially those who may be struggling in school. Parent focus group participants reported communication from schools as consistent, and they explained they feel very involved in their child's learning and in their child's school community. School and district leaders mentioned that parents are given frequent opportunities to provide feedback to the schools via surveys, and parents noted that they are always made aware of changes to curriculum at the appropriate times. School leaders also noted that communication to parents can be sent out in many different languages to ensure that all families can receive important information. Stakeholders mentioned that important school materials, like student handbooks, have been translated into the districts three most prevalent languages to promote equity and inclusion of families. One area for growth noted by parent focus groups is making students and families enrolled in the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO) program feel a stronger sense of belonging to the community. Family focus group participants spoke to the importance of all students and their families, including those attending schools but living outside of the district, feeling connected to their schools to build coherence and trust among the entire school community.

The district has a firm commitment to the community and its established community partnerships. Schools partner closely with Westwood Youth and Family Services to provide access to mental health help and counseling for students in need of services. The district also works with Lesley University to ensure access to special education interns in their schools and to increase its candidate pipeline for

special education teachers.. At the high school, a Key Club focuses on community service, and several local businesses work with students in the Transition program to offer jobs and internships to build life skills. Overall, the district has developed strong community partnerships and works to establish continued communication with students and their families.

Recommendations

- The district should implement districtwide restorative practices to ensure consistent, timely, and effective responses to disciplinary issues.
- The district should identify and implement inclusive practices to increase the engagement of all families, including those from diverse backgrounds.

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Westwood. The team conducted 64 classroom observations and held interviews and focus groups during the week of May 23, 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 leaders
- Special education teachers
- EL teachers
- General education teachers
- Student support specialists
- Guidance counselors
- Middle school students
- High school students
- Families

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. Westwood Public Schools: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	2,894	100.0%	911,529	100.0%
African American	61	2.1%	84,970	9.3%
Asian	358	12.4%	65,813	7.2%
Hispanic	151	5.2%	210,747	23.1%
Native American	1	0.0%	2,060	0.2%
White	2,173	75.1%	507,992	55.7%
Native Hawaiian	2	0.1%	788	0.1%
Multirace, non-Hispanic	148	5.1%	39,159	4.3%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

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

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of state
All students with high need	761	100.0%	26.2%	512,242	100.0%	55.6%
Students with disabilities	579	76.1%	19.9%	174,505	34.1%	18.9%
Low income	211	27.7%	7.3%	399,140	77.9%	43.8%
ELs and former ELs	21	2.8%	0.7%	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 need are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 2,910; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 920,971.

Table B3. Westwood Public Schools: Chronic Absence Rates^a by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	4.1	4.3	4.9	3.2	-0.9	17.7
African American/Black	9.1	12.2	13.8	11.9	2.8	24.1
Asian	3.6	2.9	4.9	1.4	-2.2	7.2
Hispanic/Latino	5.2	5.7	6.7	8.1	2.9	29.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	3.8	2.4	2.2	3.4	-0.4	18.9
White	3.9	4.3	4.7	2.9	-1.0	13.2
High need	7.6	7.7	8.8	7.6	0.0	26.3
Economically disadvantaged	9.4	11.8	12.7	12.6	3.2	30.2
ELs	24.2	6.9	13.8	3.6	-20.6	29.0
Students with disabilities	7.0	7.5	9.0	7.6	0.6	26.8

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

Table B4. Westwood 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
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	\$44,903,135	\$44,903,135	\$46,513,031	\$46,513,031	\$48,347,500	\$48,253,133
By municipality	\$12,266,202	\$11,481,320	\$12,869,877	\$11,996,893	\$13,256,139	\$12,589,897
Total from local appropriations	\$57,169,337	\$56,384,455	\$59,382,908	\$58,509,924	\$61,603,639	\$60,843,030
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$6,765,748	--	\$5,016,836	--	\$3,580,994
Total expenditures	--	\$63,150,203	--	\$63,526,760	--	\$64,424,024
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid ^a	--	\$5,336,202	--	\$5,496,384	--	\$5,635,223
Required local contribution	--	\$25,156,380	--	\$25,911,525	--	\$26,566,051
Required net school spending ^b	--	\$30,492,582	--	\$31,407,909	--	\$32,201,274
Actual net school spending	--	\$52,540,537	--	\$54,517,594	--	\$55,988,267
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$22,047,955	--	\$23,109,685	--	\$23,786,993
Over/under required (%)	--	72.3%	--	73.6%	--	73.9%

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

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	\$529.91	\$574.13	\$655.06
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$1,411.76	\$1,453.86	\$1,418.20
Teachers	\$7,507.17	\$7,966.10	\$8,135.99
Other teaching services	\$2,027.15	\$2,165.42	\$2,282.62
Professional development	\$169.57	\$200.53	\$201.50
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$585.79	\$468.26	\$575.58
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$490.55	\$565.58	\$619.69
Pupil services	\$1,630.57	\$1,479.23	\$1,549.22
Operations and maintenance	\$2,159.00	\$2,074.80	\$2,187.92
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$2,312.18	\$2,454.17	\$2,557.24
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$18,823.65	\$19,402.07	\$20,183.02

Note. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Data are from <https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/per-pupil-exp.xlsx>

Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report



Westwood 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

Contents

	Page
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.

Seven observers visited Westwood Public Schools during the week of May 23, 2022. The observers conducted 64 observations in a sample of classrooms across 7 schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

Table 1. CLASS K-3 Domains and Dimensions

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

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average*: 5.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	2	4	6	13	25	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	4	5	7	1	18	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	1	0	3	5	7	5	21	5.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 9] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 20] + [7 \times 19]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 5.7$

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*: 6.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	3	1	21	25	6.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	2	5	5	5	18	5.6
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	21	6.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 15] + [7 \times 34]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 6.2$

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

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average*: 5.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	8	2	9	6	25	5.5
Grades 6-8	0	1	3	3	6	2	3	18	4.8
Grades 9-12	0	3	2	7	3	3	3	21	4.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 4] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 18] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 14] + [7 \times 12]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 5.0$

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

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

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

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–3

Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4–12

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 55, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.¹

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

Negative Climate District Average*: 6.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	25	6.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	18	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	21	6.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as: $([6 \times 10] + [7 \times 54]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 6.8$

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

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

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

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average*: 6.4

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	4	21	25	6.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	2	3	3	9	18	5.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	2	9	10	21	6.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 16] + [7 \times 40]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 6.4$

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	0	0	2	7	16	25	6.6
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	0	3	7	7	18	6.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	21	6.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [5 \times 9] + [6 \times 22] + [7 \times 32]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 6.3$

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*: 5.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	3	1	3	17	25	6.3
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	3	7	5	2	18	5.2
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	3	12	4	1	21	5.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 9] + [5 \times 20] + [6 \times 12] + [7 \times 20]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

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	0	5	0	4	3	3	15	4.9

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

**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*: 4.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	1	1	1	3	0	4	10	5.2
Grades 6-8	0	3	3	4	2	3	3	18	4.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	9	7	1	3	21	4.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 4] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 14] + [5 \times 12] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 10]) \div 49 \text{ observations} = 4.8$

**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*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	10	5.1
Grades 6-8	3	4	2	3	4	1	1	18	3.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	5	8	7	0	1	21	4.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 3] + [2 \times 4] + [3 \times 8] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 4]) \div 49 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

**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*: 4.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	2	6	4	5	8	25	5.4
Grades 6-8	1	4	2	6	2	3	0	18	3.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	7	4	3	7	0	21	4.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 4] + [3 \times 11] + [4 \times 16] + [5 \times 9] + [6 \times 15] + [7 \times 8]) \div 64 \text{ observations} = 4.6$

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*: 4.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	1	1	3	7	2	1	15	4.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 1]) \div 15 \text{ observations} = 4.7$

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average*: 4.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	10	5.6
Grades 6-8	3	3	6	3	1	0	2	18	3.2
Grades 9-12	0	3	6	5	4	2	1	21	4.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 3] + [2 \times 6] + [3 \times 13] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 8]) \div 49 \text{ observations} = 4.0$

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average*: 5.7

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	0	9	10	6.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	4	5	6	3	18	5.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	1	9	7	3	21	5.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 13] + [7 \times 15]) \div 49 \text{ observations} = 5.7$

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	0	0	10	9	18	63	100	6.3
Positive Climate	0	0	0	2	4	6	13	25	6.2
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	25	6.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	0	3	1	21	25	6.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	0	0	8	2	9	6	25	5.5
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	1	3	3	14	54	75	6.6
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	25	6.8
Productivity	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	25	6.6
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	1	3	1	3	17	25	6.3
Instructional Support Domain	0	2	11	14	24	11	23	85	5.2
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	0	5	0	4	3	3	15	4.9
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	1	1	1	3	0	4	10	5.2
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	10	5.1
Quality of Feedback	0	0	2	6	4	5	8	25	5.4
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	1	1	3	7	2	1	15	4.7
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	10	5.6
Student Engagement (UE only)	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	10	6.8

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([4 \times 2] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 13]) \div 25 \text{ observations} = 6.2$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 23]) \div 25 \text{ observations} = 6.9$. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	1	5	9	16	14	9	54	5.2
Positive Climate	0	0	1	4	5	7	1	18	5.2
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	1	2	5	5	5	18	5.6
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	1	3	3	6	2	3	18	4.8
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	2	2	6	11	33	54	6.3
Behavior Management	0	0	1	2	3	3	9	18	5.9
Productivity	0	0	1	0	3	7	7	18	6.1
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	18	6.9
Instructional Support Domain	7	14	14	19	16	12	8	90	4.0
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	1	3	7	5	2	18	5.2
Content Understanding	0	3	3	4	2	3	3	18	4.4
Analysis and Inquiry	3	4	2	3	4	1	1	18	3.4
Quality of Feedback	1	4	2	6	2	3	0	18	3.7
Instructional Dialogue	3	3	6	3	1	0	2	18	3.2
Student Engagement	0	0	0	4	5	6	3	18	5.4

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 1]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 17]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	4	2	11	11	19	16	63	5.4
Positive Climate	0	1	0	3	5	7	5	21	5.5
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	21	6.1
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	3	2	7	3	3	3	21	4.5
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	0	0	6	24	33	63	6.4
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	2	9	10	21	6.4
Productivity	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	21	6.2
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	21	6.7
Instructional Support Domain	0	3	20	29	33	14	6	105	4.5
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	1	3	12	4	1	21	5.0
Content Understanding	0	0	1	9	7	1	3	21	4.8
Analysis and Inquiry	0	0	5	8	7	0	1	21	4.2
Quality of Feedback	0	0	7	4	3	7	0	21	4.5
Instructional Dialogue	0	3	6	5	4	2	1	21	4.0
Student Engagement	0	0	1	1	9	7	3	21	5.5

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 5]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 5.5$

**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: $([6 \times 7] + [7 \times 14]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 6.7$

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

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

Table D1. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

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

Table D2. Resources to Support Assessment

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

Table D3. Resources to Support Student Support

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

Appendix E. Student Performance Tables

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

Table E1. Westwood 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	1,316	514.2	516.0	514.6	0.4	496.5	18.1
African American/ Black	20	502.6	504.9	495.5	-7.1	486.4	9.1
Asian	159	525.3	523.7	521.2	-4.1	508.5	12.7
Hispanic/Latino	70	507.4	508.1	506.2	-1.2	484.3	21.9
Multirace	72	512.1	517.3	519.8	7.7	499.7	20.1
White	993	513.4	515.6	514.2	0.8	501.3	12.9
High need	388	498.7	501.0	498.5	-0.2	485.9	12.6
Economically disadvantaged	98	505.1	506.0	497.7	-7.4	485.2	12.5
ELs and former ELs	51	508.1	509.2	501.6	-6.5	482.8	18.8
Students with disabilities	310	493.8	497.0	495.4	1.6	478.1	17.3

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. Westwood 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	1,314	510.8	513.5	505.6	-5.2	489.7	15.9
African American/ Black	20	496.9	496.6	486.0	-10.9	477.3	8.7
Asian	159	524.4	528.3	520.6	-3.8	508.6	12.0
Hispanic/Latino	69	504.3	503.5	494.4	-9.9	476.5	17.9
Multirace	72	514.5	517.5	515.2	0.7	492.1	23.1
White	992	509.4	512.2	503.7	-5.7	494.3	9.4
High need	386	496.8	498.9	490.2	-6.6	479.0	11.2
Economically disadvantaged	98	499.1	502.5	487.4	-11.7	477.4	10.0
ELs and former ELs	50	509.5	510.6	494.6	-14.9	477.8	16.8
Students with disabilities	309	492.0	494.2	487.4	-4.6	472.5	14.9

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. Westwood 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	1,316	75%	77%	75%	0	46%	29
African American/ Black	20	51%	59%	35%	-16	28%	7
Asian	159	88%	87%	85%	-3	66%	19
Hispanic/Latino	70	61%	60%	57%	-4	26%	31
Multirace	72	77%	82%	83%	6	51%	32
White	993	74%	77%	75%	1	54%	21
High need	388	44%	48%	47%	3	28%	19
Economically disadvantaged	98	61%	59%	46%	-15	27%	19
ELs and former ELs	51	65%	69%	53%	-12	24%	29
Students with disabilities	310	31%	38%	41%	10	16%	25

Table E4. Westwood 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	1,314	71%	76%	62%	-9	33%	29
African American/ Black	20	49%	41%	30%	-19	14%	16
Asian	159	89%	92%	81%	-8	64%	17
Hispanic/Latino	69	62%	51%	45%	-17	14%	31
Multirace	72	79%	82%	71%	-8	37%	34
White	992	69%	75%	60%	-9	40%	20
High need	386	42%	46%	33%	-9	16%	17
Economically disadvantaged	98	49%	51%	32%	-17	14%	18
ELs and former ELs	50	62%	73%	42%	-20	17%	25
Students with disabilities	309	31%	36%	28%	-3	10%	18

Table E5. Westwood 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	237	517.9	507.3	10.6	239	515.5	500.6	14.9
African American/ Black	9	—	494.6	—	9	—	486.7	—
Asian	19	522.5	518.2	4.3	20	532.5	520.9	11.6
Hispanic/Latino	9	—	491.9	—	9	—	485.3	—
Multirace	9	—	510.6	—	9	—	503.9	—
White	191	517.9	512.5	5.4	192	514.5	504.9	9.6
High need	48	504.3	493.3	11.0	50	503.1	486.5	16.6
Economically disadvantaged	17	513.5	493.7	19.8	18	510.5	486.6	23.9
ELs and former ELs	0	—	477.9	—	1	—	477.6	—
Students with disabilities	32	498.3	487.2	11.1	33	498.7	479.6	19.1

Table E6. Westwood 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	237	84%	64%	20	239	80%	52%	28
African American/ Black	9	—	41%	—	9	—	27%	—
Asian	19	89%	80%	9	20	95%	80%	15
Hispanic/Latino	9	—	39%	—	9	—	26%	—
Multirace	9	—	67%	—	9	—	55%	—
White	191	83%	73%	10	192	80%	60%	20
High need	48	58%	39%	19	50	56%	26%	30
Economically disadvantaged	17	82%	41%	41	18	72%	27%	45
ELs and former ELs	0	—	19%	—	1	—	15%	—
Students with disabilities	32	44%	25%	19	33	48%	14%	34

Table E7. Westwood 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	423	76%	70%	42%	28
African American/Black	10	25%	40%	19%	21
Asian	46	98%	80%	62%	18
Hispanic/Latino	19	54%	58%	20%	38
Multirace	18	86%	78%	47%	31
White	330	76%	69%	50%	19
High need	123	50%	36%	23%	13
Economically disadvantaged	36	48%	28%	21%	7
ELs and former ELs	8	50%	25%	18%	7
Students with disabilities	105	45%	34%	15%	19

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. Westwood 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	217	76%	86%	81%	5	51%	30
4	205	82%	81%	81%	-1	49%	32
5	222	87%	86%	82%	-5	47%	35
6	241	77%	83%	74%	-3	47%	27
7	211	65%	61%	71%	6	43%	28
8	220	65%	65%	63%	-2	41%	22
3-8	1,316	75%	77%	75%	0	46%	29
10	237	—	84%	84%	—	64%	20

Table E9. Westwood 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	217	70%	79%	68%	-2	33%	35
4	205	78%	83%	69%	-9	33%	36
5	221	76%	77%	67%	-9	33%	34
6	240	69%	73%	50%	-19	33%	17
7	211	64%	75%	65%	1	35%	30
8	220	71%	67%	52%	-19	32%	20
3-8	1,314	71%	76%	62%	-9	33%	29
10	239	—	89%	80%	—	52%	28

Table E10. Westwood 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	221	84%	—	76%	-8	42%
8	202	69%	—	62%	-7	41%
5 and 8	423	76%	—	70%	-6	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

Table E11. Westwood 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	—	62.8	—	—	—	62.1	—	—
5	208	68.1	56.4	34.9	207	58.2	43.1	31.9
6	232	55.7	51.2	37.3	231	46.3	19.9	26.3
7	202	30.9	35.0	36.1	202	59.1	40.4	35.8
8	210	43.3	31.0	34.8	210	49.8	22.9	27.4
3-8	852	51.4	43.7	35.8	850	55.1	31.2	30.4
10	226	53.8	52.6	52.5	230	64.5	47.8	36.5

Table E12. Westwood 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
Deerfield	74%	74%	71%	—	—	—	73%	—
Downey	82%	86%	80%	—	—	—	82%	—
Hanlon	91%	83%	88%	—	—	—	88%	—
Jones	83%	83%	90%	—	—	—	85%	—
Sheehan	74%	81%	87%	—	—	—	81%	—
Westwood Integrated Preschool	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thurston Middle	—	—	—	74%	70%	64%	70%	—
Westwood High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	84%
District	81%	81%	82%	74%	71%	63%	75%	84%
State	51%	49%	47%	47%	43%	41%	46%	64%

Table E13. Westwood 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
Deerfield	81%	84%	61%	—	—	—	74%	—
Downey	55%	66%	70%	—	—	—	64%	—
Hanlon	67%	57%	66%	—	—	—	64%	—
Jones	62%	77%	67%	—	—	—	68%	—
Sheehan	79%	67%	68%	—	—	—	71%	—
Westwood Integrated Preschool	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thurston Middle	—	—	—	51%	66%	53%	56%	—
Westwood High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	80%
District	68%	69%	67%	50%	65%	52%	62%	80%
State	33%	33%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%	52%

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

School	5	8	5 and 8	10
Deerfield	71%	—	71%	—
Downey	74%	—	74%	—
Hanlon	78%	—	78%	—
Jones	79%	—	79%	—
Sheehan	81%	—	81%	—
Westwood Integrated Preschool	—	—	—	—
Thurston Middle	—	63%	63%	—
Westwood High	—	—	—	—
District	76%	62%	70%	—
State	42%	41%	42%	—

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

Table E15. Westwood 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
Deerfield	73%	38%	—	31%	—	—	—	—	—	72%
Downey	82%	65%	—	57%	—	—	89%	—	—	81%
Hanlon	88%	70%	—	63%	—	—	100%	—	—	87%
Jones	85%	55%	—	54%	—	—	92%	—	92%	84%
Sheehan	81%	61%	—	59%	—	—	73%	—	100%	79%
Westwood Integrated Preschool	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thurston Middle	70%	38%	39%	32%	39%	17%	81%	53%	64%	71%
Westwood High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	75%	47%	46%	41%	53%	35%	85%	57%	83%	75%
State	46%	28%	27%	16%	24%	28%	66%	26%	51%	54%

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

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

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs and former ELs	African American	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Deerfield	74%	56%	—	54%	—	—	—	—	—	73%
Downey	64%	44%	—	32%	—	—	74%	—	—	59%
Hanlon	64%	47%	—	38%	—	—	83%	—	—	58%
Jones	68%	34%	—	36%	—	—	92%	—	69%	67%
Sheehan	71%	43%	—	42%	—	—	60%	—	92%	69%
Westwood Integrated Preschool	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thurston Middle	56%	23%	27%	16%	36%	8%	85%	31%	60%	54%
Westwood High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	62%	33%	32%	28%	42%	30%	81%	45%	71%	60%
State	33%	16%	14%	10%	17%	14%	64%	14%	37%	40%

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

Table E17. Westwood 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
Westwood High	84%	58%	82%	44%	—	—	89%	—	—	83%
District	84%	58%	82%	44%	—	—	89%	—	—	83%
State	64%	39%	41%	25%	19%	41%	80%	39%	67%	73%

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

Table E18. Westwood 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
Westwood High	80%	56%	72%	48%	—	—	95%	—	—	80%
District	80%	56%	72%	48%	—	—	95%	—	—	80%
State	52%	26%	27%	14%	15%	27%	80%	26%	55%	60%

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

Table E19. Westwood 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
Deerfield	71%	33%	—	31%	—	—	—	—	—	69%
Downey	74%	47%	—	42%	—	—	—	—	—	73%
Hanlon	78%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	75%
Jones	79%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	78%
Sheehan	81%	56%	—	62%	—	—	—	—	—	80%
Westwood Integrated Preschool	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thurston Middle	63%	24%	16%	25%	—	—	85%	—	—	64%
Westwood High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	70%	36%	28%	34%	—	40%	80%	58%	78%	69%
State	42%	23%	21%	15%	18%	19%	62%	20%	47%	50%

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

Table E20. Westwood 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	246	98.8	98.1	97.1	98.0	-0.8	89.8
African American/Black	7	100	100	100	100	0	84.4
Asian	20	100	100	100	100	0	96.1
Hispanic/Latino	10	—	83.3	—	100	—	80.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	1	100	—	—	—	—	88.8
White	208	98.6	98.3	97.0	98.1	-0.5	93.2
High need	49	97.1	93.6	89.7	89.8	-7.3	82.4
Economically disadvantaged	25	100	94.7	92.0	84.0	-16.0	81.7
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	—	71.8
Students with disabilities	33	96.7	92.2	87.0	84.8	-11.9	76.6

Table E21. Westwood 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	240	97.3	99.2	98.5	97.5	0.2	91.0
African American/Black	10	100	100	100	100	0.0	87.2
Asian	22	100	100	100	100	0.0	95.8
Hispanic/ Latino	3	—	—	83.3	—	—	81.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	5	—	100	—	—	—	90.8
White	200	96.9	99.1	98.7	97.5	0.6	94.4
High need	58	91.8	97.1	94.9	89.7	-2.1	84.5
Economically disadvantaged	25	95.0	100	94.7	92.0	-3.0	84.1
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	—	74.7
Students with disabilities	46	90.4	96.7	93.8	87.0	-3.4	79.3

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	-0.2	0.3
African American/Black	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.4
White	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	-0.1	0.3
High need	0.9	1.0	1.1	—	—	0.4
Economically disadvantaged	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Students with disabilities	—	1.0	1.2	—	—	0.6

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

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.1	-0.1	0.5
African American/Black	—	—	—	—	—	0.6
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.5
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.7
White	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.5
High need	0.4	0.9	0.3	—	—	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	—	—	—	—	—	0.7
ELs and former ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Students with disabilities	—	1.0	0.3	—	—	1.1

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

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	990	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
African American/Black	33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Asian	109	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
White	782	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
High need	203	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7
Economically disadvantaged	57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
ELs and former ELs	2	—	—	—	—	—	5.8
Students with disabilities	154	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4

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

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	3-year change	State (2021)
All	499	77.1	76.3	74.1	-3.0	65.3
African American/Black	17	57.9	70.6	41.2	-16.7	54.9
Asian	55	89.2	90.5	96.4	7.2	84.3
Hispanic/Latino	20	62.5	64.3	60.0	-2.5	50.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	6	42.9	66.7	50.0	7.1	65.5
White	401	77.7	75.6	73.6	-4.1	69.6
High need	90	56.4	40.5	32.2	-24.2	47.7
Economically disadvantaged	35	55.2	44.0	42.9	-12.3	49.0
ELs and former ELs	1	—	—	—	—	28.1
Students with disabilities	66	50.0	35.5	22.7	-27.3	33.1