

Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District

Comprehensive District Review Report

February 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
Waltham, MA 02451-1600
781-373-7000
www.air.org

Contents

- Executive Summary 1
- Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: District Review Overview..... 4
- Leadership and Governance 9
- Curriculum and Instruction.....14
- Assessment.....20
- Human Resources and Professional Development.....24
- Student Support.....28
- Financial and Asset Management.....34
- Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities..... A-1
- Appendix B. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures B-1
- Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report C-1
- Appendix D. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators.... D-1
- Appendix E. Student Performance Tables E-1



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

Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner

Published September 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 comprehensive review of Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District (hereafter, BRRSD) in February 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.

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.

At the time of the onsite review, BRRSD's superintendent, Derek Swenson, was in his seventh year in the role. Superintendent Swenson leads the district with a central office staff that includes an assistant superintendent of schools; directors/managers of business services and student services, facilities, human resources, databases, and IT; and coordinators of teaching and learning in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics); humanities; and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). The district is governed by a school committee composed of eight members who are elected for staggered three-year terms.

Leadership and Governance

In recent years, BRRSD has improved communication and community building between the two towns that make up the district, Bridgewater and Raynham, as well as within the district community. The district leadership team and school committee members are dedicated to collaborative relationships. In 2021-2022, the district introduced two new coordinator positions: a mathematics and science curriculum director and a DEI director, with the goals of creating consistency in quality of education and curriculum and diversifying curricular content across the district. Multiple interviewees described the working relationship among key district leaders, including the superintendent, school committee, and teachers' association representatives, as positive. The district's strategic vision is articulated in the Student Success Plan, which outlines four strategic objectives: safe and supportive schools, curriculum and instruction, technology, and facilities. Interviews and a document review indicated action plans and activities that various staff in the district planned to take to support the development of these strategic objectives.

Curriculum and Instruction

Interviews with district leaders and a review of BRRSD's Student Success Plan indicated that the district was making concerted efforts to make its curriculum more diverse and vertically aligned. BRRSD has hired two curriculum coordinators, for the humanities and STEM, as well as a DEI coordinator, all of whom are involved in developing stronger curricula throughout the district. Teachers reported some involvement in the curriculum decision process but said that the district could better implement teacher feedback. The district also has hired interventionists as it has transitioned back to in-person learning to help close any gaps caused by remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. These specialists work with both teachers and students to ensure that instruction is modified appropriately to meet all students' needs. Most members of the school community said that instruction was a strength for BRRSD. At the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement (grades 4-5) and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. At the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization and mixed evidence of consistent emotional support, rigorous instructional support, and student engagement.

Assessment

BRRSD's assessment system is an area of improvement for the district. Various stakeholders reported that the assessment systems were inconsistent and decentralized. Leaders have implemented learning management systems that assess students' learning needs at all levels to improve the system. Multiple systems, such as individual evaluations, surveys, screeners, and public forums, are in place to review students' learning outcomes. However, the team found limited evidence of district leaders using the data gathered to inform student supports. Teachers and school leaders often assume responsibility in this area and use the data at their own discretion, without applying a standardized system. School-level stakeholders also strive to communicate with students and families about the performance data and provide them with the online resources needed to better understand this information. The team found little evidence that district and school leaders facilitated data discussions with students.

Human Resources and Professional Development

BRRSD is pursuing short- and long-term strategies to strengthen and diversify its workforce. In addition, its professional development since 2019 has focused on DEI. At the time of this review, BRRSD was identifying additional opportunities for observations and feedback for educators. BRRSD is actively working to diversify its workforce by participating in DESE's teacher diversification professional learning community (PLC) and conversing with Bridgewater State University (BSU). BRRSD has mentor programs in place to support new teachers. However, limited opportunities exist for teacher leaders and recognition of excellence in teaching.

A review of the educator evaluation system indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice. The sample of the summative teacher evaluations reviewed were all marked as complete, but a small percentage of evaluations did not include required components such as ratings or feedback. In addition, a review

of educator evaluation documents indicated that some but not all educators were developing student learning and professional practice SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goals. A review of all summative evaluations for 2020-2021 for administrative staff showed only four administrative staff (assistant principals) had summative evaluations available for review. Of those evaluations, two were missing performance ratings or assessments of progress toward goals, and all administrators were not developing student learning, professional practice, or school improvement SMART goals.

Student Support

BRRSD prioritizes a school climate that ensures the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging of its students. Stakeholders said and a document review confirmed BRRSD's commitment to developing staff capacity to examine and dismantle implicit biases and systemic inequalities and identify, understand, and respond to underlying causes of student behavior. BRRSD prioritizes the physical, intellectual, and emotional safety of all students and adults. The district does not provide a well-defined, horizontally and vertically aligned tiered system of support across the district. Processes for identifying students in need of support and interventions vary across schools and grade levels. District staff recognize the importance of and are working toward building relationships with students' families and the community, ensuring that partnerships are culturally responsive and strengths based, and providing leadership opportunities for students and families.

Financial and Asset Management

BRRSD leaders use the Student Success Plan as the basis for the budget. The superintendent's budget presentation connects budget requests to the Student Success Plan. As part of the budget process, school leaders make budget requests, which must be connected to their ability to provide a high-quality education for students. The business office provides regular reports on all funding sources to the superintendent and the school committee for review, and they adjust their plans, as needed. The district uses DESE's template to report its end-of-year finances, which include historical data for comparisons. This form includes information about the district's revenues and expenditures and other financial information. The district's capital plan is a spreadsheet that clearly articulates the timeline for capital spending priorities.

Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.¹ Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. In addition, the design of the 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 reviews and then sends the report to the district for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website.

Site Visit

The site visit to BRRSD was conducted from January 31 to February 2, 2022. The site visit included approximately 25 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 100 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school principals, school staff, middle- and high-school students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted interviews with the superintendent; assistant superintendent; director of business services; director of student services; coordinators of teaching and learning; coordinator of diversity, equity, and inclusion; human resources manager; district treasurer; members of the school

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/>.

committee; and leadership of the local teachers' association. In addition, the review team conducted eight teacher focus groups, with 20 elementary-school teachers, as well as focus groups at the high school (10 high-school teachers) and at the two middle schools with five teachers each. Additional focus groups were held with five high-school specialists (e.g., special education and English learner [EL] specialists and school counselors) and one focus group of specialists at the elementary-school level, with eight specialists. The two school administrator focus groups included the high-school principal, the two middle-school principals, and the four elementary-school principals. Three members of the school committee also were interviewed, including the chair. Middle and high school students participated in three focus groups and family members of students also participated in a separate focus group.

The site team conducted 60 observations of classroom instruction across 7 BRRSD schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

Additional information is in the appendices. Information about review activities and the site visit schedule is in Appendix A. Appendix B provides information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures. The districtwide instructional observation report is in Appendix C. Appendix D contains resources to support implementation of DESE's District Standards and Indicators. Lastly, Appendix E contains student performance data.

District Profile

BRRSD is led by a superintendent who was in his seventh year in the role at the time of the onsite review, as well as a central office staff, including an assistant superintendent of schools; directors/managers of business services and student services, facilities, human resources, databases, and IT; and coordinators of teaching and learning in STEM, and humanities, and DEI. The district is governed by a school committee composed of eight members who are elected for staggered three-year terms.

In the 2021-2022 school year, there were 337 teachers in the district, with 5,392 students enrolled in the district's 8 schools; this includes the Therapeutic Day School which was not included in the district review. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

Table 1. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2021-2022

School	Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Bridgewater Middle School	Middle	7-8	511
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High School	High	9-12	1,368
LaLiberte Elementary School	Elementary	2-4	517
Merrill Elementary School	Elementary	K-1	326
Mitchell Elementary School	Elementary	Pre-K-3	1,204
Raynham Middle School	Middle	5-8	714
Therapeutic Day School	Middle/High	7-12	13
Williams Intermediate School	Intermediate	4-6	739
Totals			5,392

Note. [Enrollment Data \(2021-22\)—Bridgewater-Raynham \(06250505\)](#) as of October 1, 2021.

In recent years, BRRSD’s student enrollment increased 1.9 percent, from 5,289 in 2018 to 5,392 in 2022. In 2022, students from low-income households³ made up 28.2 percent of the district (state average is 43.8 percent). The district served a similar percentage of students with disabilities as the state (17.3 percent versus 18.9 percent), a smaller percentage of ELs (2.5 percent versus 11 percent), and a smaller percentage of students whose first language is not English (6.0 percent versus 23.9 percent).⁴ Additional enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high-need populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged, and ELs and former ELs) compared with the state are provided in Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was less than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for 31 K-12 districts of similar size (5,000-7,999 students) in fiscal year 2020: \$13,221 versus \$14,895. Actual net school spending was equal to what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B4 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Gen MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) is greater than the state average for all tested grades and subject areas, except for grade 8 ELA. Tables 2-4 provide an overview of student performance in ELA, mathematics, and science by grade level between 2018 and 2021.

³ DESE has changed its terminology to low income.

⁴ Source: [Selected Populations \(2021-22\)—Bridgewater-Raynham \(06250505\)](#).

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	432	63%	66%	53%	-10	51%	2
4	421	60%	65%	55%	-5	49%	6
5	395	57%	55%	49%	-8	47%	2
6	390	55%	50%	54%	-1	47%	7
7	433	53%	63%	45%	-8	43%	2
8	457	57%	53%	37%	-20	41%	-4
3-8	2,528	57%	58%	49%	-8	46%	3
10	294	—	71%	69%	—	64%	5

Note. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=06250000&orgtypecode=5&fycode=2021&subject=ELA (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	432	57%	56%	34%	-23	33%	1
4	420	62%	66%	43%	-19	33%	10
5	396	50%	54%	40%	-10	33%	7
6	388	57%	59%	45%	-12	33%	12
7	435	54%	56%	37%	-17	35%	2
8	454	71%	60%	41%	-30	32%	9
3-8	2,525	58%	58%	40%	-18	33%	7
10	291	—	71%	59%	—	52%	7

Note. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=06250000&orgtypecode=5&fycode=2021&subject=ELA (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	395	57%	—	46%	-11	42
8	401	49%	—	45%	-4	41
5 and 8	796	53%	—	45%	-8	42
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. Grade 10 results for the spring 2021 Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) tests are not provided because students in the class of 2023 were not required to take the STE test. Information about Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test. Data sourced from https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_level.aspx?linkid=32&orgcode=06250000&orgtypecode=5&fycode=2021&subject=ELA (2021).

In addition, the district's four- and five-year graduation rates, 92.7 percent in 2020 and 97.1 percent in 2019, respectively, are both greater than the state averages of 89 percent and 90.1 percent, respectively.

Leadership and Governance

In recent years, BRRSD has improved communication and community building between the two towns that make up the district, as well as within the district community. The district leadership team and school committee members are dedicated to collaborative relationships. In 2021-2022, BRRSD introduced two new director positions: a mathematics and science curriculum director, and a DEI director, with the goals of creating consistency in quality of education and curriculum and diversifying curricular content across the district. Multiple interviewees described the working relationship among key district leaders, including the superintendent, the school committee, and teachers’ association representatives, as positive. A review of district documents and interviews and focus groups with stakeholders showed the following:

- **Superintendent tenure and leadership.** At the time of the onsite review, the superintendent was in his seventh year in the role, having formerly served as the assistant superintendent. He oversees the district’s policies and procedures and collaborates with central office staff, including the assistant superintendent, directors/managers, and coordinators, to promote initiatives that support the broader BRRSD community.
- **School committee structure.** The district is governed by an eight-member school committee, which is elected for staggered three-year terms.
- **District improvement plan.** The district has a strategic vision articulated in the Student Success Plan. Presented to the school committee in 2019, the Student Success Plan outlines four strategic objectives: safe and supportive schools, curriculum and instruction, technology, and facilities. Interviews and a document review indicated action plans and activities that various staff in the district planned to take to support the development of these strategic objectives.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in leadership and governance.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
School committee governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Members use the Student Success Plan to guide efforts to improve student outcomes, with a particular focus on the district’s equity goals. ■ Members have a collaborative working relationship with each other, the superintendent, other district leaders, and municipal leaders. ■ The committee ensures prudent financial management and spending in accordance with the approved budget. ■ Members use four measurable goals to evaluate the superintendent’s performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Continue to investigate ways to increase the student advisory council’s participation in the school committee’s executive sessions.

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
District and school leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ School committee members and other district leaders work diligently to ensure that all stakeholders have a voice about district issues. ■ School leaders feel supported by district leaders and have a sense of autonomy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Increase leadership opportunities for teachers.
District and school improvement planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ District leaders, including school committee members and school leaders, developed the Student Success Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Involve students and families in the development of improvement plans. ■ Base improvement plans on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and disaggregated student data.
Budget development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ District and school leaders work together to develop a budget through a participatory and transparent process, with a focus on equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Carefully consider how current resource allocation directly supports strategic improvement and what reallocations may be needed.

School Committee Governance

Interviews, focus groups, and a document review indicated that the BRRSD school committee fulfilled its responsibilities under Massachusetts laws and regulations. School committee members and other district leaders make decisions with student outcomes in mind. Thus, BRRSD serves as an advocate for meeting students’ needs. The school committee uses the Student Success Plan to guide these efforts, with a particular focus on the district’s equity goals. Systems are in place to facilitate feedback and communication between the superintendent, the teachers’ association, and the community.

Interviews with school committee members and district leaders and a review of recent administrative council meeting agendas indicated that the committee has been involved in the development of the Student Success Plan. The committee also regularly updates the community about progress and alignment toward the goals outlined in the Student Success Plan. School committee members involve community members by allowing them to virtually attend meetings and gathering feedback from the community. School committee members and other district leaders focus on equity in the district by requiring new curriculum coordinators to review the curriculum and curricular resources to ensure that they are inclusive of all students. Interviews and a review of the district’s 2021-2022 approved budget indicated that district leaders also hired a new district DEI coordinator to aid their efforts in fostering a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive culture. A review of 2021 school committee meeting minutes indicated that committee members also have been working to make their policies and procedures equitable and inclusive, including Policy BEDH, “Public Participation at School Committee Meetings.” These efforts at creating a sustainable foundation for equity and inclusion are an area of strength.

School committee members and other district leaders have established multiple systems of communication and collaboration. School committee members told the review team that they maintained open communication with the superintendent and provided feedback during meetings

and through email and discussed urgent matters by telephone. Members also maintain constant communication with municipal leaders, such as the town administrators. A review of school committee meeting minutes indicated that the committee has provided opportunities for students to share meaningful input into decision making through the student advisory council. School committee members also are investigating ways in which they can increase the student advisory council's participation in these executive sessions. These examples of promoting positive working relationships among stakeholders are an area of strength in the district.

Focus groups and a document review indicated that the school committee worked with district leaders to develop budgets and policies, using a process that ensured they remained fiscally responsible in a way that aligned with community expectations as well as in accordance with the approved budget. A review of school committee meeting minutes indicated that members used four measurable goals that tie into the Student Success Plan to evaluate the superintendent's performance at the middle and end of the school year.

District and School Leadership

District and school leaders strive to foster a culture of collaboration by working with a districtwide management team composed of central office leaders and administrators as well as newly appointed district leaders on key initiatives. They engage stakeholders in various ways, including individual meetings between the superintendent and assistant superintendent with principals, district coordinators, and the school committee. However, school-level stakeholders said that there were few teacher leadership opportunities, indicating an area for growth.

Teachers' association representatives said that the superintendent has been an extremely strong leader and was actively involved in frequent meetings during collective bargaining agreement negotiations about changes in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. School committee members and other district leaders work diligently to ensure that all stakeholders have a voice about district issues. A review of administrator meeting minutes indicated that the superintendent and assistant superintendent, as well as other district leaders, came together as one central management team to collaborate across all departments on key initiatives. The district's curriculum and DEI coordinators said that they felt supported and could maintain good communication with the superintendent and assistant superintendent about important issues. The school committee members noted that they also foster "really open communication with the superintendent, giving him feedback, and having meetings with him," which is the direction that they intended to continue moving toward.

To continue building on their efforts at promoting a more equitable and inclusive climate, district leaders allow school leaders some autonomy in developing schedules and budgets, as well as contributing ideas that foster equity across the district. District leaders meet directly with the DEI and curriculum coordinators to assess and revise teaching and learning programs, including anything pertaining to curriculum instruction assessment, and to discuss how the role of the DEI coordinator would tie into these reviews. The 2021-2022 student handbook states that the district received its New England Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation for exceeding the criteria for the assessment of institutional quality.

School leaders said that they felt supported by district leaders and had a sense of autonomy. Teachers have opportunities to collaborate on initiatives such as the development of the Student Success Plan. However, school-level stakeholders spoke about an absence of additional leadership opportunities for teachers, indicating an area for growth.

District and School Improvement Planning

District leaders, in collaboration with school administrators, the school committee, and teachers, created and supported the ongoing refinement of the Student Success Plan to improve student outcomes. The plan has four “pillars of success” with specific points and goals tied to it. Each school’s improvement plan has the same four pillars: safe and supportive schools, curriculum and instruction, technology, and facilities. The management team, comprising central office staff, regularly meets to review and analyze the data collected from the previous year to determine progress and any needed revisions to the plan and associated action items.

Interviews and a document review indicated that school and district leaders, along with school committee members, worked together to develop the district’s Student Success Plan during administrative meetings and retreats. The acknowledgments in the middle-school and high-school improvement plans state that the strategies in the plan were developed in collaboration with administrators, staff, students, and families. However, district leaders said that students were not involved in the development of the Student Success Plan, and the review team did not find evidence that families were involved. Throughout the development phase, administrators implemented action items in the plan, named the people responsible for each action item, developed the timeline, and reported progress to district leaders and the community. School-level leaders also ensure an ongoing, participatory process for reflection on progress toward plan goals. District leaders noted that student and school-level leaders implemented a new recycling program as part of the facilities action plan in the middle-school improvement plan and analyzed the data from this effort, hoping to refine the program across time.

Interviews with school and district leaders indicated that these staff have set clear goals for improving learning outcomes and opportunities for all students. The middle-school curriculum and instruction improvement plan was developed using i-Ready diagnostic data and baseline data from the 2021 Spring MCAS in mathematics, ELA, and science and demographic and enrollment data to close achievement, access, and opportunity gaps for students who are economically disadvantaged, ELs, and students with disabilities. The high-school improvement plan also outlines the achievement, demographic, program, and perception data (surveys to gauge staff and students’ attitudes and beliefs about various aspects of the school) used to develop the guide. The Student Success Plan is not based on analysis of historical, longitudinal, and disaggregated student data. Leaders and staff regularly monitor the progress of their goals as outlined in the Student Success Plan during administration meetings and determine any necessary revisions. Improvements have been made in BRRSD’s improvement strategies, such as ensuring equal access to technology as mentioned in the technology pillar of the Student Success Plan and offering additional programs to students and families, such as supporting their social, emotional, and physical well-being as detailed in the safe and supportive schools pillar of the Student Success Plan.

Budget Development

Sufficient evidence exists that BRRSD strategically aligns its budget to the goals of its improvement plans, with a strong focus on equity. The school committee and other district leaders meet regularly to address components of the budget and monitor progress. The district abides by local and state guidelines for budget development and review. Leaders purposefully create a transparent and collaborative budget-building process. Still, district and school-level stakeholders said that the limited collaboration on defining the role of new positions that provide direct services to students was challenging.

District leaders strive to create a transparent and participatory budget-building process by facilitating joint meetings and working with each town's finance committee to receive feedback on decisions they want to implement. Interviews indicated that the budget development team included principals, directors, supervisors, and coordinators. This team develops a needs-based template that is later cross-referenced across the district to ensure that resources are distributed equally. The superintendent and the school committee's budget subcommittee work with the town to refine the budget as appropriate. The superintendent regularly meets with the school committee about initiatives that may have budgetary implications, to serve as a "voice of advocacy for the students, staff, and district as a whole."

Multiple school and district leaders reported an effort to allocate resources equitably across BRRSD's schools and in a way that supported more equitable student outcomes. However, elementary-school specialists raised concerns about the limited number of students they may work with. Additional interventionists were recruited in 2021-2022. They are staffed at each school, working at certain grade levels with a cap on the number of students whom they may work with, so not all students who need additional support receive support from the interventionists. The superintendent and school committee proposed during the 2021-2022 budget hearing and confirmed for the approved 2021-2022 budget that funding should be allocated toward hiring a new district DEI coordinator and curriculum coordinators to review policies and practices. They also raised the need to allocate funds toward student supports, such as a new speech and language pathologist and a school adjustment counselor. A review of budget reports indicated that the district's finance representative, the director of business services, oversaw the funding for utilities such as electricity and oil, as well as health insurance and property insurance. At the time of this review, several interventionists at district schools had been recruited to serve students with certain social-emotional and academic needs.

Recommendations

- The school committee should continue to investigate ways to increase the student advisory council's participation in the school committee's executive sessions.
- The district should consider ways to increase leadership opportunities for teachers.
- The district should involve students and families in the development of improvement plans.
- The district should base improvement plans on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and disaggregated student data.
- The budget development process should carefully consider whether current resource allocation directly supports strategic improvement, including what reallocations may be needed to fully implement the strategic plan and supporting plans.

Curriculum and Instruction

Interviews with district leaders and a review of the Student Success Plan indicated that BRRSD was making concerted efforts to make its curriculum more diverse and vertically aligned. BRRSD has hired two curriculum coordinators, for the humanities and STEM, as well as a DEI coordinator. All these coordinators are involved in developing stronger curricula throughout the district. Teachers reported some involvement in the curriculum decision process, but said that the district could better implement teacher feedback. BRRSD also hired interventionists as it transitioned back to in-person learning to help close any gaps caused by remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. These specialists work with both teachers and students to ensure that instruction is modified appropriately to meet all students' needs. Most interviewees said that instruction was a strength for the district.

- **Curriculum Selection and Use.** A review of 2021-2022 Student Success Plan indicated that BRRSD's focus for curriculum and instruction was to "establish a cohesive, rigorous district wide system of teaching and learning," BRRSD plans to do this by developing a multitiered system of support (MTSS) and developing curriculum maps and assessments that "ensure vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum."
- **Classroom Instruction.** Teachers in BRRSD schools are invested in students' learning and modify instruction to meet their needs while also attempting to develop lessons that are engaging and effective. Instructional observation data show that teachers create welcoming environments for students, but classroom experiences are not always academically rigorous.
- **Access to Coursework.** The district provides a wide range of academic offerings, especially at the higher grade levels. Students said that they felt well prepared for life after high school while also noting a desire for more opportunities to learn life skills. District leaders are working to make course access more equitable, especially for BRRSD's increasingly diverse student body.

Six observers, focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited BRRSD during the week of January 31, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The classroom observations were guided by the CLASS protocol. These observations were guided by three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). Overall, at the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest generally strong emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement (grades 4-5) and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support. At the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide evidence of strong classroom organization and mixed evidence of consistent emotional support, rigorous instructional support, and student engagement. Table 6 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Curriculum selection and use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Two curriculum coordinators for humanities and STEM, as well as a DEI coordinator, are helping school and district leaders develop curricula aligned with state standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Develop a formal, inclusive process for systematically reviewing curricula. ■ Ensure that curricular materials are aligned to the content and rigor of the appropriate Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and to definitions of high-quality instructional materials. ■ Ensure that curricular materials are aligned vertically and readily available and feasible to implement for all teachers. ■ Ensure that the curriculum review process is inclusive.
Classroom instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers adjust instructional practices to meet different learning needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ensure that all teachers provide effective instruction that challenges and supports all students.
Student access to coursework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The district provides a range of courses for students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Continue to improve the district’s student placement system to increase the representation of students from historically marginalized groups in advanced-level classes.

Curriculum Selection and Use

BRRSD is engaged in vertically aligning curricula, including more diversity in the taught curriculum, and making the curricular review process more inclusive of key stakeholders. At the time of the onsite review, the district had recently hired two curriculum coordinators, for humanities and STEM, as well as a DEI coordinator, to help school and district leaders develop curricula aligned with state standards. However, a cohesive process is not fully developed, and teachers are not as involved in this process as they would like. Many teachers said that their subject did not have a documented curriculum. Interviewees said and a document review confirmed that the district knew that it needed to improve its curricular selection and documentation processes and ensure that the curricula were relevant to students and inclusive of diverse student backgrounds.

Teachers and district leaders stated that they wanted the decision-making process to be more cohesive because BRRSD did not have a formalized process or timeline for systemically reviewing curricula. District leaders want to ensure that the curricular review process is more inclusive. Teachers described the decision-making processes as “top-down,” noting that directives about curricular changes came from school and district leaders with little regard for teacher feedback. Although teachers can volunteer to “pilot” new programs, many teachers said that they felt that their feedback often was not used when curricular decisions were made. Curriculum coordinators expressed awareness that the curricula needed to be more diverse, and instructional materials of higher quality.

A document review and interviews indicated that curricula in the district did not consistently meet CURATE expectations.⁵ Almost all curricula are “not rated” by CURATE or are rated as “partially

⁵ CURATE: CUrriculum RATings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate/>.

meeting expectations.” However, the enVisions curriculum being piloted at the elementary level does meet CURATE expectations. In addition, a document review and interviews indicated that curricula in the district were not effectively documented to ensure vertical alignment. Teachers consistently reported that an absence of documented curricula left many curricular decisions up to individual teachers, creating an absence of consistency and cohesion for students. This is a special area of concern in the lower grades, with teachers stating that the curriculum often changed year to year. School leaders and teachers alike noted that science and social studies had the least structured curricula; many teachers stated that the district did not have documented curricula for those subjects. District leaders said that they were aware of the absence of alignment and documentation and were working closely with the curriculum coordinators to remedy this.

Both teachers and students said that the taught curriculum could be more diverse. BRRSD has provided extensive professional development (PD) on culturally responsive teaching to ensure that teaching practices and curricular materials were inclusive of all students. The major concern from school leaders and teachers was an absence of aligned implementation between the two towns—teachers cited differences in class size and school schedules as the main reasons for this. Although teachers said that students in the elementary and middle schools in both towns were learning the same content, how the content was taught and the speed at which it was taught were quite different.

Classroom Instruction

Interviews and observations of instruction indicated areas of strength and challenges within instruction. Students said that teachers were invested in their learning and modified instruction to meet students’ needs. A review of a simple random sample of teachers’ evaluations indicated that most teachers were meeting standards and developing engaging, appropriate, and effective lessons (see the Human Resources and Professional Development section). Instructional observation data showed that teachers created welcoming environments for students, but schools could develop more rigorous classroom experiences that challenged students to take ownership of their learning. In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, BRRSD hired interventionists to ensure that the district was addressing learning gaps, and school leaders were working toward establishing more “best practices” for teachers to make their classrooms more engaging and instruction more active.

Six observers, focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited BRRSD during the week of January 31, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The classroom observations were guided by the CLASS protocol. These observations were guided by three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

- **Emotional Support.** Describes the social-emotional functioning of the classroom, including teacher-student relationships and responsiveness to social-emotional needs.

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

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

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

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

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings fell at the high end of the middle range in the K-5 grade band and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands.
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings fell in the high range for all grade bands.
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings fell in the middle range for all grade bands.
- **Student Engagement.** For grade 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings fell at the high end of the middle range in the 4-5 grade band and in the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands.

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

Interviews and instructional observation data showed that students had a mix of classroom experiences, but most students said that instruction was “book heavy.” These students said that they believed that instruction was mostly rote, aimed more toward filling out worksheets and completing tasks versus more interactive, hands-on, or practical work. Some students noted exceptions to this, such as working on projects or labs or using real restaurant menus to learn about the sales tax. School leaders spoke about the district recently adopting an instructional framework that highlights best practices for teaching. Principals reported that they liked to focus on one or two of the frameworks in monthly meetings to make sure that all teachers were using these districtwide best practices to create more student-centered classrooms.

The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report (see Appendix C) showed that all grade levels in the district scored in the high-middle range in the Classroom Organization domain. K-5 scored in the

high-middle range in the Emotional Support domain, but the Instructional Support domain illustrated an area for growth. At the middle- and high-school levels, scores were in the low-middle range for three dimensions in the Instructional Support domain: analysis and inquiry (3.0 out of 7), instructional dialogue (3.3 out of 7), and quality of feedback (3.0 out of 7). These observation scores indicated that instruction was somewhat engaging for students but did not always require students to use higher-level thinking, and class discussions did not consistently encourage and further student learning. At the elementary level, areas for growth were concept development, language modeling, and analysis and inquiry; these dimensions, which scored in the middle range, indicated that lessons sometimes encouraged deep understanding and language facilitation but often focused more on rote understanding.

Students, teachers, and school leaders stated that teachers were willing to change content and instruction based on students' interest and feedback. Students said that they were comfortable giving their teachers feedback when they were asked, but they noted that not all teachers solicited student feedback and not all teachers used that feedback to make positive changes that would help students' learning. Teachers and school leaders reported that teachers attempted to adjust instructional practices to meet different learning needs. School leaders said that regardless of whether a student had an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or 504 plan or was in an English as a second language program, teachers consciously tried to modify instruction to ensure that all students understood the content. Students, in turn, also reported that their teachers were likely to modify instruction to meet students' needs. However, teachers said that individual teachers decided these modifications, noting that the district did not have a standardized method for instruction that teachers followed. Teachers receive data, but each teacher decides how they interpret those data and use it to adjust their instruction. BRRSD does not have instructional coaches, but it has hired interventionists because of learning gaps caused by the online learning format during the COVID-19 pandemic. These interventionists help identify areas of needs for students and work with teachers to best adjust practices to meet those needs.

Students, teachers, and district leaders described various levels of satisfaction with the learning environments and student learning. Students said that teachers were supportive of and involved in their learning. Districtwide instructional observation data showed scores in general in the medium/high range for positive climate, teacher sensitivity, and instructional learning formats and in the high range for productivity and behavior management. School and district leaders, however, said that teachers could do a better job of encouraging students to take ownership of their learning and providing more opportunities for them to do so. Data from instructional observations showed that the district did not score as high in dimensions such as analysis and inquiry and instructional dialogue (both dimensions were in the low range), both of which were focused on students developing higher-level thinking skills and taking active roles in their learning. However, students in focus groups said that teachers made classes both engaging and challenging. The most common barriers that school staff noted to student ownership of learning were the COVID-19 pandemic, which drastically changed instruction, and class size, which many teachers and school and district leaders noted as a concern. For example, some elementary classes have more than 30 students.

Student Access to Coursework

The district offers a range of courses at the higher grade levels. Although students said they were well prepared for life after high school, they expressed a desire for more core subject classes about applicable life skills. Noting how the student body has become increasingly more diverse, district leaders said that they wanted to ensure equal access to courses for all students. At the time of the on-site visit, district leaders were working to make course access more equitable by developing new assessments for student course placement.

Interviews with students and a review of the high-school's program of studies indicated that the district offered a range of courses, mostly at the middle- and high-school levels. Students identified classes such as computer science, marine biology, and business. Students said that core subjects did not teach them "real life skills," such as doing taxes or budgeting, but elective business or economics classes covered those skills. In addition, students, predominately at the high school, noted that classes and guidance staff prepared them for life after high school, especially related to college and career planning. District leaders and teachers also described the work that the guidance office did to prepare students to meet graduation requirements and discuss options for next steps after high school.

District leaders are aware of equity issues in advanced-level classes. At the time of the on-site visit, the district was piloting a program designed to ensure that students from historically marginalized groups were equally represented in advanced-level classes. District leaders told the team that this program would help these students move from the "academic level" to the "advanced level" in their courses to create equal opportunities for all students. District leaders also have developed a more equitable test for student placement that emphasizes student skills versus only considering grades and behavioral compliance, which interviewees indicated was done in previous placement determinations. In addition, district leaders advocate for students with strong skills who are often overlooked during the placement process so that all students have equitable access to challenging courses. School leaders said that they wanted to improve the inclusion programs for students with disabilities and ELs. There is a pilot program for inclusion mathematics and ELA classes at the middle school and a push to mainstream more students in the social-emotional learning program at the high school.

Recommendations

- The district should develop a formal, inclusive process for systematically reviewing curricula.
- The district should ensure that curricular materials are aligned to the content and rigor of the appropriate Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and the definitions of high-quality instructional materials.
- The district should ensure that curricular materials are aligned vertically and readily available and feasible to implement for all teachers.
- The district should ensure that the curriculum review process is inclusive.
- The district should ensure that all teachers provide effective instruction that challenges and supports all students.

Assessment

Various stakeholders told the review team that the district’s assessment systems were inconsistent and decentralized. Leaders have implemented learning management systems that assess students’ learning needs at all levels to improve the assessment systems in the district. Multiple systems are in place to review students’ learning outcomes, such as individual evaluations, surveys, screeners, and public forums. However, the team found limited evidence that district leaders used the data gathered to inform student supports. Teachers and school leaders often assume responsibility in this area and use the data at their own discretion, without applying a standardized system. School-level stakeholders also strive to communicate with students and families about the performance data and provide them with the online resources needed to better understand this information. The team found little evidence that district and school leaders facilitated data discussions with students.

- **Assessments.** The district uses assessments inconsistently. Teachers determine if and when to use formative assessments, such as unit evaluations and benchmarks, and screeners are used primarily by specialists to assess concerns and determine necessary supports.
- **Data Use.** Data use and data implementation are done inconsistently across schools and grade levels. However, the district uses i-Ready diagnostic assessments at the elementary- and middle-school levels to identify students in need of additional support.
- **Sharing Data.** Teachers discuss progress and areas of concern with students and families and use multiple systems to collect and distribute student data. However, district leaders do not share data in a systemic way.

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Data and assessment systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ i-Ready and ALEKS have been implemented across the district to create a more unified and robust assessment system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Continue to develop a unified and robust system for efficient and purposeful data collection, use, and sharing to guide decision making.
Data use		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish a more systematic process to ensure the effective use of data districtwide. ■ Establish a standard process based on district screening data for determining which students need support.
Sharing results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers regularly communicate with students about their progress and help them improve if they are struggling. ■ Staff provide timely and effective information to families about their children’s progress. 	

Data and Assessment Systems

Various stakeholders described BRRSD's use of data as historically inconsistent. District leaders have implemented learning management programs to improve this and better address elementary- and middle-school students' learning needs. Formative assessments such as unit evaluations and benchmarks often are left to the discretion of teachers. Leadership uses surveys and open forums to review feedback from students and the community. Specialists use screeners to assess academic or behavioral concerns and determine necessary supports.

At the time of the onsite review, the district had recently implemented i-Ready and ALEKS (Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces) to collect data and assess students' learning needs, skill levels, and degrees of readiness. Curriculum coordinators and teachers said that i-Ready was used at the elementary- and middle-school levels to assess students' mathematics and English language learning skills. Interviews with curriculum coordinators and teachers and a document review indicated the use of ALEKS at the middle-school level. End-of-unit evaluations and benchmarks are used at the elementary-school level to review students' progress at the end of each term. Teachers said that although i-Ready focused on only mathematics and ELA at the elementary- and middle-school levels, the administration of this assessment in tandem with the benchmarks provided a comprehensive view of student performance. In addition, to determine students' learning needs, school-level staff conduct informal assessments such as one-on-one check-ins and conferencing with students. Leaders also gather student and parent feedback through surveys and public forums to better understand students' and families' experiences at specific schools and in the district overall.

District leaders stated that the district did not have in place a system for efficient and purposeful data collection, use, and sharing to guide decision making. i-Ready and ALEKS were implemented across the district to create a more unified and robust assessment system. These learning management programs serve as a foundation for more centralized processes for data collection and analysis.

Data Use

The district uses the i-Ready diagnostic assessments at the elementary- and middle-school levels. The district uses this information, primarily at the school level, to identify students in need of extra support. At the district level, the team found little evidence of support for data use. There are inconsistencies across schools and grade levels about data use and implementation. At the high-school level, assessment is left up to the teachers, and data often are collected from midyear exams.

The district implemented the i-Ready diagnostic assessment system in 2021-2022 at the elementary- and middle-school levels. Students are tested three times to obtain baseline data, observe student progress throughout the year, and as a summative assessment at the end of the school year. Teachers and school leaders emphasized that these tests were used to identify students who needed additional support and intervention. In addition, these tests are used to help teachers and school leaders see where students are struggling and modify curriculum and instruction to focus on areas of need. The district also analyzes MCAS data at all school levels to identify low-performing schools and to see where the district can improve. School leaders noted that a major goal for the

district was more formalized data analysis meetings at the district level. The review team did not find evidence that the district analyzed data to identify inequities among student groups or address inequitable outcomes.

Interviewees said that the child study team (CST), which referred students districtwide who needed intervention, relied on data from teachers. District leaders described the i-Ready assessment as a tool for teachers to identify students' needs. Most district and school stakeholders reported that the district was not doing enough to encourage the meaningful use of collected data. Although the district implemented the i-Ready assessment, some teachers stated that it was "up to the teacher" to decide what to do with data, and there was "no oversight" from the district. Corroborating this statement, one district leader said that BRRSD did not have a standard process based on district screening data for determining which students needed support. Other teachers said that the district collected too much data from diagnostic testing that was not incorporated into the curriculum in a way that enabled students to take ownership of their learning.

Sharing Results

Systems are in place for collecting and distributing student data. However, district leaders do not implement data use in a systemic way from the top down. Teachers facilitate most internal data sharing with students and families. Teachers discuss progress and areas of concern with students and families. Families also receive access to learning management systems so that they can review students' grades. The team found limited evidence of leaders including students in data discussions. District leaders said that they planned to host more formal meetings about data analysis to resolve this.

School-level stakeholders reported using i-Ready data to assess students' learning needs and screeners to determine academic or behavioral concerns. However, teachers said that i-Ready data use was not implemented in a systemic way, noting that "these assessments aren't being successfully incorporated into the curriculum enough" and were "not representative of what's happening in the moment."

School and district leaders strive to communicate performance data with families. Parents receive access to students' grades through PowerSchool. Teachers also use online learning management systems, such as Google Classroom and Class Dojo, which parents can access. District leaders also distribute progress reports for students with disabilities and ELs. School leaders reported that teachers were very good at reaching out to families and developing positive channels of communication overall. Parents and community members also can voice their ideas or concerns with school committee members during executive sessions.

Students said that teachers regularly communicated with them about their academic progress. Students are taken aside to go over specific areas of improvement, receive feedback on assignments, and receive rubrics to assess their own work. Students also can view their grades in PowerSchool. However, the team found limited evidence of district and school leaders facilitating data discussions with students. The district administered the DEI survey to better understand the perspectives of students, staff, and families. The district shared the findings with families, and

during its May 2021 meeting, the school committee discussed the next steps in working with school-level administrators to analyze the data and convey the findings to the district's student body.

Recommendations

- District and school leaders should establish a more systematic process to ensure the effective use of data districtwide.
- To create a more effective system for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data, the district should create two data teams—one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level—with representation from both leadership and teaching staff in all subjects.
- The district should establish a standard process based on district screening data for determining which students need support.
- The district should analyze disaggregated student performance data, particularly to identify and address performance, access, and opportunity outcomes and gaps.

Human Resources and Professional Development

BRRSD is pursuing short- and long-term strategies to strengthen and diversify its workforce. In addition, in recent years the district’s PD has focused on DEI. At the time of this review, the district was identifying additional opportunities for observations and feedback for educators.

- **Educator Pipeline.** BRRSD is actively working to diversify its workforce by participating in DESE’s teacher diversification PLC and conversations with BSU.
- **Evaluation and Recognition.** The district has mentor programs in place to support new teachers. However, limited opportunities exist for teacher leaders and to recognize excellence in teaching.

Table 8 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Procedures, policies, and practices are in place about new staff, employee development and feedback, safety, and staff conduct. 	
Recruitment, hiring, and assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Short- and long-term strategies are in place to diversify the workforce. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ensure that teacher assignment is based on students’ learning needs and master schedules result in an equitable distribution of educator skills across grades and content levels.
Supervision, evaluation, and educator development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The district focuses on DEI in PD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Consistently provide constructive, growth-oriented feedback to teachers.
Recognition, leadership development, and advancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The district provides leadership opportunities for high-school department heads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Increase formal opportunities for teacher leadership.

Infrastructure

A review of the 2021-2022 BRRSD employee handbook indicated that the district had procedures, policies, and practices about staff hiring and onboarding, employee development and feedback, safety, and staff conduct.

Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

The district is employing both short- and long-term strategies to diversify its workforce so that it better reflects the student population, which has changed in the last decade. According to DESE

data, between 2012 and 2022, district enrollment declined from 5,556 to 5,392 students. During this period, the percentages of various races and ethnicities has changed: Black students increased from 2.9 percent to 8.9 percent; Hispanic students from 2.1 percent to 4.6 percent; Asian students from 1.2 percent to 2.4 percent; and multi-race (non-Hispanic) students from 3 percent to 5 percent. From 2012 and 2022, the percentage of White students decreased from 90.7 percent to 79 percent. School leaders reported being given autonomy in hiring decisions with the view that they knew their schools best. Staff members' years of experience varies across grade-level teams. Although teachers sometimes apply for open positions at other schools, there is not a lot of movement within the district.

BRRSD is actively working to diversify its workforce through a variety of actions. A review of a document that describes efforts to diversify the workforce and build cultural competency indicated that the DEI coordinator, the director of human resources, the coordinator of teaching and learning, the principal of the high school, and a high-school history teacher were participating in DESE's teacher diversification PLC. This group meets monthly to strategize about recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce. Some efforts focus on "expanding the ways that they're [leaders are] posting job availabilities in an effort to widen the pool" and looking for hiring platforms that specifically target educators of color. As part of a longer term strategy, these educators are talking with BSU about how they can develop a pipeline of their students who want to pursue education and then return to teach in the district. One stakeholder said that these efforts had "varied in their success," and the district was still a long way from "making sure that all of the students that we're responsible for educating have representation among our faculty and staff."

School leaders at all levels reported having autonomy in hiring. One school leader described the attitude of the district as "You know your school the best. You know your teachers and how they interact with one another the best." School leaders spoke about the need to be fiscally responsible and to consider trade-offs between a person's level of experience and salary requirements. A review of a hiring process document indicated that the district's process included specific selection criteria for candidates and interviewing at least three candidates. Overall, school leaders said that the district supported their needs and judgments.

Teachers stated that teacher assignment did not change regularly based on students' learning needs, and teachers generally remained in the role for which they were initially hired unless the school leader approached a teacher about an opening in another grade. A district leader echoed these sentiments, sharing that there was limited movement within the district after teachers were hired. Occasionally when there is a job opening, if a teacher wants to move to another school within the district, the teacher applies for the open position. Interviews and a document review did not provide evidence that master schedules resulted in an equitable distribution of educator skills across grades and content levels. According to 2021-2022 DESE data, at all district schools, a high percentage of teachers (between 82 percent and 100 percent) have more than three years of experience. However, teachers stated the view that in some grades the entire group of teachers was more experienced, whereas in other grades, the teachers were all newer educators. Stakeholders attributed these perceived differences to the timing of retirements in different schools and at different grade levels.

Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development

New teachers in the district are assigned a mentor for support. Other types of support include grade-level meetings and opportunities to observe other classrooms. Since the COVID-19 pandemic started, administrators observe classrooms less frequently than in the past. Teachers reported not receiving a lot of feedback from these informal classroom observations. PD support focused on DEI for the two years before this review.

Teachers said that before the COVID-19 pandemic, administrators came into classrooms more frequently than they did at the time of this review. Now, administrators come into classrooms, but teachers receive little feedback from these visits, which are quite short. In a sentiment shared by many teachers, one teacher told the review team, “Their [administrators’] goal is to be there for the kids and not really to be there for us,” which other teachers agreed with. Teachers shared that Title I teachers and teaching and learning coordinators are available to come into classes to support teachers.

A review of the educator evaluation system, which is stored using TeachPoint, indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample of 10 percent (24) of 232 Professional Teacher Status teachers with complete summative evaluations for the 2020-2021 school year. The sample of summative teacher evaluations reviewed were all (100 percent) marked as complete, but a small percentage of evaluations did not include required components such as ratings or feedback. In addition, summative evaluations did not always include observation notes, a rationale for rating, or feedback identifying strengths or areas for improvement. In a review of the written comments provided by standard, educators received specific, actionable feedback approximately 46 percent to 79 percent of the time. One teacher told the team that the degree to which feedback was actionable varied depending on who is doing the evaluation. A review of educator evaluation documents indicated that some but not all educators were developing student learning and professional practice SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goals. Educators received ratings on progress toward their goals in the summative evaluations; however, only 66.7 percent of the reviewed evaluations contained student learning SMART goals, and 62.5 percent of evaluations reviewed contained professional practice SMART goals.

A review of all summative evaluations for 2020-2021 for administrative staff showed that only four administrative staff (assistant principals) had summative evaluations available for review. Of those evaluations, two evaluations (50 percent) were not complete. Evaluations were missing performance ratings or assessments of progress toward goals. The review of evaluation documents also indicated that all administrators were not developing student learning, professional practice, or school improvement SMART goals. Of the summative evaluations reviewed, two evaluations (50 percent) included student learning goals, three evaluations (75 percent) contained professional practice goals, and two evaluations (50 percent) included school improvement goals. None of the evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. All summative administrator evaluations reviewed (100 percent) included evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback identifying an administrator’s strengths and areas for improvement.

DEI has been a focus of the district's PD for the two years before this review. One leader stated, "We were really strategic in making a commitment to intensive DEI work," and we "need[ed] teachers to think more critically about how they view[ed] all students." A review of the document *Description of How Bridgewater-Raynham is Developing Staff Capacity to Understand Bias and Inequities* indicated that in 2020-2021, the district's focus was on culturally responsive school leadership for district leaders. In addition, in 2020-2021, consultants worked with the middle-school social studies department and the coordinator of teaching and learning to analyze the curricular materials for biases and inequities, which was expanded to all grade levels in the 2021-2022 school year. In 2021-2022, consultants provided professional development on culturally responsive schools and teaching to all faculty and staff in grades 6-12. The district hosted an equity symposium to start the 2021-2022 school year. The PD calendar for the district's work with consultants corroborated interviewees' statements. In addition to DEI PD, the district has offered PD on MTSS and on supervision, evaluation, and managing conflict for administrators. Teachers expressed a few concerns about PD, including the view that the quality of the PD varied, and PD was typically concentrated at the beginning of the year even though it could be useful to have additional PD later in the year. Teachers also stated that they would like the PD to be more teacher driven and more grade specific.

A review of BRRSD's employee handbook indicated that new teachers who have never held the position to which they have been hired were eligible for induction and mentoring supports for their first year. Interviewees said that new teachers were assigned a mentor for support. Other types of support for new teachers include grade-level meetings, principals' observation with a goal to help support new teachers, and opportunities for the new teacher to observe other classrooms. Finally, depending on the time of year, PD opportunities might be available.

Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Limited opportunities for leadership roles exist in the district. At the high school, teachers can be department heads. Interviewees said that "formal leadership opportunities in [the] early grades are scarce." In the past, the district had lead teachers at each grade level, but the district moved away from that role in 2019-2020. The lead teacher roles have "been replaced by several roles in administration." Interviewees said that the lead teachers provided a way for teachers to help their colleagues without being evaluative as well as to link the towns of Raynham and Bridgewater by facilitating cross-town meetings.

Recommendations

- The district should ensure that teacher assignment is based on students' learning needs and master schedules result in an equitable distribution of educator skills across grades and content levels.
- The district should leverage its educator evaluation system to strengthen instruction by consistently providing constructive, growth-related feedback to teachers.
- The district should consider developing a career-ladder pipeline and a formal recognition program for educators.

Student Support

BRRSD prioritizes a school climate that ensures the safety, well-being, and sense of belonging of its students. Stakeholders said and a document review confirmed the district’s commitment to developing staff capacity to examine and dismantle implicit biases and systemic inequalities and identify, understand, and respond to underlying causes of student behavior.

- **School Climate.** BRRSD prioritizes the physical, intellectual, and emotional safety of all students and adults.
- **Tiered Supports.** The district does not provide a well-defined, horizontally and vertically aligned tiered system of support across the district. Processes for identifying students who need support and interventions vary across schools and grade levels.
- **Family Engagement.** District staff recognize the importance of and are working toward building relationships with students’ families and the community, ensuring that partnerships are culturally responsive and strengths based, and providing leadership opportunities for students and families.

Table 9 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support.

Table 9. 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"> ■ Prioritizes the safety and well-being of all students and adults. ■ Uses districtwide positive behavioral approaches and expectations. ■ Focuses on access and equity for all students and helping staff examine and dismantle implicit biases and systemic inequalities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Continue to develop staff capacity to examine and dismantle implicit biases and systemic inequalities and create environments in which all students can deeply learn, grow, and thrive, including the work of the DEI committee.
Tiered systems of support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Uses scientifically validated assessments for screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring. ■ Provides high-quality, ongoing support and PD to support the use of tiered models and build expertise in academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provide tiered, evidence-based, and culturally responsive supports for students. ■ Use a systemic planning process for tiered supports. ■ Involve students and families in the tiered support process.
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Includes links to multiple languages in materials sent to families. ■ Works to ensure that families have a voice in planning and decision making. ■ The district has established multiple community partnerships, including BSU’s supports for students with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Consider creating clear processes to find, establish, and manage community partnerships.

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

It is clear from stakeholder interviews, surveys, and a review of district documents that BRRSD prioritizes the physical, intellectual, and emotional safety of all students and adults. The district provides PD to teachers about social-emotional learning, DEI practices, and supporting LGBTQ+ students. BRRSD's formation of the DEI committee also indicates that the district is committed to ensuring that school and classroom environments are welcoming, culturally responsive, and inclusive of all student backgrounds.

Overall, BRRSD prioritizes the safety and well-being of all students. Attention to social-emotional learning and mental health for students are priorities for both teachers and school leaders, who reported additional PD on social-emotional learning and increased counseling services, with one teacher noting that some access depended on students' insurance. District leaders said that the Student Success Plan was developed with "all tiers of staff, community stakeholders, and school committee representation." A district leader said that the district hired DEI consultants who provide PD to "grade-level groups from across the district to either engage in direct diversity, equity, and inclusion training or direct facilitation of curriculum review, primarily in history and social sciences." Students reported feeling supported by teachers and school leaders and described a "welcoming school" environment. Students said that one challenge was the absence of cultural competence among their peers and in the curriculum. School leaders said that they addressed this issue by reviewing curricular and PD offerings at all grade levels and integrating student identities into their respective disciplines.

Results from the 2020-2021 Views of Climate and Learning survey are similar to those in districts across Massachusetts and corroborate the views of students and staff in focus groups. Elementary-school students rated the overall school climate, engagement climate, safety climate, and environment climate in the favorable to mostly favorable range, whereas middle-school and high-school students rated their schools across the domains in the somewhat favorable range. No student groups rated their school in the lowest category (least favorable) on any indicator. However, beginning in grade 8, African American/Black students in BRRSD were more likely to rate the overall school climate between three and five points lower than the overall student population.

BRRSD is in the early stages of ensuring access and equity for all students and helping staff examine and dismantle implicit biases, as indicated by interviews, a document review, contracted work with an outside agency to provide PD on culturally responsive school leadership, and the hiring of a DEI coordinator. In addition, the district provided a one-day equity symposium in fall 2021 for all staff, and teachers reported receiving PD on how to support students who identify as LGBTQ+. District leaders said that school staff were directed to review their curricula to ensure that it was accessible by and representative of students in the district. When discussing culturally responsive practices, one district leader stated: "I'd say that that's an area that we need to improve on . . . we have asked our building teams to select data points from their buildings that they could analyze and analyze specifically for a discrepancy in DEI practices."

The district provides opportunities for students to meaningfully engage in educational decisions and experiences. A district leader said that students are part of the DEI committee, which was corroborated by an email requesting student representation for the committee. In addition, the high-

school handbook states that students who hold positions as the class officer, team captains, or club presidents meet with administrators, as representatives of the student body. The team did not find evidence of a focus on engaging students who have been historically underserved.

Interviews and a review of the district's Student Success Plan indicated that BRRSD has implemented clear districtwide positive behavioral systems and expectations. District leaders described the implementation of the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning model as ensuring "a multifaceted way of understanding student behavior." Teachers at all school levels reported training and focusing on social-emotional learning, creating individual behavior support plans, and prioritizing relationship building. However, some middle school teachers noted an absence of consistency in approaches because the physical building is split, saying "the building split makes it [consistency] really impossible." District leaders reported aligning student handbooks across grade levels and schools for consistency in schoolwide positive behavioral systems. Elementary-school leaders spoke about the implementation of a daily staff morning meeting to help teachers learn how they could support students. At the high-school level, a district leader spoke about the training and use of MTSS and positive behavioral interventions and supports. Teachers said that district leaders "from the top down, they see the need for enhanced mental health support or Tier 1 behavioral and emotional supports for kids." Some students at the middle-school level said that their homeroom "student of the week" recognition was based on positive behaviors and general behavioral improvement. At the middle- and high-school levels, students said that expectations across the school were discussed and modeled, but teachers did not consistently apply the rules about mobile phone use, noting, "kids barely listen or abide by the rule." The Student Success Plan includes action items for the 2021-2022 school year related to training staff on MTSS and positive behavioral interventions and supports.

Tiered Systems of Support

BRRSD does not have a well-defined, horizontally and vertically aligned tiered system of support across the district. District leaders, principals, and staff reported that PD on the purposes of MTSS was a focus in 2021-2022. The district has well-established CSTs at each school in the district that are responsible for determining which students need interventions and assessing students' progress with the interventions in place. However, a district leader said that the district did not have a standard process for intervention selection or movement between tiers. District leaders recognize that tiered systems of support are an area of growth. The district is providing PD for their staff on the basic tenets of MTSS, and in 2021-2022 adopted a scientifically validated assessment tool for screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring decisions.

District leaders and educators reported that the implementation of tiered supports was in the early stages and varied by school. Principals, teachers, and district leaders said that although components of tiered supports, such as CSTs, have been in place for years, the process for identifying and intervening to support students varied by school. For example, a review of the Tiered Supports Information Compilation document indicated that a CST referral took place at Tier 2, and one middle school listed the CST as a Tier 3 intervention following different Tier 2 supports. One district leader said, "MTSS is an area that we're very much currently exploring, and I feel like it's a huge area of growth for us."

The district has been increasing staff capacity to provide tiered supports through its Title I teachers, who provide coaching and support for teachers, and through the addition of interventionists at each school. Systemic planning for tiered supports is an area of improvement for BRRSD. Although district leaders, principals, and educators said that CSTs were in place and included principals, school psychologists, counselors, intervention staff, and teachers, these teams were not used to systemically address tiered supports for students.

School staff use data from scientifically validated assessments. At the time of the onsite review, the district had recently adopted the i-Ready assessment as its screener, diagnostic, and progress monitoring tool. Teachers, specialists, and school committee members all spoke about the adoption of i-Ready as a screener to support student identification, and a review of the Tiered Supports Information Compilation document corroborated this. One stakeholder said that the district needed a new assessment system because it did not have a strong assessment system in place, stating, “Teachers were using DIBELS [Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills], but they were using it really not authentically and not with fidelity. So we brought in i-Ready last year.”

Interviews with district leaders, principals, and teachers and a document review indicated that each school had a CST that met to discuss students who need additional supports. However, families and students are not central to the district’s teaming process. One principal stated that teachers contacted the families of children referred to the CST to let them know of the referral and provide updates on the team’s decision. However, a district leader said that families and students were not involved in the tiered support process.

The district provides PD about what an MTSS model entails and which components are already in place in schools. Principals and one district leader said that the MTSS trainings focused on basic components of MTSS, including why MTSS was important and what quality tiered supports looked like. Teachers stated that the training helped them understand what parts of MTSS they have already been implementing and how they could improve their tiered support system. One teacher stated, “But getting the language rolled out and getting the process rolled out and like I said, how it aligns with what we’re doing and how we can enhance what we offer for tiered supports has really been a focus of the admin[istration], this year especially.” Stakeholder interviews were corroborated by the BRRSD Professional Development Plan 2021-2022 document, which stated that MTSS PD offerings were provided under the safe and supportive schools and curriculum and instruction pillars of success identified by the district.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Stakeholder interviews and focus groups and a review of documents indicated that the district recognized the importance of engaging families, students, and the broader community. The district has worked to increase familial engagement by providing information in multiple languages, hosting parent town hall meetings, and establishing a DEI committee that includes parents, students, and community members. In addition, the district established partnerships with BSU and a clinical services group in the region. District leaders acknowledged that they needed to continue to ensure that students and families have a voice in planning and decision making in the district.

District leaders, principals, and instructional staff said that BRRSD has improved family and student engagement but recognized that it could be further improved. District leaders and teachers stated that in the years before this review, the district had increased access to information by including links to translations in multiple languages in materials sent to parents. Teachers said that in the past, translators attended parent meetings for ELs and their families to ensure access. In addition, district staff shared their institutional self-evaluation data, through the DEI lens, with families in a town hall presentation.

In addition to communicating more openly with families, BRRSD is working to ensure that families have a voice in planning and decision making. The superintendent, district leaders, and instructional staff said that families and students were part of the district's DEI committee, as corroborated by district emails requesting that students join the committee. The superintendent said that in 2021-2022, the committee has been focused on analyzing the social studies curriculum through a DEI lens. In addition, one district leader said that BRRSD established DEI liaisons on the parent teacher organization boards for five of its seven schools, noting that two schools were currently selecting their liaisons.

Perceptions of students' opportunities to lead and to have a voice in planning and decision making, varied by stakeholder group and level. Although middle-school staff and students identified leadership opportunities, such as participating on the student council, high-school staff and students did not articulate leadership positions available for students. However, district leaders said that students could participate in the DEI committee. This was corroborated by district emails sent to staff requesting that they share the information with students.

BRRSD has established multiple community partnerships to support the academic, behavioral, and mental wellness of its students. One district leader said that the district worked with BSU to provide supports for students with disabilities. Through BSU's inclusive concurrent enrollment initiative program, students with significant disabilities who require transition services between the ages of 18 to 22 can audit courses at BSU, participate in mentorship opportunities on the campus, and receive vocational training at BSU. In addition, the district provides co-located mental health supports through a partnership with High Point, a clinical group in the region.

BRRSD could benefit from conducting a comprehensive mapping of partners and resources and creating clear processes to find, establish, and manage community partnerships. A district leader stated that except for larger partnerships such as BSU, most partnerships were formed and maintained by individual staff members through personal connections in the district. This district leader noted: "But it might be just a teacher that continues that relationship and continues that connection because they're there day-to-day operationally engaging with them." The district leader said that except for allocated time for working with community partners, the district did not dedicate resources to establish or maintain community partnerships.

Recommendations

- The district should continue to develop staff capacity to examine and dismantle implicit biases and systemic inequalities and create environments in which all students can deeply learn, grow, and thrive, including the work of the DEI committee.

- District leaders, teachers, and staff should develop a well-defined, horizontally, and vertically aligned tiered system of support across the district.
- The district should put practices into place to ensure that all students receive instruction and supports that meet their needs.
- The district should involve students and families in the tiered support process.
- The district should consider creating clear processes to find, establish, and manage community partnerships.

Financial and Asset Management

District leaders use BRRSD’s Student Success Plan as the basis for the budget. The superintendent’s budget presentation connects budget requests to the Student Success Plan. As part of the budget process, school leaders make budget requests, which must connect to their ability to provide a high-quality education for students. The business office provides regular reports on all funding sources to the superintendent and the school committee for review and they adjust their plans, as needed. Table 10 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management.

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Budget documentation and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Clear and user-friendly budget documents ■ Bridgewater and Raynham review and update the municipal agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Use student performance data, particularly related to performance, access, and opportunity outcomes and gaps, to set budget priorities.
Adequate budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Adequate funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Carefully consider how current resource allocation directly supports strategic improvement and what reallocations may be needed.
Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Efficient business office systems 	
Capital planning and facility maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Appropriate preventive maintenance ■ Five- and 10-year capital plan 	

Budget Documentation and Reporting

School committee members reported receiving many different budget documents, including monthly and quarterly financial reports. The budget documents that BRRSD submitted as part of this review were clear and user-friendly. The superintendent’s budget requests connect to BRRSD’s Student Success Plan, although the requests do not include student performance data or information about performance, access, and opportunity outcomes and gaps. The district uses DESE’s template to report its end-of-year finances, which includes historical data for comparisons. This form includes information about the district’s revenues and expenditures and other financial information. The district’s capital plan is a spreadsheet that clearly articulates the timeline for capital spending priorities.

Bridgewater and Raynham have a regional agreement about cost sharing that is based on each town’s population. When the budget is approved, each town knows its tentative percentage. At the

time of this review, the towns were reviewing and updating the agreement. BRRSD pays for the electricity and oil, snow removal, health insurance, and insurance for its buildings.

Adequate Budget

Interviews with district and school leaders and a reviews of financial documents indicated that the district built its budget based on its Student Success Plan, which has four pillars. In his budget presentation to the school committee, the superintendent connects budget requests with specific elements of the Student Success Plan. As part of the budget process, principals justify their budget requests in terms of their ability “to provide a quality education to the kids.” Although stakeholders said that the budget was sufficient to meet the needs of the district, they also noted “we can always do better.” In particular, stakeholders noted that the social-emotional and mental health needs of students have grown during the COVID-19 pandemic.

A district leader said considering how they would build the budget was a priority during development of the Student Success Plan. Interviews and a review of budget presentations indicated that the superintendent connected requests to a specific pillar of this plan. If stakeholders expressed surprise at the cost of the requests, the superintendent said that his response was “always to say it’s a needs-based budget” with no “fluff.” The superintendent said that he would tell these stakeholders: “These are things that we need to, obviously, run the district effectively and efficiently and provide the best support for our children.”

When the budget process starts in the fall, the superintendent sends a notice to the principals to ask about their staffing needs. The school leaders make requests based “on really what we think we need to be able to provide a quality education to the kids. And then we have to then justify those positions through our own budget process.” The district recently added three new curriculum coordinators. District leaders hope that the work of these coordinators will lead to improved student performance. In addition, the district increased the number of school adjustment counselors to help with social-emotional support in response to increased social-emotional and mental health needs of students since the COVID-19 pandemic.

Financial Tracking, Forecasting, Controls, and Audits

Interviews and a review of financial documents indicated that district finance leaders provided regular reports to the superintendent and the school committee on spending from all funding sources. The district regularly reports on the status of different streams of money. The fund balance report is created monthly, and the superintendent and the school committee receive monthly and quarterly financial reports “so they can see where things are now and what the projections are.” This information is not provided directly to principals unless they request the information, although all budget documents are public.

In addition to a grants’ manager, an assistant to the finance director helps track grants and make certain that grant funds are spent in accordance with grant deadlines. The districts tracks and expends its grant funds. In recent years, the district has not had to return a substantial amount of grant funds. The district submits an end-of-year financial report, using DESE’s template. Interviewees stated that independent auditors reviewed the district’s financial records each year. In addition, the

district's finance leaders regularly consult legal counsel and the Massachusetts General Laws before implementing any new policies or regulations.

Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

The district has a 5- and 10-year capital improvement plan that details each school's capital needs for the next 5 and 10 years. The plan prioritizes capital spending for each plan of work and is reviewed annually and adjusted, as needed. A review of the plan showed that it contained a spreadsheet that describes each school's capital needs. The spreadsheet describes the work, the estimated cost, the priority level, the funding source, and the year the work is planned to be completed. Interviewees said that the plan was reviewed annually and updated regularly, as needed.

Around 2016, the director of finance and the former director of facilities walked around the buildings together and started a capital plan of "all the things that needed doing." On a day-to-day basis, the director of facilities is responsible for maintaining all buildings. The director of facilities also plans for the facilities to be "accessible, clean, safe, well lit, and well maintained."

Recommendations

- The district should use student performance data, particularly related to performance, access, and opportunity outcomes and gaps, to set budget priorities.
- The budget development process should carefully consider whether current resource allocation directly supports strategic improvement, including what reallocations may be needed to fully implement the Student Success Plan and supporting plans.

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in BRRSD. The team conducted 60 classroom observations the week of January 31, 2022 and held interviews and focus groups between January 31 and February 2, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

- Superintendent
- Other district leaders
- School committee members
- Teachers' association representatives
- Principals
- Teachers
- Support specialists
- Families
- Students

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- Data on the district's staffing and finances
- 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. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	5,392	100.0%	911,529	100.0%
African American	479	8.9%	84,970	9.3%
Asian	130	2.4%	65,813	7.2%
Hispanic	247	4.6%	210,747	23.1%
Native American	4	0.1%	2,060	0.2%
White	4,259	79.0%	507,992	55.7%
Native Hawaiian	4	0.1%	788	0.1%
Multirace, non-Hispanic	269	5.0%	39,159	4.3%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021.

Table B2. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 2021-2022 Student Enrollment by High-Need Populations

Student	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high need	Percentage of state
All students with high needs	2,105	100.0%	38.8%	512,242	100.0%	55.6%
Students with disabilities	938	44.6%	17.3%	174,505	34.1%	18.9%
Low-income households	1,520	72.2%	28.2%	399,140	77.9%	43.8%
ELs and former ELs	137	6.5%	2.5%	100,231	19.6%	11.0%

Note. Data as of October 1, 2021. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 5,424; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 920,971.

Table B3. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District, Chronic Absence Rates^a by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year change	State (2021)
All	7.2	6.3	5.5	9.1	1.9	17.7
African American/Black	5.6	3.7	4.7	16.3	10.7	24.1
Asian	4.0	5.8	4.8	4.7	0.7	7.2
Hispanic/Latino	16.7	7.0	10.1	18.1	1.4	29.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	12.7	12.4	8.5	13.2	0.5	18.9
White	7.0	6.1	5.3	7.7	0.7	13.2
High need	11.4	10.5	9.4	18.6	7.2	26.3
Economically disadvantaged	13.4	13.9	11.1	21.9	8.5	30.2
ELs	6.6	3.3	4.0	18.2	11.6	29.0
Students with disabilities	10.6	9.8	10.2	18.2	7.6	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. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District, Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2019-2021

	Fiscal year 2019		Fiscal year 2020		Fiscal year 2021	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	\$73,665,185	\$73,646,634	\$75,423,012	\$76,065,382	\$78,492,931	\$81,132,888
By municipality	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total from local appropriations	\$73,665,185	\$73,646,634	\$75,423,012	\$76,065,382	\$78,492,931	\$81,132,888
From revolving funds and grants	—	\$7,498,863	—	\$7,100,154	—	\$7,372,284
Total expenditures	—	\$81,145,497	—	\$83,165,536	—	\$88,505,172
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid ^a	—	\$21,293,351	—	\$22,061,362	—	\$22,716,693
Required local contribution	—	\$34,169,692	—	\$35,678,127	—	\$36,619,588
Required net school spending ^b	—	\$55,463,043	—	\$57,739,489	—	\$59,336,281
Actual net school spending	—	\$63,401,882	—	\$66,465,810	—	\$68,520,317
Over/under required (\$)	—	\$7,938,839	—	\$8,726,321	—	\$9,184,036
Over/under required (%)	—	14.3%	—	15.1%	—	15.5%

^a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. ^b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital. Data as of May 6, 2022 and sourced from fiscal year 2020 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 Program information on DESE website.

**Table B5. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2019-2021**

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	\$338.55	\$451.48	\$566.10
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$550.36	\$611.61	\$616.95
Teachers	\$5,373.08	\$5,486.56	\$5,727.94
Other teaching services	\$996.49	\$982.79	\$1,084.55
Professional development	\$38.58	\$32.49	\$56.72
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$134.78	\$130.14	\$276.94
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$426.69	\$467.10	\$509.91
Pupil services	\$1,787.51	\$1,574.35	\$1,677.37
Operations and maintenance	\$938.09	\$1,124.30	\$1,081.11
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$2,437.71	\$2,360.36	\$2,496.65
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$13,021.83	\$13,221.18	\$14,094.23

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

Appendix C. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report



Bridgewater-Raynham Public Schools

Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

February 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.

Observers visited Bridgewater-Raynham Public Schools during the week of January 31, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across seven 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. There are three levels of CLASS Manuals: K-3, Upper Elementary, and Secondary. The K-3 tool is used to observe grades K-3, the Upper Elementary tool is used to observe grades 4-5, and the Secondary tool is 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 Climate ■ Negative Climate ■ Teacher Sensitivity ■ Regard for Student Perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Behavior Management ■ Productivity ■ Instructional Learning Formats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Concept Development ■ Quality of Feedback ■ Language Modeling

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average*: 5.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	2	0	6	7	7	22	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	2	4	5	5	1	17	4.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	3	8	6	3	21	5.3

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 5] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 19] + [6 \times 18] + [7 \times 11]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average*: 5.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	0	5	12	4	22	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	4	4	7	2	17	5.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	2	4	9	5	1	21	5.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 18] + [6 \times 24] + [7 \times 7]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 5.4$

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

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average*: 3.5

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	1	4	9	5	3	0	22	4.2
Grades 6-8	0	7	7	2	1	0	0	17	2.8
Grades 9-12	1	6	7	2	2	2	1	21	3.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 14] + [3 \times 18] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 8] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 1]) \div 60$ observations = 3.5

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.⁶

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

Negative Climate District Average*: 6.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	22	7.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	7.0
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	21	6.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as: $[(5 \times 1) + (6 \times 4) + (7 \times 55)] \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

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

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

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

⁶ 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	2	3	17	22	6.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	17	6.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	21	6.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 1] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 18] + [7 \times 33]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.4$

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*: 6.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	22	6.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	17	5.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	1	6	6	8	21	6.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: $([4 \times 3] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 19] + [7 \times 27]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.2$

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*: 4.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	3	9	9	0	22	5.2
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	4	8	4	0	17	4.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	2	5	11	3	0	21	4.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 4] + [4 \times 12] + [5 \times 28] + [6 \times 16]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

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

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

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

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Concept Development District Average*: 3.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	3	2	4	3	0	0	12	3.6

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

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

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

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

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

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Content Understanding District Average*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	3	2	2	2	1	10	4.6
Grades 6-8	0	5	4	6	2	0	0	17	3.3
Grades 9-12	0	1	5	4	7	3	1	21	4.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 6] + [3 \times 12] + [4 \times 12] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 2]) \div 48 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average*: 3.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	2	3	4	0	1	0	10	3.5
Grades 6-8	1	1	8	3	4	0	0	17	3.5
Grades 9-12	5	7	7	1	0	1	0	21	2.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 6] + [2 \times 10] + [3 \times 18] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 2]) \div 48 \text{ observations} = 3.0$

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

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

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

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

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Quality of Feedback District Average*: 3.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	2	5	3	8	3	1	22	4.4
Grades 6-8	0	5	4	4	3	1	0	17	3.5
Grades 9-12	4	2	4	1	6	3	1	21	3.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: $[(1 \times 4) + (2 \times 9) + (3 \times 13) + (4 \times 8) + (5 \times 17) + (6 \times 7) + (7 \times 2)] \div 60 \text{ observations} = 3.9$

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average*: 3.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	1	3	5	2	1	0	12	3.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 3] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 1]) \div 12 \text{ observations} = 3.9$

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average*: 3.3

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	1	1	1	2	2	3	0	10	4.2
Grades 6-8	1	5	7	3	1	0	0	17	2.9
Grades 9-12	4	4	5	5	1	1	1	21	3.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: $([1 \times 6] + [2 \times 10] + [3 \times 13] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 1]) \div 48 \text{ observations} = 3.3$

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average*: 4.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	3	2	4	1	10	5.3
Grades 6-8	0	0	3	4	4	6	0	17	4.8
Grades 9-12	0	0	4	3	6	7	1	21	4.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 7] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 12] + [6 \times 17] + [7 \times 2]) \div 48 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

**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	1	7	9	16	23	32	88	5.7
Positive Climate	0	0	2	0	6	7	7	22	5.8
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	22	7.0
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	1	0	5	12	4	22	5.8
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	1	4	9	5	3	0	22	4.2
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	1	4	12	18	31	66	6.1
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	22	6.7
Productivity	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	22	6.5
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	1	3	9	9	0	22	5.2
Instructional Support Domain	1	9	17	20	17	10	2	76	4.1
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	3	2	4	3	0	0	12	3.6
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	0	3	2	2	2	1	10	4.6
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	0	2	3	4	0	1	0	10	3.5
Quality of Feedback	0	2	5	3	8	3	1	22	4.4
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	1	3	5	2	1	0	12	3.9
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	1	1	1	2	2	3	0	10	4.2
Student Engagement (UE only)	0	0	0	3	2	4	1	10	5.3

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 2] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 7]) \div 22 \text{ observations} = 5.8$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 21]) \div 22 \text{ observations} = 7.0$. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	0	7	9	10	10	12	3	51	4.4
Positive Climate	0	0	2	4	5	5	1	17	4.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	4	4	7	2	17	5.4
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	7	7	2	1	0	0	17	2.8
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	0	1	5	16	29	51	6.4
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	17	6.4
Productivity	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	17	5.9
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	7.0
Instructional Support Domain	2	16	24	20	18	5	0	85	3.6
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	1	4	8	4	0	17	4.9
Content Understanding	0	5	4	6	2	0	0	17	3.3
Analysis and Inquiry	1	1	8	3	4	0	0	17	3.5
Quality of Feedback	0	5	4	4	3	1	0	17	3.5
Instructional Dialogue	1	5	7	3	1	0	0	17	2.9
Student Engagement	0	0	3	4	4	6	0	17	4.8

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 2] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 1]) \div 17 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([7 \times 17]) \div 17 \text{ observations} = 7.0$

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	1	6	10	9	19	13	5	63	4.6
Positive Climate	0	0	1	3	8	6	3	21	5.3
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	2	4	9	5	1	21	5.0
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	6	7	2	2	2	1	21	3.4
Classroom Organization Domain	0	0	1	2	11	15	34	63	6.3
Behavior Management	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	21	6.0
Productivity	0	0	0	1	6	6	8	21	6.0
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	21	6.8
Instructional Support Domain	13	14	23	16	25	11	3	105	3.7
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	2	5	11	3	0	21	4.7
Content Understanding	0	1	5	4	7	3	1	21	4.4
Analysis and Inquiry	5	7	7	1	0	1	0	21	2.4
Quality of Feedback	4	2	4	1	6	3	1	21	3.8
Instructional Dialogue	4	4	5	5	1	1	1	21	3.1
Student Engagement	0	0	4	3	6	7	1	21	4.9

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 8] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 3]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 5.3$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([5 \times 1] + [6 \times 3] + [7 \times 17]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 6.8$

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 Leadership and Governance

Resource and Link	Description
Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB) from Education Resource Strategies	This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs.

Table D2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

Resource and Link	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 then publishes their findings for educators across the Commonwealth to consult.

Table D3. Resources to Support Assessment

Resource and Link	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 D4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

Resource and Link	Description
Quick Reference Guide: Opportunities to Streamline the Evaluation Process	This guide helps districts reflect on and continuously improve their evaluation systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ What's working? What are the bright spots? ■ How can we streamline the process to stay focused on professional growth and development? ■ What do we need to adjust to ensure our system is valuable to educators and students?

Table D5. Resources to Support Student Support

Resource and Link	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.

Table D6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

Resource and Link	Description
<u>Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets</u>	A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.

Appendix E. Student Performance Tables

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

Table E1. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Scaled Scores in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/below
All	2,528	503.5	503.7	498.2	-5.3	496.5	1.7
African American/Black	213	498.2	499.5	493.4	-4.8	486.4	7.0
Asian	56	502.3	503.5	496.2	-6.1	508.5	-12.3
Hispanic/Latino	65	—	489.5	485.2	—	484.3	0.9
Multirace	111	500.5	496.5	497.0	-3.5	499.7	-2.7
White	2,077	504.0	504.5	499.2	-4.8	501.3	-2.1
High need	904	492.8	491.4	486.5	-6.3	485.9	0.6
Economically disadvantaged ⁷	566	496.9	495.6	489.6	-7.3	485.2	4.4
ELs and former ELs	130	492.5	492.8	488.2	-4.3	482.8	5.4
Students with disabilities	458	483.3	481.7	476.7	-6.6	478.1	-1.4

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

⁷ **Economically Disadvantaged (2015 to 2021).** Calculated based on a student's participation in one or more of the following state-administered programs: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Transitional Assistance for Families with Dependent Children, the Department of Children and Families' foster care program, and MassHealth (Medicaid).

Table E2. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Scaled Scores in Grades 3-8, 2018-2021

Group	N (2021)	2018	2019	2021	Change	State (2021)	Above/ below
All	2,525	503.1	503.3	493.9	-9.2	489.7	4.2
African American/ Black	213	495.2	497.7	486.7	-8.5	477.3	9.4
Asian	57	504.3	505.4	496.5	-7.8	508.6	-12.1
Hispanic/Latino	64	—	488.0	481.1	—	476.5	4.6
Multirace	110	498.3	495.5	492.3	-6.0	492.1	0.2
White	2,074	503.8	504.3	495.1	-8.7	494.3	0.8
High need	902	491.5	490.9	482.0	-9.5	479.0	3.0
Economically disadvantaged	565	494.4	493.9	484.3	-10.1	477.4	6.9
ELs and former ELs	131	494.3	494.7	484.8	-9.5	477.8	7.0
Students with disabilities	456	482.3	481.7	473.5	-8.8	472.5	1.0

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. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	2,528	57%	58%	49%	-8	46%	3
African American/ Black	213	44%	49%	38%	-6	28%	10
Asian	56	57%	56%	38%	-19	66%	-28
Hispanic/Latino	65	—	42%	26%	—	26%	0
Multirace	111	48%	43%	45%	-3	51%	-6
White	2,077	59%	60%	51%	-8	54%	-3
High need	904	34%	33%	28%	-6	28%	0
Economically disadvantaged	566	44%	41%	33%	-11	27%	6
ELs and former ELs	130	34%	38%	28%	-6	24%	4
Students with disabilities	458	14%	15%	12%	-2	16%	-4

Table E4. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	2,525	58%	58%	40%	-18	33%	7
African American/ Black	213	40%	45%	28%	-12	14%	14
Asian	57	63%	59%	40%	-23	64%	-24
Hispanic/Latino	64	—	26%	19%	—	14%	5
Multirace	110	50%	44%	37%	-13	37%	0
White	2,074	60%	60%	42%	-18	40%	2
High need	902	32%	32%	19%	-13	16%	3
Economically disadvantaged	565	37%	38%	22%	-15	14%	8
ELs and former ELs	131	41%	37%	21%	-20	17%	4
Students with disabilities	456	13%	15%	8%	-5	10%	-2

Table E5. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	294	510.2	507.3	2.9	291	504.6	500.6	4.0
African American/ Black	15	506.5	494.6	11.9	16	500.1	486.7	13.4
Asian	7	—	518.2	—	7	—	520.9	—
Hispanic/Latino	6	—	491.9	—	6	—	485.3	—
Multirace	13	502.6	510.6	-8.0	14	502.5	503.9	-1.4
White	252	511.1	512.5	-1.4	247	505.5	504.9	0.6
High need	79	493.7	493.3	0.4	76	487.5	486.5	1.0
Economically disadvantaged	50	501.0	493.7	7.3	49	492.5	486.6	5.8
ELs and former ELs	10	490.3	477.9	12.4	10	483.2	477.6	5.6
Students with disabilities	38	478.5	487.2	-8.7	36	475.2	479.6	-4.4

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

Table E6. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	294	69%	64%	5	291	59%	52%	7
African American/Black	15	60%	41%	19	16	56%	27%	29
Asian	7	—	80%	—	7	—	80%	—
Hispanic/Latino	6	—	39%	—	6	—	26%	—
Multirace	13	54%	67%	-13	14	50%	55%	-5
White	252	71%	73%	-2	247	61%	60%	1
High need	79	34%	39%	-5	76	28%	26%	2
Economically disadvantaged	50	46%	41%	5	49	37%	27%	10
ELs and former ELs	10	30%	19%	11	10	20%	15%	5
Students with disabilities	38	11%	25%	-14	36	6%	14%	-8

Table E7. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next Generation MCAS Science Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5 and 8, 2019-2021

Group	N (2021)	2019	2021	State (2021)	Above/below
All	796	53%	45%	42%	3
African American/Black	57	48%	35%	19%	16
Asian	17	56%	29%	62%	-33
Hispanic/Latino	18	50%	22%	20%	2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	41	37%	39%	47%	-8
White	661	54%	48%	50%	-2
High need	257	32%	22%	23%	-1
Economically disadvantaged	158	36%	29%	21%	8
ELs and former ELs	34	24%	9%	18%	-9
Students with disabilities	131	17%	9%	15%	-6

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. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	432	63%	66%	53%	-10	51%	2
4	421	60%	65%	55%	-5	49%	6
5	395	57%	55%	49%	-8	47%	2
6	390	55%	50%	54%	-1	47%	7
7	433	53%	63%	45%	-8	43%	2
8	457	57%	53%	37%	-20	41%	-4
3-8	2,528	57%	58%	49%	-8	46%	3
10	294	—	71%	69%	—	64%	5

Table E9. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	432	57%	56%	34%	-23	33%	1
4	420	62%	66%	43%	-19	33%	10
5	396	50%	54%	40%	-10	33%	7
6	388	57%	59%	45%	-12	33%	12
7	435	54%	56%	37%	-17	35%	2
8	454	71%	60%	41%	-30	32%	9
3-8	2,525	58%	58%	40%	-18	33%	7
10	291	—	71%	59%	—	52%	7

Table E10. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: 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	395	57%	—	46%	-11	42%
8	401	49%	—	45%	-4	41%
5 and 8	796	53%	—	45%	-8	42%
10	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

Table E11. Bridgewater-Raynham Public Schools: English Language Arts 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	—	54.8	—	—	—	60.2	—	—
5	372	44.0	28.6	34.9	373	39.4	31.3	31.9
6	370	39.7	37.4	37.3	367	47.9	28.2	26.3
7	391	63.1	34.4	36.1	393	53.7	30.2	35.8
8	434	45.2	31.4	34.8	431	60.5	35.0	27.4
3-8	1,567	48.8	32.9	35.8	1,564	52.2	31.3	30.4
10	273	49.2	51.3	52.5	270	39.3	30.7	36.5

Table E12. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Mitchell	54%	—	—	—	—	—	54%	—
Merrill	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
LaLiberte	51%	58%	—	—	—	—	55%	—
Williams Intermediate	—	53%	51%	55%	—	—	53%	—
Raynham Middle	—	—	44%	54%	42%	36%	44%	—
Bridgewater Middle	—	—	—	—	50%	39%	44%	—
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	70%
District	53%	55%	49%	54%	45%	37%	49%	69%
State	51%	49%	47%	47%	43%	41%	46%	64%

Table E13. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	3-8	10
Mitchell	32%	—	—	—	—	—	32%	—
Merrill	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
LaLiberte	37%	45%	—	—	—	—	41%	—
Williams Intermediate	—	42%	47%	48%	—	—	46%	—
Raynham Middle	—	—	32%	43%	32%	40%	37%	—
Bridgewater Middle	—	—	—	—	42%	42%	42%	—
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	61%
District	34%	43%	40%	45%	37%	41%	40%	59%
State	33%	33%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%	52%

Table E14. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2021

School	5	8	5 and 8	10
Mitchell	—	—	—	—
Merrill	—	—	—	—
LaLiberte	—	—	—	—
Williams Intermediate	48%	—	48%	—
Raynham Middle	43%	46%	44%	—
Bridgewater Middle	—	46%	46%	—
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	—	—	—	—
District	46%	45%	45%	—
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. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Mitchell	54%	31%	30%	22%	33%	50%	—	50%	—	54%
Merrill	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
LaLiberte	55%	33%	34%	15%	36%	41%	—	—	33%	58%
Williams Intermediate	53%	30%	40%	14%	28%	45%	38%	21%	50%	56%
Raynham Middle	44%	22%	27%	5%	26%	35%	44%	20%	32%	46%
Bridgewater Middle	44%	25%	32%	6%	20%	32%	27%	23%	52%	46%
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	49%	28%	33%	12%	28%	38%	38%	26%	45%	51%
State	46%	28%	27%	16%	24%	28%	66%	26%	51%	54%

Note. High need = students with high needs; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; ELs = ELs and former ELs; Black = African American/Black students; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E16. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Mitchell	32%	16%	23%	7%	11%	10%	—	25%	—	33%
Merrill	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
LaLiberte	41%	18%	15%	12%	27%	19%	—	—	33%	45%
Williams Intermediate	46%	26%	32%	13%	33%	38%	54%	16%	39%	48%
Raynham Middle	37%	13%	18%	1%	16%	22%	44%	—	24%	39%
Bridgewater Middle	42%	18%	21%	6%	12%	29%	55%	23%	54%	43%
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	40%	19%	22%	8%	21%	28%	40%	19%	37%	42%
State	33%	16%	14%	10%	17%	14%	64%	14%	37%	40%

Note. High need = students with high needs; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; ELs = ELs and former ELs; Black = African American/Black students; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E17. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	70%	36%	48%	9%	—	60%	—	—	58%	72%
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	69%	34%	46%	11%	30%	60%	—	—	54%	71%
State	64%	39%	41%	25%	19%	41%	80%	39%	67%	73%

Note. High need = students with high needs; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; ELs = ELs and former ELs; Black = African American/Black students; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E18. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grade 10, 2021

School	All	High Needs	Econ. Dis.	SWD	ELs	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High School	61%	30%	40%	6%	—	56%	—	—	54%	62%
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	59%	28%	37%	6%	20%	56%	—	—	50%	61%
State	52%	26%	27%	14%	15%	27%	80%	26%	55%	60%

Note. High need = students with high needs; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; ELs = ELs and former ELs; Black = African American/Black students; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E19. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Next-Generation MCAS Science Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in Grades 5-8 by School, 2021

School	All	High need	Econ. dis.	SWD	ELs	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multi-race	White
Mitchell	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Merrill	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
LaLiberte	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Intermediate	48%	24%	30%	14%	8%	42%	—	—	38%	51%
Raynham Middle	44%	20%	26%	6%	—	35%	—	—	25%	47%
Bridgewater Middle	46%	26%	35%	9%	9%	36%	—	—	47%	47%
Therapeutic Day School	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District	62%	35%	30%	28%	44%	5%	77%	47%	77%	63%
State	42%	23%	21%	15%	18%	19%	62%	20%	47%	50%

Note. High need = students with high needs; Econ. dis. = students who are economically disadvantaged; SWD = students with disabilities; ELs = ELs and former ELs; Black = African American/Black students; multi-race = students who are multiple races but not Hispanic or Latino.

Table E20. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates^a by Student Group, 2017-2020

Group	N (2020)	2017	2018	2019	2020	4-year Change	State (2020)
All	384	91.5	94.0	95.4	92.7	1.2	89.0
African American/Black	18	85.0	87.5	76.9	88.9	3.9	83.1
Asian	11	87.5	100	87.5	100	12.5	95.0
Hispanic/Latino	1	71.4	—	—	—	—	77.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	88.2	100	100	91.7	3.5	88.6
White	341	92.5	94.1	95.9	93.0	0.5	93.2
High need	130	84.8	81.9	87.2	80.8	-4	81.1
Economically disadvantaged	90	87.3	84.0	88.5	81.1	-6.2	80.6
ELs	4	80.0	90.9	90.9	—	—	68.3
Students with disabilities	61	73.7	68.9	75.9	73.8	0.1	74.9

^a Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income households used for 2017, 2018, and 2019 rates.

Table E21. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2016-2019

Group	N (2019)	2016	2017	2018	2019	4-year Change	State (2019)
All	413	93.0	92.8	95.3	97.1	4.1	90.1
African American/Black	13	86.7	90.0	93.8	84.6	-2.1	84.1
Asian	8	62.5	87.5	100	87.5	25.0	96.3
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	71.4	—	—	—	78.5
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	20	100	88.2	100	100	0.0	90.3
White	370	94.0	93.6	95.3	97.6	3.6	93.9
High need	117	86.9	87.7	85.3	90.6	3.7	82.4
Low income	78	89.7	90.2	86.4	91.0	1.3	82.0
ELs	11	66.7	90.0	100	90.9	24.2	71.1
Students with disabilities	54	79.0	78.9	73.3	81.5	2.5	78.2

Table E22. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year Change	State (2021)
All	1.4	1.7	1.5	0.6	-0.8	0.3
African American/Black	2.6	2.0	3.3	0.9	-1.7	0.3
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Multirace, non-Hispanic or Latino	3.6	3.5	1.9	—	—	0.4
White	1.3	1.7	1.4	0.6	-0.7	0.3
High needs	2.6	3.5	3.0	1.1	-1.5	0.4
Economically disadvantaged	2.4	2.9	3.1	1.2	-1.2	0.3
ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Students with disabilities	3.8	4.4	3.3	1.3	-2.5	0.6

Table E23. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021

Group	2018	2019	2020	2021	4-year Change	State (2021)
All	2.0	2.1	1.0	0.5	-1.5	0.5
African American/Black	2.6	3.0	1.4	0.7	-1.9	0.6
Asian	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Hispanic/Latino	—	—	—	—	—	0.5
Multirace, non-Hispanic or Latino	4.4	3.1	0.8	—	—	0.7
White	1.8	2.1	1.0	0.5	-1.3	0.5
High need	3.2	3.5	1.9	1.2	-2	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	3.7	3.5	1.9	0.8	-2.9	0.7
ELs	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
Students with disabilities	3.0	3.8	2.1	1.6	-1.4	1.1

Table E24. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2017-2020

Group	N (2020)	2017	2018	2019	2020	4-year Change	State (2020)
All	1,420	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.7	-0.2	1.6
African American/Black	84	0.0	1.6	4.5	1.2	1.2	2.2
Asian	30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Hispanic/Latino	20	0.0	—	14.3	0.0	0.0	3.5
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	68	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
White	1,216	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.7	-0.4	0.9
High need	331	3.2	2.3	2.5	2.1	-1.1	2.9
Economically disadvantaged	209	5.0	3.1	3.1	3.3	-1.7	3.1
ELs	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3	5.6
Students with disabilities	153	1.4	1.3	2.0	1.3	-0.1	2.6

Table E25. Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2018-2020

Group	N (2020)	2018	2019	2020	3-year Change	State (2020)
All	738	56.7	62.1	62.1	5.4	65.7
African American/Black	42	43.8	35.7	45.2	1.4	54.2
Asian	18	73.3	82.4	83.3	10	84.0
Hispanic/Latino	6	—	—	50.0	—	50.0
Multirace, non-Hispanic/Latino	30	58.3	54.5	36.7	-21.6	65.6
White	642	57.2	63.1	63.9	6.7	70.0
High need	178	32.7	30.8	36.5	3.8	47.3
Economically disadvantaged	124	41.9	39.6	40.3	-1.6	48.9
ELs	2	20.0	—	—	—	27.1
Students with disabilities	74	7.8	6.6	18.9	11.1	33.2