

# Holbrook Public Schools

## Targeted District Review Report

February 2023

---

### **Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

75 Pleasant Street  
Malden, MA 02148-4906  
781-338-3000  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)

### **American Institutes for Research**

Education Systems and Policy

201 Jones Road, Suite 100  
Waltham, MA 02451  
202-403-5000  
[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)



# Contents

- Executive Summary ..... 1
- Holbrook Public Schools: District Review Overview ..... 3
- Curriculum and Instruction ..... 7
- Assessment ..... 12
- Student Support ..... 15
- Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities ..... A-1
- Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report ..... B-1
- Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators .... C-1
- Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures ..... D-1
- Appendix E. Student Performance Data ..... E-1



MASSACHUSETTS

Department of Elementary  
and Secondary Education



Advancing Evidence.  
Improving Lives.

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

Jeffrey C. Riley  
Commissioner

**Published August 2023**

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

© 2023 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper.

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

## Executive Summary

---

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a targeted review of Holbrook Public Schools (hereafter, Holbrook) in February 2023. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on three of the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.<sup>1</sup>

### Curriculum and Instruction

Holbrook uses systems and structures to ensure that the K-5 curriculum is vertically and horizontally aligned. Teachers districtwide use Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to plan their instruction. At the high school level, students have access to a variety of advanced course offerings including Advanced Placement (AP) classes, college courses at Middlesex Community College, and College and Career Pathways. These are all strengths for the district. A need for greater transparency around the curriculum selection process and increasing elective course offerings at the high school level are areas for growth.

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Holbrook during the week of February 6, 2023. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,<sup>2</sup> guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12). Overall, for the K-5 grade band, instructional observations suggest mixed evidence of emotional support, strong evidence of classroom organization, and mixed evidence of student engagement (Grades 4-5) and instructional support. For the 6-8 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of emotional support, strong evidence of classroom organization, and mixed evidence of instructional support. For the 9-12 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of emotional support, strong evidence of classroom organization, and mixed evidence of instructional support.

### Assessment

Overall, the data and assessment systems as well as data use are areas of growth for the district. The district uses benchmark assessments built into the elementary curricula to frequently assess student progress. However, assessment systems are less established and formal at the middle and high school levels. The elementary and middle school levels recently established data teams, and the district would like to incorporate data teams at the high school as well. Currently, districtwide expectations do not exist for monitoring data or using data to inform instruction and teachers stated

---

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

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

that they lack adequate time to analyze and collaborate around student data. Providing professional development and collaboration opportunities around using data to inform instruction are areas of growth for the district. Furthermore, communication regarding student progress is initiated on an as-needed basis, but there is no district-wide expectation for proactive communication with families, which is an area for growth for Holbrook.

## **Student Support**

Student support is a strength for the district, and students and families feel safe and valued. Holbrook's strengths include providing professional development around social emotional learning, successfully implementing social-emotional supports in grades 9-12, and providing many opportunities for family and student engagement and feedback. Areas for growth include inconsistencies in how staff respond to behavior challenges at the middle school level, the need to strengthen Tier 1 instructional supports, and the need to increase supports and interventions to meet students' social-emotional needs.

# Holbrook Public Schools: District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

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

## Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data prior to conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including school committee members, teachers' association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students' families. Virtual interviews and focus groups also are conducted as needed. Information about review activities and the site visit schedule is in Appendix A. Team members also observe classroom instruction and collect data using the CLASS protocol. The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report resulting from these classroom observations is in Appendix B.

Following the site visit, the team members code and analyze the data to develop a set of objective findings. The team lead and multiple quality assurance reviewers, including DESE staff, then review the initial draft of the report. DESE staff provides recommendations for the district, based on the findings of strengths and areas of growth identified, before AIR finalizes and submits the report to DESE. DESE previews and then sends the report to the district for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website. DESE also provides additional resources to support implementation of DESE's District Standards and Indicators, summarized in Appendix C.

## Site Visit

The site visit to Holbrook was conducted during the week of February 6, 2023. The site visit included 17 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 55 stakeholders, including district administrators, school leaders, students, students' families, teachers, specialists, and members of the student support team. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with six elementary school teachers, six middle school teachers, and six high school teachers; one middle school student focus group and one high school student focus group; and two family focus groups.

The site team also conducted 60 observations of classroom instruction in two schools covering Grades K-12. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

## District Profile

Holbrook’s superintendent is Julie Hamilton, who has been in the district for 26 years. Her previous roles in the district included the director of curriculum and the director of special education and pupil personnel services. The district is governed by a school committee composed of five members who are elected for 3-year terms.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 93 teachers in the district, with 1,310 students enrolled in the district’s two schools. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school.

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

| School                            | Type        | Grades served | Enrollment   |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| John F. Kennedy Elementary School | Elementary  | PK-5          | 675          |
| Holbrook Middle-High School       | Middle/High | 6-12          | 635          |
| <b>Total</b>                      |             |               | <b>1,310</b> |

Note. Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2020 and 2023, overall student enrollment increased by one student. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English learners [ELs] and former ELs) compared with the state are in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, attendance, and expenditures.

## Student Performance

In ELA in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) declined 8 percentage points, from 46 percent in 2019 to 38 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 41 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 2 percentage points, from 58 percent in 2019 to 56 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 58 percent (see Tables E1 and E2 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was greater than the state rate by 12 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students; greater than the state rate by 2 percentage points to 4 percentage points for African American/Black students, high needs students, students from low-income households, and ELs and former ELs; and below the state rate by 3 percentage points to 12 percentage points for students with disabilities, White students, Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, and Asian students.

- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was greater than the state rate by 15 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students; greater than the state rate by 1 percentage point and 5 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income households; equal to the state rate for African American/Black students; and below the state rate by 6 percentage points and 14 percentage points for White students and students with disabilities.

In mathematics in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 11 percentage points, from 44 percent in 2019 to 33 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 39 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined 20 percentage points, from 56 percent in 2019 to 36 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 50 percent (see Tables E3 and E4 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was greater than the state rate by 2 percentage points and 7 percentage points for students from low-income households and Hispanic/Latino students; below the state rate by 18 percentage points for Asian students; and below the state rate by 1 percentage point to 8 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was greater than the state rate by 11 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students, below the state rate by 23 percentage points for White students, and below the state rate by 2 percentage points to 9 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

In science in Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 3 percentage points, from 45 percent in 2019 to 42 percent in 2022, which equals the 2022 state rate of 42 percent. In Grade 10, 39 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 47 percent (see Tables E5 and E6 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in science was greater than the state rate by 26 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and greater than the state rate by 2 percentage points to 12 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data, except for African American/Black students, which was 1 percentage point below the state rate.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in science was greater than the state rate by 3 percentage points and 20 percentage points for students from low-income households and Hispanic/Latino students, equal to the state rate for African American/Black students, and below the state rate by 2 percentage points to 19 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the 2022 Next-Generation MCAS assessments in Grades 3-8 ELA was 51.5 and 49.6 in mathematics for all students, which represents typical



growth. In the Grade 10, SGP in ELA was high (65.4), and in mathematics SGP was typical (42.8) for all students<sup>3</sup> (see Tables E7-E10 in Appendix E).

- SGPs in grades 3-8 in ELA were typical ranging from 46.7 to 55.5 for each student group with reportable data, except for Asian students (60.80 which was high and Students with Disabilities (36.5) which was low. Math SGPs were typical ranging from 46.0 to 52.3 for every student group with reportable data, except for Students with Disabilities (36.2) which was low.
- In the 10<sup>th</sup> grade ELA SGPs was high for each student group with reportable data ranging from 66.1 to 68.4. Math SGPs were typical for each student group with reportable data ranging from 40.9 to 45.0.

Holbrook's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students decreased 1.8 percentage points, from 88.9 percent in 2020 to 87.1 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 90.1 percent. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students increased 13.5 percentage points, from 73.5 percent in 2019 to 87.0 percent in 2021, which is below the state rate of 91.8 percent (see Tables E16 and E17 in Appendix E).

- The four-year cohort graduation rate was greater than the state rate in 2022 by 7.7 percentage points and 13.8 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and African American/Black students; below the state rate by 1.1 percentage points and 2.9 percentage points for students from low-income households and high needs students; and below the state rate by 12.4 percentage points to 24.2 percentage points for Asian students, White students, and students with disabilities.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate was greater than the 2021 state rate for each student group with reportable data by 3.0 percentage points to 11.3 percentage points, except for students with disabilities, which was 36.2 percentage points below the state rate.

The district's annual dropout rate increased from 1.0 percent in 2020 to 2.7 percent in 2022, which is greater than the 2022 state rate of 2.1 percent (see Table E20 in Appendix E).

- The dropout rate for students with disabilities was 11.1 percent, which is more than three times the state rate for students with disabilities; it was 17.6 percent for ELs, which is more than twice the state rate. The dropout rate was greater than the state rate for African American/Black students, White students, and high needs students and below the state rate for every other group with reportable data.

---

<sup>3</sup> Average SGP ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0-29.9, Low Growth = 30.0-39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0-59.9, High Growth = 60.0 or higher.

## Curriculum and Instruction

Holbrook engages in a systematic curricular review process that is completed regularly. The district uses vertical alignment teams to ensure that curricula are aligned through grade bands, and grade-level teams work to make sure that curricula are horizontally aligned. In addition to using CURATE ratings, the district employs a standards checklist when reviewing materials and choosing supplementary materials. Although the district has systems and practices in place to ensure the selection of standards-aligned curricula, many teachers are unaware of the details of the process.

ELA and mathematics curricula at the elementary and middle school include Fountas and Pinnell, Heggerty, EnVisions Math, IXL, MyView, and Bridges. Science and social studies curricula are teacher created. The high school uses primarily teacher-created curricula focusing on state standards.

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

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

| Indicator                                    | Strengths   | Areas for growth  |
|--|---|---|
| <a href="#">Curriculum selection and use</a> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District and school leaders ensure vertical and horizontal alignment of curricula for Grades K-5</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transparency of processes used to review and select curricula</li> </ul>                               |
| <a href="#">Classroom instruction</a>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers use Universal Design for Learning (UDL) districtwide to plan instruction.</li> </ul>  |   |
| <a href="#">Student access to coursework</a> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students have access to a variety of advanced course offerings including Advanced Placement (AP) course offerings, college courses through a partnership with Middlesex Community College, and College and Career Pathways.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Widening high school course offerings for students that include a variety of interest areas</li> </ul> |

### Curriculum Selection and Use

The district has intentional systems to (a) ensure that curricula are aligned and consistently meet state standards, (b) archive curriculum, and (c) conduct regular curricular reviews. Holbrook's CURATE table indicates that many of the curricula used throughout the district meet or partially meet expectations, which is especially true at the elementary level. Selecting and using curricula aligned across subject areas and grade levels in the elementary grades is a strength for Holbrook. According to district leaders, vertical alignment teams work to make sure that curricula are aligned through grade bands, and teachers work in grade-level teams to align curricula horizontally. The district uses a standards checklist when reviewing curricula, which helps district leaders know that curricular materials are aligned to state standards. District leaders also said that they use this checklist with teachers when choosing supplemental materials to be sure those materials are aligned to the standards. The checklist outlines the various phases of the curricular review cycle, from identifying

parameters to curriculum implementation. This document also contains the school committee policies for curriculum development and implementation.

District leaders described conducting a curricular review “every 3-5 years.” However, teachers described being unaware of the process, other than being asked to pilot new curricula. One teacher shared their limited experience with the curriculum selection process, saying that they are not involved “beyond just being asked if you want to pilot the program and being part of that process.” Other teachers agreed and explained that they often are not asked for their opinions on the piloted curriculum; if they do provide an opinion, they do not feel that it is considered in the final decision. Though administrators noted that they regularly solicit feedback on curricular decisions through surveys and during PLCs, the perception from teachers suggests that increasing transparency in the curricular review process is an area for growth in the district.

Teachers described overall satisfaction with their curricula but reported often needing to supplement materials because the curriculum is too challenging for their students or does not reflect student diversity. For elementary ELA, the district’s CURATE table lists MyView, Comprehensive Orton-Gillingham, Heggerty, Lively Letters, Morphology Plus as well as some teacher-created curricula for fourth and fifth grades. MyView Literacy meets expectations on CURATE, whereas the other curricula are not rated on CURATE. Staff shared that the teacher-created curriculum pulls from Core Knowledge, which is rated as partially meets expectations on CURATE, along with Making Meaning, Novel Studies, and Empowering Writers curricula, all of which are not rated on CURATE. Elementary teachers explained that they use Bridges as their mathematics curriculum, which has a partially meets expectations rating on CURATE. Elementary teachers specifically discussed creating their own curricula for science and social studies, noting the process as collaborative between their grade-level teams. High school teachers described developing their own curricula by focusing on alignment to state standards. District leaders explained and shared documents verified that the curricula are documented online and organized by folders according to grade level. In addition, district leaders described an induction mentor program in which new teachers are taught the new curricula with an emphasis on how to design units and lessons using Universal Design for Learning (UDL), which is one of the district’s major instructional focus areas in recent years. In addition to a focus on vertical and horizontal curricular alignment, teachers and district leaders spoke of some interdisciplinary planning and lessons, mostly done at the middle school level. District leaders described that teachers are always accommodating to student needs, and teachers further explained the adjustments they make to curricula to meet student learning needs.

## Classroom Instruction

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Holbrook during the week of February 6, 2023. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

The K-3 protocol includes 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. The Upper Elementary and Secondary protocols include 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom

Organization, and Instructional Support, in addition to Student Engagement. The three domains observed at all levels broadly are defined as follows:

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

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

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

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

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were in the high-middle range for the K-5 and 6-8 grade bands (5.0 and 5.1, respectively) and in the middle range for the 9-12 grade band (3.6).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (6.0, 6.2, and 6.7 for K-5, 6-8, and 9-12, respectively).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (3.1, 3.5, and 3.2 for K-5, 6-8, and 9-12, respectively).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the middle range for Grades 4-5 (4.5), the high-middle range for Grades 6-8 (5.1), and the middle range for Grades 9-12 (4.1).

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

Holbrook has a districtwide instructional vision, as expressed by many stakeholders during interviews. Teachers described UDL as their main instructional focus, which is a strength of the

district. District leaders and documents corroborated UDL as a focus; professional learning community and professional development agendas, the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan, and the strategic improvement plan also corroborated the UDL focus. Using UDL as the instructional framework is clearly a goal for the district; district leaders mentioned professional learning focused on UDL as well as a mentor program for new teachers to teach them how to implement this pedagogy in their classrooms. Teachers reported project-based learning and community-based learning as part of the district's use of UDL, although those primarily take place in the younger grades. According to district leaders, implementing a UDL framework further allows teachers to modify instruction to best meet the needs of all students and create a learning environment in which students are encouraged to take risks and ownership of their learning.

District leaders spoke about conducting walkthroughs to monitor instruction, using a checklist to ensure that teachers are aware of certain goals and standards, including curriculum planning, instruction, and the learning environment. Teachers mentioned this checklist as well and confirmed that school leaders monitor instruction through walkthroughs.

## Student Access to Coursework

Allowing students access to advanced coursework and career exploration is a strength for the district overall. The first initiative of the 2022-2026 strategic plan includes “creating and expanding multiple college and career paths for graduates,” which highlights that including more opportunities for college and career readiness is a goal for the district. Holbrook has opportunities for students to engage in rigorous coursework and electives through the district. Teachers mentioned AP classes as an option for students to engage in higher level learning experiences. Teachers encourage students who express interest to take advanced classes, even if they did not obtain a teacher recommendation. High school teachers and students agree that there is room to increase advanced course offerings and the district explained they intend to increase offerings in the near future. A district leader further explained they have approximately “eight more AP classes coming.” District leaders reported that the district has recently joined a consortium and now partners with Middlesex Community College. Through this partnership students have access to a variety of college course offerings and can earn up to 12 credits before graduating. When discussing the process for students to enroll in college classes, teachers described needing a teacher recommendation but also shared that “we’re not opting anyone out.” The district also has partnered with the organization Schools to Careers, which offered classes such as an emergency medical technician training class for students. Even with the courses offered within the district and at the college, teachers and students alike described wanting more options for classes, which was tied to students revealing that they can demonstrate interest in elective classes via Google Forms but are unlikely to get their first choice. Widening course offerings to students that include a variety of interest areas is an area for growth for the high school.

District leaders discussed the College and Career Pathways program, which aims to provide alternative pathways to success for students who are not on a “traditional trajectory.” They also provided information on an alternative pathway for students who are struggling mentally and emotionally to remain in school and on track. These pathways support students by providing alternate opportunities to earn and recover credits. According to district leaders, other avenues provided to students to connect coursework to postsecondary goals include career exploration

courses. Non-academic courses called, “exploratories,” are provided at the middle school level and allow students to explore a variety of non-academic courses. The high school hosts career fairs to help students connect their learning to postsecondary goals and opportunities.

## Recommendations

- The district should revise its curriculum review process to incorporate teacher input and feedback in decision-making and ensure transparency in curriculum selection decisions with staff.
- Where feasible, the district should expand its course offerings and provide greater access to courses that are in demand.

## Assessment

---

The elementary level uses frequent benchmark assessments administered to students throughout the year. District leaders are hoping to implement a distinct progress monitoring system to ensure that teachers are using data to inform instruction. Data for benchmark assessments are tracked, although such tracking is limited to the elementary and middle school levels only. The district started implementing data teams, primarily at the lower grade levels, but meetings are infrequent. Assessment systems are less formal at the secondary levels. The district is aware of the changes that could improve their assessment systems, bolster the use of data, and make more data readily available for teachers to use.

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

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

| Indicator                                   | Strengths   | Areas for growth  |
|---|---|---|
| <a href="#">Data and assessment systems</a> |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Districtwide expectations for assessment use and benchmark testing for Grades 9-12</li></ul>  |
| <a href="#">Data use</a>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Elementary and middle school levels use data teams to analyze data.</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Providing adequate time for teachers to analyze and collaborate around student data</li><li>■ Professional development on how to use data to inform instruction</li></ul> |
| <a href="#">Sharing results</a>             |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Consistent communication with families about student progress</li></ul>   |

### Data and Assessment Systems

Holbrook has documented assessment sequences for Grades K-8. These sequences include the types of benchmark assessments administered and their frequency. At the elementary and middle school levels, assessments are built into the curriculum. For example, the elementary ELA curriculum, MyView, has assessments after each unit, as does the Orton-Gillingham curriculum. The district also has documented fluency norms for Oral Reading benchmark assessments. At the middle school, teachers spoke about IXL and Edulastic benchmark testing as a form of assessment and data collection.

Although teachers and district leaders described an increased districtwide focus on data use in recent years, the district is currently working on implementing supportive systems in a meaningful and sustainable way. Teachers described data use as a practice left up to the teachers. Many stakeholders, including teachers and district leaders, mentioned that the district reviews MCAS data. District leaders also mentioned the use of Panorama surveys to track nonacademic data like attendance and intervention tracking. Similarly, for students receiving interventions, a checklist tracks student progress. Although some systems are in place to support data collection and

assessment, consistent expectations do not exist for assessment use and benchmark testing for Grades 9-12, thus making this an area for growth for Grades 9-12.

## Data Use

Effectively using data is a goal for Holbrook, but data use at all levels is inconsistent. One district leader mentioned that a goal within the district regarding data use is to develop a concrete progress monitoring system that tracks how teachers are using data and ensures that they are using relevant data to inform instruction. District leaders described using a districtwide spreadsheet to track student data, and a review of district documents showed that the spreadsheets track student progress for a benchmark assessment in Grades K-8. Additionally, district leaders discussed using data to inform instruction, citing data collection strategies and data meetings that focus on communicating with students and families about students' progress. This data is used to determine whether a student would benefit from additional support and whether they should be referred to the child study team to access further interventions.

However, teachers reported that they do not have regularly designated time to review data with grade-level or content area teams; data review might occur during professional learning community time, but there is no regular schedule for data review. Teachers at the elementary and middle school levels spoke about data meetings led by the district curriculum director that take place following the benchmark assessments, which can be administered up to three times per year, depending on the grade and the assessment. According to district documents, these data team meetings focus on curriculum-embedded benchmark assessments, such as those within Orton-Gillingham, and a review of MCAS data, when applicable. Under the district's expectation, teachers use data to inform instruction, but when this is done and how it is accomplished is determined by individual teachers. Although the district leads data meetings at the elementary and middle school levels, teachers across the district reported not having adequate time to analyze the data shared with them and this is an area of growth for the district.

Similarly, teacher focus groups and interviews of district leaders revealed that professional development focused on data use is an area of growth. District leaders mentioned the availability of in-person and online professional development opportunities, and district and school leaders have embedded data use into professional learning related to UDL. Teachers, however, said they have not been offered specific data-focused professional development. District leaders explained the need to implement structures for data use, but there is a gap between the intention and the facilitation of professional development to ensure implementation of data use systems.

## Sharing Results

Teachers, district leaders, students, and parents mentioned the most common forms of data sharing between the district and parents are through report cards, sent on a trimester schedule, and progress reports, sent halfway through each trimester. Parents agree that they receive report cards but said that communication beyond report cards is inconsistent and varies from teacher to teacher, making consistent communication about student progress an area of growth. According to teachers, after the first round of report cards, subsequent communication with families is sent on an as needed basis. At the elementary level, teachers reported sending home communication that outlines



assignments and the alignment to specific standards as well as information on how students are meeting or working toward those standards. Elementary teachers also have multiple unit assessments built into their curriculum, to which parents have access to the results through teacher-created reports or reports created on the various online curricular resource platforms. For example, families have access to weekly Orton-Gillingham reports. Secondary teachers and parents said that families have access to Aspen, which houses student grades; parents and families often have access to Google Classroom to access grades and assignment details. Students described some inconsistencies with when and how often teachers post grades to Aspen, with most students voicing that they have to take it upon themselves to either check online or check in with teachers after school to discuss their grades. Schools also conduct parent-teacher conferences twice per year for parents to communicate with teachers about student progress. District leaders mentioned that schools send home MCAS and IXL data as well. The district shares data regarding social-emotional learning gathered via an annual Panorama assessment. Overall, the district has systems in place to share data with families, although communication to students and families are areas for improvement.

## Recommendations

- The district should implement consistent expectations around assessment use and benchmark testing in Grades 9-12.
- The district should establish structures that allow teachers the opportunity to analyze their own student data and collaborate with peers to identify patterns and adjust instructional practices.
- The district should establish a system for monitoring student progress throughout the year that teachers, administrators, and district leaders can reference to quickly address and remediate learning gaps.
- Based on the new data systems and structures that are implemented, the district should develop professional development and train teachers on how to best use the data available to them.
- The district should set clear expectations around communication with students and families and proactively push information out to families through improved systems.

## Student Support

Holbrook students and families reported feeling safe and valued at school, and they have ample opportunities to engage with school leaders. Holbrook has a student support team that works to develop interventions and ensure that students' learning and social-emotional needs are met. The district is in the middle of fully developing Tier 1 instructional supports. In addition, even though behavioral expectations are widely known among students and families, a recent uptick in challenging behaviors has led to some concerns surrounding how such behaviors are addressed. Recent measures have aimed to identify the root causes of such behaviors in lieu of relying on punitive consequences.

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

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

| Indicator  | Strengths   | Areas for growth   |
|--|---|--|
| <a href="#">Safe and supportive school climate and culture</a>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Social-emotional learning professional development and support are provided.</li> <li>■ Schools implement social-emotional learning supports for Grades 9-12.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Lacking consistency in staff responses to challenging behaviors and effective behavioral interventions at the middle school level</li> </ul>                                    |
| <a href="#">Tiered systems of support</a>                                  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Strengthening Tier 1 instruction</li> <li>■ Supports and interventions specifically for students' social-emotional needs at the elementary and middle school levels.</li> </ul> |
| <a href="#">Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships</a> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district provides many opportunities for family and student engagement, and schools frequently respond and adjust to family feedback.</li> </ul>                     |  |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

Holbrook has prioritized creating a safe and supportive school climate and culture. According to the district's strategic improvement plan, the strategic objective regarding climate and culture is "to improve overall districtwide climate and culture to consolidate, streamline, and communicate processes and protocols." The district has focused on creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment, particularly on meeting student needs as they returned to in-person learning after the pandemic. Overall, the implementation of social-emotional learning supports is a strength of the district for Grades 9-12.

District leaders explained that the district hired adjustment counselors and a psychologist to work with students who are showing signs of mental health concerns. District and school leaders reported that one way teachers foster an inclusive and supportive learning environment is by using activators and exit tickets focused on social-emotional learning at the high school. In addition, elementary,

middle, and high school teachers, as well as school specialists, explained that professional development for all grade-level educators included topics such as how to implement social-emotional learning daily and de-escalation training, which is a strength of the district. District leaders and school support specialists said that school adjustment counselors have been working with teachers to develop and implement a more robust social-emotional learning curriculum. Furthermore, teachers at all levels discussed connecting with students, particularly outside the academic day, as an ongoing value and priority.

Although most students stated that they felt safe and respected at school, middle school students described inconsistencies in how school staff address behaviors and stated that many times student behaviors persist even after being addressed. Though positive behavioral interventions and supports exist at all school levels, according to district leaders and teachers, teachers and district leaders acknowledged a recent uptick in student behavioral issues at the middle school level. School leadership have responded in multiple ways: by providing assemblies and grade-level meetings to address commonly occurring behaviors; by employing conversations with students about problematic behaviors prior to suspension to better understand the causes of the behavior and create a “less punitive” system within the school; and utilizing a newly created “behavior matrix”—a system the district developed to better track student behavior and understand the underlying causes. District leaders also shared that an antibullying curriculum is built into health classes at the middle and high school levels, and that they are able to track student referrals to ensure that no student demographic groups are overidentified with behavioral issues, which district leaders said is currently not the case. Results from the Views of Climate and Learning student survey indicate a relatively strong school climate across all school levels and student subgroups, as evidenced by overall school climate scores in the “favorable” range (51 to 70, with a maximum score of 100). Average engagement climate, safety climate, and environment climate scores also were in the “favorable” range. Nonetheless, increasing consistency and implementing interventions in response to behavior challenges at the middle school level is an area for growth for Holbrook.

District leaders and teachers also believe that integrating student culture and identity is an area of growth for the district. As noted in the Curriculum and Development section, teachers often feel the need to supplement curricula to better represent Holbrook’s student diversity, and students shared they have not experienced any lessons that included their personal background and culture. In addition, the Regard for Student Perspectives dimension in the CLASS protocol 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. Average scores in the low end of the middle range across all grade bands in Holbrook indicates that, in many classrooms, there are few opportunities for students to express themselves or bring their background into the lesson.

## Tiered Systems of Support

Holbrook uses a multitiered system of support (MTSS) to meet the needs of all students. However, strengthening Tier 1 instruction is an area of growth for the district. Developing a clear, districtwide MTSS is part of the student support strategic objective outlined in the district improvement plan and at each school. Information collected through the district review confirmed that although language and protocols vary, each school has a multidisciplinary team that meets with classroom teachers to review data and develop appropriate intervention plans based on student needs. Districtwide, the

focus is on improving Tier 1 Instruction, primarily through the shift to a UDL framework and employing support staff, such as behavioral therapists and adjustment counselors, to ensure that students' social-emotional needs are met. District and school leaders explained that strengthening Tier 1 instruction would include providing teachers with the tools to collect and analyze data to inform instruction and identify appropriate instructional methods to meet the needs of students more holistically.

District leaders shared that they want to strengthen their MTSS processes so that students do not go straight to a referral process for special education. When describing the process for identifying students who need additional support, district leaders mentioned that teachers primarily identify students, and teacher-driven supports are the main interventions in the classroom. The teacher-driven identification process is outlined in the Child Study Team procedure document shared by the district. However, systems for referrals vary slightly by school, with a district leader saying:

At the elementary school, it sounds a little more defined. There's a guidance meeting and there's a student support meeting. So at the middle-high school, it's just kind of a guidance meeting where we are separating those to be a student support and the guidance meeting. Guidance meeting is a little more catchall—where we are dealing with the behaviors, the emotional piece, the attendance piece—whereas SST [the student support team] is more academically driven with the accommodations and those Tier 2 and 3 interventions.

At the elementary level, teachers described the process as a “child study referral team,” and middle and high school teachers mentioned a “student support team.” However, both processes stem from teacher identification of students and involve other staff to develop a plan for intervention and monitor supports. At the elementary level, the Orton-Gillingham curriculum has benchmark assessments built into it that allow teachers to identify students needing support, and the elementary schools provide Tier 1 reading support for those identified. District leaders mentioned that it is usually the guidance department that works on implementing Tier 2 and 3 supports. According to teachers and district leaders, Holbrook uses assessments to monitor student progress in academic interventions whereas social-emotional data comes from informal observations and occurs at all levels.

District leaders know that supports and interventions that address students' social-emotional needs are an area of growth at the elementary and middle levels. The district relies mostly on data from Panorama as a diagnostic tool to flag students needing social-emotional support and student support specialists say that there are missed opportunities to collect more data. The district has worked to hire board-certified behavioral analysts and registered behavior technicians to work with students needing behavioral or emotional support, but the district had not sufficiently staffed these roles at the time of the review. District leaders stated that many students who receive referrals for social-emotional needs are referred to an outside agency, and this highlights the fact that the district is not equipped to support students with more intensive needs internally. To support internal capacity and current staff, school leaders and teachers across grade levels shared that professional development this year has focused on UDL and social-emotional learning, and they feel those two are intertwined in the way they are implemented in the classroom.

## Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Holbrook has various opportunities for parents and students to engage within the district, as well as partnerships within the community, which is a strength of the district. Parents primarily mentioned school councils at the two schools as well as parent groups as the methods for parent involvement. They also mentioned a Facebook group centered on community and school events as a way to share news and updates. Parents shared that teachers, principals, and the superintendent primarily communicate with families via email, and teachers are generally very responsive should a parent reach out with a question or a concern. Teachers shared that documents sent home can be translated into a student's home language for more effective communication. Although these opportunities are available for parents, some worried that the timing of parent meetings can be limiting for parents who work full time because many volunteer opportunities are available only during the school day.

Students mentioned school council as a leadership opportunity, as well as the National Honor Society and class officers. Students felt that when they do have meetings with the principal and offer suggestions to improve the school culture, those suggestions are heard, with changes implemented.

District leaders explained that Holbrook recently joined a consortium of nine districts, which allowed them to expand their course offerings and programming, and they also described a few partnerships with community organizations. Teachers described a partnership with Dove, a domestic violence shelter network, which provides high schoolers training on dating violence and safe relationships, and ninth graders receive the Free From Depression curriculum from Boston Children's Hospital. District leaders shared that the district has a strong partnership with the Quincy Family Resource Center, which is a helpful resource for families in the district.

## DESE Recommendations

- The district should strengthen Tier 1 instruction by establishing a strong culture of responsiveness to data in which teachers are equipped with high-quality data collection tools and regularly use data to plan differentiated instruction and implement just-in-time supports that meet the needs of all learners.
- District and school leaders and staff should ensure that curriculum selection, student support, and family engagement efforts honor and reflect the various cultures and identities of the district's students.
- The district should both develop existing staff's ability to support students' Tier 1 social-emotional needs in the classroom and through intervention, while also identifying ways to fill BCBA and registered behavior technician positions that can internally serve students with greater needs.

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

---

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Holbrook. The team conducted 60 classroom observations during the week of February 6, 2023, and held interviews and focus groups on February 8-9, 2023. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

- Superintendent
- Other district leaders
- Teachers' association members
- Principals
- Teachers
- Support specialists
- Student support staff
- Parents
- Students

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- Curricular review process and timeline
- The Holbrook curriculum unit template
- Published educational reports on the district by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district's end-of-year financial reports

# Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

---

## *Holbrook Public Schools*

### Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

## Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

February 2023



# Contents

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

Three observers visited Holbrook Public Schools during the week of February 6, 2023. Observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across two schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

**Table 1. CLASS K-3 Domains and Dimensions**

| Emotional Support   | Classroom Organization  | Instructional Support   |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Positive Climate</li><li>• Negative Climate</li><li>• Teacher Sensitivity</li><li>• Regard for Student Perspectives</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Behavior Management</li><li>• Productivity</li><li>• Instructional Learning Formats</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concept Development</li><li>• Quality of Feedback</li><li>• Language Modeling</li></ul> |

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

**Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Positive Climate

---

### *Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

#### **Positive Climate District Average\*: 4.5**

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades K-5  | 1         | 0 | 9            | 7 | 4 | 8          | 3 | 60 | 4.5     |
| Grades 6-8  | 0         | 0 | 3            | 2 | 2 | 4          | 3 | 14 | 5.1     |
| Grades 9-12 | 0         | 2 | 5            | 4 | 3 | 0          | 0 | 14 | 3.6     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 2] + [3 \times 17] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 9] + [6 \times 12] + [7 \times 6]) \div 60$  observations = 4.5

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

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

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

## Teacher Sensitivity

---

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.2**

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |    | High Range |    | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|----|------------|----|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5  | 6          | 7  |    |         |
| Grades K–5  | 2         | 0 | 1            | 6 | 10 | 3          | 10 | 32 | 5.2     |
| Grades 6-8  | 0         | 0 | 0            | 2 | 0  | 5          | 7  | 14 | 6.2     |
| Grades 9-12 | 0         | 2 | 3            | 5 | 1  | 2          | 1  | 14 | 4.1     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 2] + [2 \times 2] + [3 \times 4] + [4 \times 13] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 10] + [7 \times 18]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

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

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

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

## Regard for Student Perspectives

---

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 3.5**

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades K–5  | 0         | 9 | 13           | 3 | 2 | 4          | 1 | 32 | 3.4     |
| Grades 6-8  | 0         | 2 | 5            | 1 | 4 | 1          | 1 | 14 | 4.0     |
| Grades 9-12 | 1         | 4 | 5            | 2 | 0 | 2          | 0 | 14 | 3.1     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 15] + [3 \times 23] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 2]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 3.5$

**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.<sup>1</sup>

**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 | 1 | 2          | 29 | 32 | 6.9     |
| Grades 6–8  | 0         | 0 | 0            | 0 | 0 | 1          | 13 | 14 | 6.9     |
| Grades 9–12 | 0         | 0 | 0            | 0 | 0 | 2          | 12 | 14 | 6.9     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:  $([5 \times 1] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 54]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

**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.

---

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

## Behavior Management

---

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

**Behavior Management District Average\*: 6.5**

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |    | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|----|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7  |    |         |
| Grades K–5  | 0         | 1 | 0            | 0 | 1 | 7          | 23 | 32 | 6.6     |
| Grades 6–8  | 0         | 0 | 0            | 2 | 3 | 1          | 8  | 14 | 6.1     |
| Grades 9–12 | 0         | 0 | 0            | 0 | 2 | 2          | 10 | 14 | 6.6     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 10] + [7 \times 41]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 6.5$

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

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

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



## Productivity

---

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

**Productivity District Average\*: 6.4**

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |    | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|----|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7  |    |         |
| Grades K–5  | 0         | 1 | 0            | 0 | 1 | 2          | 28 | 32 | 6.7     |
| Grades 6–8  | 0         | 1 | 1            | 1 | 2 | 4          | 5  | 14 | 5.6     |
| Grades 9–12 | 0         | 0 | 0            | 1 | 1 | 1          | 11 | 14 | 6.6     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 44]) \div 60$  observations = 6.4

**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\*: 4.6

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades K–5  | 0         | 2 | 5            | 7 | 8 | 5          | 5 | 32 | 4.8     |
| Grades 6–8  | 0         | 2 | 1            | 3 | 5 | 2          | 1 | 14 | 4.5     |
| Grades 9–12 | 0         | 0 | 5            | 5 | 1 | 2          | 1 | 14 | 4.2     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 4] + [3 \times 11] + [4 \times 15] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 7]) \div 60 \text{ observations} = 4.6$

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

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

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

## Concept Development

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Concept Development District Average\*: 2.7**

| Grade Band   | Low Range |    | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|--------------|-----------|----|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|              | 1         | 2  | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades K–3** | 4         | 10 | 1            | 4 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 21 | 2.7     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 4] + [2 \times 10] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 4] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 1]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 2.7$

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

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

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

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

## Content Understanding

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12*

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

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

**Content Understanding District Average\*: 3.3**

| Grade Band   | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|              | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades 4-5** | 1         | 1 | 7            | 2 | 0 | 0          | 0 | 11 | 2.9     |
| Grades 6-8   | 1         | 3 | 3            | 3 | 2 | 1          | 1 | 14 | 3.6     |
| Grades 9-12  | 0         | 5 | 6            | 1 | 0 | 0          | 2 | 14 | 3.3     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 2] + [2 \times 9] + [3 \times 16] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 3]) \div 39 \text{ observations} = 3.3$

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

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

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

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

## Analysis and Inquiry

---

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

### Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.5

| Grade Band   | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|              | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades 4-5** | 3         | 2 | 4            | 2 | 0 | 0          | 0 | 11 | 2.5     |
| Grades 6-8   | 4         | 6 | 1            | 1 | 1 | 0          | 1 | 14 | 2.5     |
| Grades 9-12  | 6         | 3 | 1            | 2 | 1 | 0          | 1 | 14 | 2.5     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 13] + [2 \times 11] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 2] + [7 \times 2]) \div 39 \text{ observations} = 2.5$

\*\*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\*: 3.5**

| Grade Band  | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|             | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades K–5  | 7         | 3 | 9            | 4 | 2 | 1          | 6 | 32 | 3.6     |
| Grades 6–8  | 2         | 2 | 5            | 0 | 0 | 2          | 3 | 14 | 3.9     |
| Grades 9–12 | 2         | 5 | 2            | 1 | 2 | 2          | 0 | 14 | 3.1     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 11] + [2 \times 10] + [3 \times 16] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 5] + [7 \times 9]) \div 60$  observations = 3.5

**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\*: 3.5**

| Grade Band   | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|              | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades K–3** | 2         | 7 | 3            | 3 | 2 | 2          | 2 | 21 | 3.5     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 2] + [2 \times 7] + [3 \times 3] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 2]) \div 21 \text{ observations} = 3.5$

\*\*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\*: 2.8**

| Grade Band   | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|              | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades 4-5** | 2         | 2 | 4            | 3 | 0 | 0          | 0 | 11 | 2.7     |
| Grades 6-8   | 5         | 3 | 1            | 3 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 14 | 2.8     |
| Grades 9-12  | 6         | 2 | 2            | 1 | 1 | 0          | 2 | 14 | 2.8     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 13] + [2 \times 7] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 1] + [6 \times 1] + [7 \times 3]) \div 39 \text{ observations} = 2.8$

\*\*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\*: 4.6**

| Grade Band   | Low Range |   | Middle Range |   |   | High Range |   | n  | Average |
|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|---|---|------------|---|----|---------|
|              | 1         | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6          | 7 |    |         |
| Grades 4-5** | 0         | 0 | 1            | 4 | 6 | 0          | 0 | 11 | 4.5     |
| Grades 6-8   | 0         | 0 | 2            | 2 | 4 | 4          | 2 | 14 | 5.1     |
| Grades 9-12  | 0         | 1 | 4            | 5 | 1 | 3          | 0 | 14 | 4.1     |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 11] + [5 \times 11] + [6 \times 7] + [7 \times 2]) \div 39 \text{ observations} = 4.6$

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

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

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

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

|                                      | Low Range |           | Middle Range |           |           | High Range |           | n          | Average Scores* |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|
|                                      | 1         | 2         | 3            | 4         | 5         | 6          | 7         |            |                 |
| <b>Emotional Support Domain</b>      | <b>3</b>  | <b>9</b>  | <b>23</b>    | <b>16</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>17</b>  | <b>43</b> | <b>128</b> | <b>5.0</b>      |
| Positive Climate                     | 1         | 0         | 9            | 7         | 4         | 8          | 3         | 32         | 4.5             |
| Negative Climate**                   | 0         | 0         | 0            | 0         | 1         | 2          | 29        | 32         | 6.9             |
| Teacher Sensitivity                  | 2         | 0         | 1            | 6         | 10        | 3          | 10        | 32         | 5.2             |
| Regard for Student Perspectives      | 0         | 9         | 13           | 3         | 2         | 4          | 1         | 32         | 3.4             |
| <b>Classroom Organization Domain</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>     | <b>7</b>  | <b>10</b> | <b>14</b>  | <b>56</b> | <b>96</b>  | <b>6.0</b>      |
| Behavior Management                  | 0         | 1         | 0            | 0         | 1         | 7          | 23        | 32         | 6.6             |
| Productivity                         | 0         | 1         | 0            | 0         | 1         | 2          | 28        | 32         | 6.7             |
| Instructional Learning Formats***    | 0         | 2         | 5            | 7         | 8         | 5          | 5         | 32         | 4.8             |
| <b>Instructional Support Domain</b>  | <b>19</b> | <b>25</b> | <b>28</b>    | <b>18</b> | <b>4</b>  | <b>4</b>   | <b>9</b>  | <b>107</b> | <b>3.1</b>      |
| Concept Development (K–3 only)       | 4         | 10        | 1            | 4         | 0         | 1          | 1         | 21         | 2.7             |
| Content Understanding (UE only)      | 1         | 1         | 7            | 2         | 0         | 0          | 0         | 11         | 2.9             |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)       | 3         | 2         | 4            | 2         | 0         | 0          | 0         | 11         | 2.5             |
| Quality of Feedback                  | 7         | 3         | 9            | 4         | 2         | 1          | 6         | 32         | 3.6             |
| Language Modeling (K–3 only)         | 2         | 7         | 3            | 3         | 2         | 2          | 2         | 21         | 3.5             |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only)     | 2         | 2         | 4            | 3         | 0         | 0          | 0         | 11         | 2.7             |
| <b>Student Engagement (UE only)</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>     | <b>4</b>  | <b>6</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>  | <b>11</b>  | <b>4.5</b>      |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [3 \times 9] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 8] + [7 \times 3]) \div 32 \text{ observations} = 4.5$

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment:  $([5 \times 1] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 29]) \div 32 \text{ observations} = 6.9$ . In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

|                                      | Low Range |           | Middle Range |           |          | High Range |           | n         | Average Scores* |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
|                                      | 1         | 2         | 3            | 4         | 5        | 6          | 7         |           |                 |
| <b>Emotional Support Domain</b>      | <b>0</b>  | <b>2</b>  | <b>8</b>     | <b>5</b>  | <b>6</b> | <b>10</b>  | <b>11</b> | <b>42</b> | <b>5.1</b>      |
| Positive Climate                     | 0         | 0         | 3            | 2         | 2        | 4          | 3         | 14        | 5.1             |
| Teacher Sensitivity                  | 0         | 0         | 0            | 2         | 0        | 5          | 7         | 14        | 6.2             |
| Regard for Student Perspectives      | 0         | 2         | 5            | 1         | 4        | 1          | 1         | 14        | 4.0             |
| <b>Classroom Organization Domain</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>1</b>     | <b>3</b>  | <b>5</b> | <b>6</b>   | <b>26</b> | <b>42</b> | <b>6.2</b>      |
| Behavior Management                  | 0         | 0         | 0            | 2         | 3        | 1          | 8         | 14        | 6.1             |
| Productivity                         | 0         | 1         | 1            | 1         | 2        | 4          | 5         | 14        | 5.6             |
| Negative Climate**                   | 0         | 0         | 0            | 0         | 0        | 1          | 13        | 14        | 6.9             |
| <b>Instructional Support Domain</b>  | <b>12</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>11</b>    | <b>10</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>6</b>   | <b>7</b>  | <b>70</b> | <b>3.5</b>      |
| Instructional Learning Formats       | 0         | 2         | 1            | 3         | 5        | 2          | 1         | 14        | 4.5             |
| Content Understanding                | 1         | 3         | 3            | 3         | 2        | 1          | 1         | 14        | 3.6             |
| Analysis and Inquiry                 | 4         | 6         | 1            | 1         | 1        | 0          | 1         | 14        | 2.5             |
| Quality of Feedback                  | 2         | 2         | 5            | 0         | 0        | 2          | 3         | 14        | 3.9             |
| Instructional Dialogue               | 5         | 3         | 1            | 3         | 0        | 1          | 1         | 14        | 2.8             |
| <b>Student Engagement</b>            | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>2</b>     | <b>2</b>  | <b>4</b> | <b>4</b>   | <b>2</b>  | <b>14</b> | <b>5.1</b>      |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 3] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 3]) \div 14 \text{ observations} = 5.1$

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 13]) \div 14 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

|                                      | Low Range |           | Middle Range |           |          | High Range |           | n         | Average Scores* |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
|                                      | 1         | 2         | 3            | 4         | 5        | 6          | 7         |           |                 |
| <b>Emotional Support Domain</b>      | <b>1</b>  | <b>8</b>  | <b>13</b>    | <b>11</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>4</b>   | <b>1</b>  | <b>42</b> | <b>3.6</b>      |
| Positive Climate                     | 0         | 2         | 5            | 4         | 3        | 0          | 0         | 14        | 3.6             |
| Teacher Sensitivity                  | 0         | 2         | 3            | 5         | 1        | 2          | 1         | 14        | 4.1             |
| Regard for Student Perspectives      | 1         | 4         | 5            | 2         | 0        | 2          | 0         | 14        | 3.1             |
| <b>Classroom Organization Domain</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>     | <b>1</b>  | <b>3</b> | <b>5</b>   | <b>33</b> | <b>42</b> | <b>6.7</b>      |
| Behavior Management                  | 0         | 0         | 0            | 0         | 2        | 2          | 10        | 14        | 6.6             |
| Productivity                         | 0         | 0         | 0            | 1         | 1        | 1          | 11        | 14        | 6.6             |
| Negative Climate**                   | 0         | 0         | 0            | 0         | 0        | 2          | 12        | 14        | 6.9             |
| <b>Instructional Support Domain</b>  | <b>14</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>16</b>    | <b>10</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b>   | <b>6</b>  | <b>70</b> | <b>3.2</b>      |
| Instructional Learning Formats       | 0         | 0         | 5            | 5         | 1        | 2          | 1         | 14        | 4.2             |
| Content Understanding                | 0         | 5         | 6            | 1         | 0        | 0          | 2         | 14        | 3.3             |
| Analysis and Inquiry                 | 6         | 3         | 1            | 2         | 1        | 0          | 1         | 14        | 2.5             |
| Quality of Feedback                  | 2         | 5         | 2            | 1         | 2        | 2          | 0         | 14        | 3.1             |
| Instructional Dialogue               | 6         | 2         | 2            | 1         | 1        | 0          | 2         | 14        | 2.8             |
| <b>Student Engagement</b>            | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>4</b>     | <b>5</b>  | <b>1</b> | <b>3</b>   | <b>0</b>  | <b>14</b> | <b>4.1</b>      |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 3]) \div 14 \text{ observations} = 3.6$

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment:  $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 12]) \div 14 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

## References

---

- Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf>
- MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from [http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS\\_10\\_29\\_10.pdf](http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf)
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.
- Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K–3*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

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

**Table C1. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction**

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

**Table C2. Resources to Support Assessment**

| Resource  | Description   |
|---|---|
| DESE’s <a href="#">District Data Team Toolkit</a> | A set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team. |

**Table C3. Resources to Support Student Support**

| Resource   | Description  |
|--|--|
| <a href="#">Safe and Supportive Schools (SaSS) Framework and Self-Reflection Tool</a>  | Based on <a href="#">Five Essential Elements</a> , these resources (see <a href="#">At-a-Glance overview</a> ) can help guide school- and district-based teams create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures. Through a phased process (with preliminary and deeper dive self-reflection options), teams can create plans based on local context and data, and through examination of <a href="#">six areas</a> of school operation. |
| <a href="#">MTSS Blueprint</a>   | This resource offers a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.   |
| <a href="#">Prenatal Through Young Adulthood Family Engagement Framework for Massachusetts</a>   | This resource offers a roadmap for practitioners and families in health, human services, and education. A companion document is the <a href="#">Family, School and Community Partnership Fundamentals Self-Assessment Version 2.0</a> .  |
| State and local student survey data such as <a href="#">Views of Climate and Learning</a> and the <a href="#">Youth Risk Behavior Survey</a> | State and local student survey data can provide information about student experiences, strengths, and needs. They also help prompt additional local inquiry through focus groups, advisories, and ongoing communication with students, families, staff, and partners to inform continuous improvement efforts.   |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

| Group                   | District | Percentage of total | State   | Percentage of total |
|-------------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|
| All                     | 1,310    | 100.0%              | 913,735 | 100.0%              |
| African American        | 306      | 23.4%               | 85,662  | 9.4%                |
| Asian                   | 78       | 6.0%                | 67,010  | 7.3%                |
| Hispanic                | 227      | 17.3%               | 221,044 | 24.2%               |
| Native American         | 4        | 0.3%                | 2,155   | 0.2%                |
| White                   | 590      | 45.0%               | 496,800 | 54.4%               |
| Native Hawaiian         | 0        | 0.0%                | 787     | 0.1%                |
| Multirace, Non-Hispanic | 105      | 8.0%                | 40,277  | 4.4%                |

Note. As of October 1, 2022.

**Table D2. Holbrook Public Schools: 2022-2023 Student Enrollment by High-Need Populations**

| Group                        | District |                         |                        | State   |                         |                     |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------------------|
|                              | N        | Percentage of high need | Percentage of district | N       | Percentage of high need | Percentage of state |
| All students with high needs | 775      | 100.0%                  | 58.2%                  | 508,820 | 100.0%                  | 55.1%               |
| Students with disabilities   | 279      | 36.0%                   | 20.9%                  | 179,095 | 35.2%                   | 19.4%               |
| Low-income households        | 576      | 74.3%                   | 44.0%                  | 386,060 | 75.9%                   | 42.3%               |
| ELs and former ELs           | 93       | 12.0%                   | 7.1%                   | 110,554 | 21.7%                   | 12.1%               |

Note. As of October 1, 2022. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,332; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 923,349.

**Table D3. Holbrook Public Schools: Chronic Absence<sup>a</sup> Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 1,360    | 7.8  | 12.5 | 22.2 | 27.7         |
| African American/Black            | 319      | 4.5  | 10.0 | 15.4 | 32.0         |
| Asian                             | 80       | 3.0  | 10.7 | 10.0 | 15.4         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 217      | 10.1 | 13.5 | 24.4 | 42.3         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 110      | 6.8  | 11.0 | 18.2 | 28.4         |
| Native American                   | 6        | --   | --   | 0.0  | 37.8         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | --   | 32.1         |
| White                             | 628      | 9.2  | 13.8 | 27.4 | 22.1         |
| High needs                        | 850      | 9.9  | 18.9 | 27.3 | 37.1         |
| Low income <sup>b</sup>           | 686      | --   | --   | 29.6 | 40.6         |
| ELs                               | 97       | 6.2  | 18.4 | 18.6 | 39.9         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 290      | 12.0 | 27.4 | 32.1 | 36.9         |

<sup>a</sup> The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. <sup>b</sup> Since fall 2021, DESE no longer reports data for the economically disadvantaged student group and instead reports data for a newly defined low-income student group. This change also affects the high needs group



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

|  | Fiscal Year 2020 |              | Fiscal Year 2021 |              | Fiscal Year 2022 |              |
|--|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
|  | Estimated        | Actual       | Estimated        | Actual       | Estimated        | Actual       |
| <b>Expenditures</b>                        |                  |              |                  |              |                  |              |
| From local appropriations for schools      |                  |              |                  |              |                  |              |
| By school committee                        | \$15,332,639     | \$15,170,247 | \$15,997,237     | \$15,319,979 | \$16,001,785     | \$16,090,935 |
| By municipality                            | \$10,147,567     | \$9,877,736  | \$9,531,799      | \$11,394,397 | \$9,178,162      | \$9,947,274  |
| Total from local appropriations            | \$25,480,206     | \$25,047,983 | \$25,529,036     | \$26,714,376 | \$25,179,947     | \$26,038,209 |
| From revolving funds and grants            | —                | \$1,973,223  | —                | \$2,379,682  | —                | \$2,635,038  |
| Total expenditures                         | —                | \$27,021,205 | —                | \$29,094,058 | —                | \$28,673,247 |
| <b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b> |                  |              |                  |              |                  |              |
| Chapter 70 state aid <sup>a</sup>          | —                | \$7,338,311  | —                | \$7,826,400  | —                | \$8,776,288  |
| Required local contribution                | —                | \$7,861,744  | —                | \$8,273,118  | —                | \$8,486,011  |
| Required net school spending <sup>b</sup>  | —                | \$15,200,055 | —                | \$16,099,518 | —                | \$17,262,299 |
| Actual net school spending                 | —                | \$18,610,350 | —                | \$18,576,987 | —                | \$19,873,943 |
| Over/under required (\$)                   | —                | \$3,410,295  | —                | \$2,477,469  | —                | \$2,611,644  |
| Over/under required (%)                    | —                | 22.4%        | —                | 15.4%        | —                | 15.1%        |

Note. Data as of February 10, 2023, and sourced from fiscal year 2022 district end-of-year reports and Chapter 70 program information on DESE website.

<sup>a</sup> Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. <sup>b</sup> Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

**Table D5. Holbrook Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2020-2022**

| Expenditure category                               | 2020     | 2021     | 2022     |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Administration                                     | \$600    | \$620    | \$598    |
| Instructional leadership (district and school)     | \$867    | \$959    | \$755    |
| Teachers   | \$5,308  | \$5,733  | \$5,869  |
| Other teaching services                            | \$946    | \$1,217  | \$1,141  |
| Professional development                           | \$43     | \$87     | \$99     |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | \$319    | \$678    | \$771    |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services         | \$483    | \$522    | \$571    |
| Pupil services                                     | \$1,283  | \$1,285  | \$1,613  |
| Operations and maintenance                         | \$934    | \$1,061  | \$1,307  |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs       | \$2,947  | \$2,858  | \$3,297  |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil           | \$13,729 | \$15,021 | \$16,021 |

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

## Appendix E. Student Performance Data

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

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

| Group                             | N<br>(2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |                 | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|------|------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|
|                                   |             | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) |
| All                               | 636         | 46   | 43   | 38   | 41              | 11                                  | 13   | 15   | 17              |
| African American/Black            | 139         | 35   | 34   | 30   | 26              | 18                                  | 22   | 22   | 27              |
| Asian                             | 37          | 70   | 64   | 51   | 63              | 0                                   | 3    | 11   | 8               |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 88          | 38   | 34   | 34   | 22              | 15                                  | 15   | 16   | 31              |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 50          | 54   | 58   | 40   | 48              | 7                                   | 8    | 12   | 14              |
| Native American                   | 1           | --   | --   | --   | 29              | --                                  | --   | --   | 25              |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --          | --   | --   | --   | 43              | --                                  | --   | --   | 17              |
| White                             | 321         | 48   | 44   | 41   | 48              | 10                                  | 11   | 13   | 11              |
| High needs                        | 388         | 29   | 32   | 26   | 24              | 20                                  | 21   | 23   | 28              |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 300         | --   | --   | 28   | 24              | --                                  | --   | 19   | 28              |
| ELs and former ELs                | 88          | 26   | 24   | 22   | 20              | 13                                  | 23   | 27   | 34              |
| Students w/disabilities           | 133         | 12   | 10   | 8    | 11              | 40                                  | 40   | 44   | 46              |

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

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

| Group                             | N<br>(2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |                 | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|------|------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|
|                                   |             | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) |
| All                               | 77          | 58   | 53   | 56   | 58              | 9                                   | 10   | 9    | 8               |
| African American/Black            | 17          | 35   | 37   | 41   | 41              | 18                                  | 17   | 12   | 13              |
| Asian                             | 6           | --   | --   | --   | 79              | --                                  | --   | --   | 4               |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 19          | 70   | --   | 53   | 38              | 20                                  | --   | 5    | 17              |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 6           | --   | --   | --   | 62              | --                                  | --   | --   | 6               |
| Native American                   | --          | --   | --   | --   | 53              | --                                  | --   | --   | 8               |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --          | --   | --   | --   | 45              | --                                  | --   | --   | 16              |
| White                             | 29          | 66   | 63   | 59   | 65              | 3                                   | 5    | 10   | 4               |
| High needs                        | 49          | 45   | 33   | 39   | 38              | 18                                  | 17   | 14   | 15              |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 42          | --   | --   | 45   | 40              | --                                  | --   | 14   | 14              |
| ELs and former ELs                | 7           | --   | 9    | --   | 21              | --                                  | 18   | --   | 30              |
| Students w/disabilities           | 16          | 10   | 6    | 6    | 20              | 40                                  | 38   | 31   | 26              |

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

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

| Group                             | N<br>(2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |                 | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|------|------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|
|                                   |             | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) |
| All                               | 639         | 44   | 25   | 33   | 39              | 13                                  | 23   | 17   | 17              |
| African American/Black            | 141         | 36   | 11   | 17   | 19              | 25                                  | 38   | 24   | 31              |
| Asian                             | 37          | 63   | 45   | 51   | 69              | 0                                   | 9    | 3    | 6               |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 89          | 39   | 22   | 25   | 18              | 15                                  | 29   | 18   | 32              |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 50          | 47   | 24   | 36   | 44              | 9                                   | 24   | 16   | 16              |
| Native American                   | 1           | --   | --   | --   | 27              | --                                  | --   | --   | 23              |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --          | --   | --   | --   | 39              | --                                  | --   | --   | 19              |
| White                             | 321         | 46   | 29   | 40   | 47              | 10                                  | 18   | 15   | 11              |
| High needs                        | 391         | 29   | 17   | 21   | 22              | 22                                  | 34   | 26   | 28              |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 303         | --   | --   | 22   | 20              | --                                  | --   | 23   | 29              |
| ELs and former ELs                | 89          | 33   | 21   | 17   | 21              | 25                                  | 34   | 26   | 32              |
| Students w/disabilities           | 134         | 11   | 5    | 10   | 12              | 44                                  | 54   | 53   | 45              |

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

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

| Group                             | N<br>(2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |                 | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|------|------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|
|                                   |             | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) |
| All                               | 76          | 56   | 35   | 36   | 50              | 6                                   | 10   | 12   | 10              |
| African American/Black            | 17          | 38   | 20   | 24   | 26              | 13                                  | 20   | 24   | 20              |
| Asian                             | 6           | --   | --   | --   | 78              | --                                  | --   | --   | 4               |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 19          | 70   | --   | 37   | 26              | 10                                  | --   | 5    | 21              |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 6           | --   | --   | --   | 53              | --                                  | --   | --   | 10              |
| Native American                   | --          | --   | --   | --   | 37              | --                                  | --   | --   | 16              |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --          | --   | --   | --   | 48              | --                                  | --   | --   | 19              |
| White                             | 28          | 63   | 53   | 36   | 59              | 3                                   | 3    | 11   | 6               |
| High needs                        | 48          | 41   | 13   | 23   | 28              | 13                                  | 17   | 19   | 19              |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 41          | --   | --   | 27   | 29              | --                                  | --   | 17   | 19              |
| ELs and former ELs                | 7           | --   | 0    | --   | 17              | --                                  | 27   | --   | 32              |
| Students w/disabilities           | 16          | --   | 6    | 6    | 15              | --                                  | 44   | 38   | 33              |

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

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

| Group                             | N<br>(2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |                 | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|------|------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|
|                                   |             | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State<br>(2022) |
| All                               | 217         | 45   | 44   | 42   | 42              | 12                                  | 11   | 18   | 18              |
| African American/Black            | 49          | 22   | 42   | 20   | 21              | 22                                  | 13   | 31   | 31              |
| Asian                             | 12          | --   | 43   | 67   | 65              | --                                  | 0    | 17   | 8               |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 39          | 38   | 43   | 46   | 20              | 13                                  | 17   | 23   | 33              |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 15          | 59   | 33   | 53   | 48              | 9                                   | 0    | 7    | 15              |
| Native American                   | 1           | --   | --   | --   | 28              | --                                  | --   | --   | 25              |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --          | --   | --   | --   | 41              | --                                  | --   | --   | 20              |
| White                             | 101         | 52   | 47   | 47   | 52              | 8                                   | 13   | 13   | 10              |
| High needs                        | 131         | 28   | 31   | 29   | 24              | 21                                  | 19   | 29   | 29              |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 100         | --   | --   | 33   | 23              | --                                  | --   | 23   | 30              |
| ELs and former ELs                | 33          | 19   | 24   | 30   | 18              | 19                                  | 21   | 39   | 37              |
| Students w/disabilities           | 52          | 13   | 18   | 10   | 15              | 37                                  | 47   | 54   | 44              |

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

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

| Group                             | N (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |              | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |              |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--|------|------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|--------------|
|                                   |          | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| All                               | 67       | --   | --   | 39   | 47           | --                                  | --   | 12   | 14           |
| African American/Black            | 16       | --   | --   | 25   | 25           | --                                  | --   | 19   | 25           |
| Asian                             | 4        | --   | --   | --   | 70           | --                                  | --   | --   | 6            |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 14       | --   | --   | 43   | 23           | --                                  | --   | 14   | 28           |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 6        | --   | --   | --   | 51           | --                                  | --   | --   | 12           |
| Native American                   | --       | --   | --   | --   | 38           | --                                  | --   | --   | 14           |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | --   | 45           | --                                  | --   | --   | 23           |
| White                             | 27       | --   | --   | 37   | 56           | --                                  | --   | 11   | 8            |
| High needs                        | 42       | --   | --   | 24   | 26           | --                                  | --   | 19   | 24           |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 35       | --   | --   | 29   | 26           | --                                  | --   | 17   | 25           |
| ELs and former ELs                | 5        | --   | --   | --   | 13           | --                                  | --   | --   | 43           |
| Students w/disabilities           | 15       | --   | --   | 7    | 16           | --                                  | --   | 40   | 37           |

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

**Table E7. Holbrook Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 & 2022**

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 485      | 45.5 | 51.5 | 49.8         |
| African American/Black            | 106      | 47.8 | 46.7 | 48.8         |
| Asian                             | 29       | 42.6 | 60.8 | 58.5         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 63       | 41.6 | 55.5 | 46.5         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 39       | 42.0 | 49.6 | 51.5         |
| Native American                   | 1        | --   | --   | 46.2         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | 51.7         |
| White                             | 247      | 46.6 | 51.5 | 50.0         |
| High needs                        | 285      | 43.9 | 47.5 | 46.7         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 227      | --   | 48.3 | 46.5         |
| ELs and former ELs                | 67       | 43.7 | 47.9 | 47.7         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 82       | 46.1 | 36.5 | 41.8         |

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

**Table E8. Holbrook Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 & 2022**

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 65       | 40.9 | 65.4 | 50.0         |
| African American/Black            | 14       | --   | --   | 49.8         |
| Asian                             | 5        | --   | --   | 56.0         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 16       | --   | --   | 47.6         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 6        | --   | --   | 50.6         |
| Native American                   | --       | --   | --   | 54.1         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | 49.5         |
| White                             | 24       | 47.0 | 68.4 | 50.1         |
| High needs                        | 38       | 35.9 | 66.6 | 47.7         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 34       | --   | 66.1 | 47.2         |
| ELs and former ELs                | 5        | --   | --   | 50.5         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 8        | --   | --   | 45.1         |

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

**Table E9. Holbrook Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 & 2022**

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 485      | 41.0 | 49.6 | 49.9         |
| African American/Black            | 106      | 41.8 | 50.3 | 47.0         |
| Asian                             | 29       | 44.1 | 52.3 | 59.8         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 63       | 41.3 | 48.8 | 46.4         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 39       | 46.8 | 46.8 | 51.0         |
| Native American                   | 1        | --   | --   | 49.5         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | 49.9         |
| White                             | 247      | 39.5 | 49.5 | 50.4         |
| High needs                        | 285      | 39.8 | 47.2 | 47.1         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 227      | --   | 48.2 | 46.4         |
| ELs and former ELs                | 67       | 35.4 | 46.0 | 48.6         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 82       | 39.2 | 36.2 | 43.3         |

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

**Table E10. Holbrook Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 & 2022**

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 64       | 25.4 | 42.8 | 50.0         |
| African American/Black            | 14       | --   | --   | 45.6         |
| Asian                             | 5        | --   | --   | 57.3         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 16       | --   | --   | 44.4         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 6        | --   | --   | 50.0         |
| Native American                   | --       | --   | --   | 46.6         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | 41.2         |
| White                             | 23       | 23.0 | 45.0 | 51.6         |
| High needs                        | 37       | 25.4 | 44.0 | 46.7         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 33       | --   | 40.9 | 45.6         |
| ELs and former ELs                | 5        | --   | --   | 48.9         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 8        | --   | --   | 47.3         |

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

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

| Grade | N (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |              | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |              |
|-------|----------|--|------|------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|--------------|
|       |          | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 3     | 107      | 44   | 54   | 50   | 44           | 8                                   | 5    | 9    | 15           |
| 4     | 104      | 52   | 45   | 51   | 38           | 5                                   | 10   | 11   | 16           |
| 5     | 117      | 47   | 35   | 31   | 41           | 9                                   | 13   | 9    | 13           |
| 6     | 116      | 53   | 39   | 24   | 41           | 9                                   | 22   | 24   | 22           |
| 7     | 90       | 38   | 38   | 31   | 41           | 17                                  | 21   | 21   | 19           |
| 8     | 102      | 43   | 47   | 44   | 42           | 18                                  | 11   | 20   | 18           |
| 3-8   | 636      | 46   | 43   | 38   | 41           | 11                                  | 13   | 15   | 17           |
| 10    | 77       | 58   | 53   | 56   | 58           | 9                                   | 10   | 9    | 8            |



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

| Grade | N (2022) | Percentages meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |              | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |              |
|-------|----------|---|------|------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|--------------|
|       |          | 2019  | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 3     | 109      | 47  | 34   | 44   | 41           | 13                                  | 26   | 17   | 20           |
| 4     | 105      | 43  | 24   | 44   | 42           | 9                                   | 25   | 16   | 17           |
| 5     | 117      | 46  | 22   | 17   | 36           | 11                                  | 17   | 19   | 16           |
| 6     | 116      | 52  | 14   | 22   | 42           | 13                                  | 34   | 13   | 15           |
| 7     | 90       | 38  | 31   | 37   | 37           | 15                                  | 15   | 17   | 19           |
| 8     | 102      | 38  | 25   | 38   | 36           | 14                                  | 23   | 20   | 17           |
| 3-8   | 639      | 44  | 25   | 33   | 39           | 13                                  | 23   | 17   | 17           |
| 10    | 76       | 56  | 35   | 36   | 50           | 6                                   | 10   | 12   | 10           |

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

| Grade   | N (2022) | Percentage meeting or exceeding expectations |      |      |              | Percentage not meeting expectations |      |      |              |
|---------|----------|--|------|------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|--------------|
|         |          | 2019   | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) | 2019                                | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
| 5       | 116      | 57   | 48   | 41   | 43           | 7                                   | 9    | 20   | 18           |
| 8       | 101      | 33   | 39   | 44   | 42           | 16                                  | 14   | 17   | 18           |
| 5 and 8 | 217      | 45   | 44   | 42   | 42           | 12                                  | 11   | 18   | 18           |
| 10      | 67       | --   | --   | 39   | 47           | --                                  | --   | 12   | 14           |

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 the Competency Determination requirements is available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/graduation.html>. In 2019, 10th graders took the Legacy MCAS science test.

**Table E14. Holbrook Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019 & 2022**

| Grade | N (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-------|----------|------|------|--------------|
| 3     | --       | --   | --   | --           |
| 4     | 101      | 58.1 | 59.0 | 50.0         |
| 5     | 109      | 33.4 | 42.6 | 49.9         |
| 6     | 105      | 47.3 | 46.7 | 49.8         |
| 7     | 82       | 42.2 | 45.4 | 49.7         |
| 8     | 88       | 48.9 | 65.2 | 49.7         |
| 3-8   | 485      | 45.5 | 51.5 | 49.8         |
| 10    | 65       | 40.9 | 65.4 | 50.0         |

**Table E15. Holbrook Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019 & 2022**

| Grade | N (2022) | 2019 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-------|----------|------|------|--------------|
| 3     | --       | --   | --   | --           |
| 4     | 100      | 39.7 | 45.9 | 50.0         |
| 5     | 109      | 44.7 | 34.9 | 50.0         |
| 6     | 105      | 34.5 | 39.1 | 49.8         |
| 7     | 82       | 46.2 | 72.2 | 49.9         |
| 8     | 89       | 39.0 | 63.6 | 49.8         |
| 3-8   | 485      | 41.0 | 49.6 | 49.9         |
| 10    | 64       | 25.4 | 42.8 | 50.0         |

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

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 62       | 88.9 | 87.0 | 87.1 | 90.1         |
| African American/Black            | 14       | 88.5 | 83.3 | 100  | 86.2         |
| Asian                             | 8        | --   | --   | 75.0 | 96.2         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 9        | 90.0 | 72.7 | 88.9 | 81.2         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 5        | --   | --   | --   | 88.7         |
| Native American                   | --       | --   | --   | --   | 82.2         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | --   | 81.3         |
| White                             | 26       | 88.9 | 91.2 | 80.8 | 93.2         |
| High needs                        | 42       | 82.0 | 75.7 | 81.0 | 83.9         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 39       | 79.5 | 76.9 | 82.1 | 83.2         |
| ELs                               | 4        | 75.0 | 75.0 | --   | 73.1         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 13       | 64.7 | 44.4 | 53.8 | 78.0         |

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

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

| Group                             | N (2021) | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | State (2021) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 69       | 73.5 | 91.4 | 87.0 | 91.8         |
| African American/Black            | 18       | 88.2 | 96.2 | 83.3 | 88.1         |
| Asian                             | 5        | --   | --   | --   | 97.0         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 11       | 87.5 | 90.0 | 72.7 | 84.0         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 1        | --   | --   | --   | 91.2         |
| Native American                   | --       | --   | --   | --   | 84.1         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | --   | 87.7         |
| White                             | 34       | 69.4 | 88.9 | 91.2 | 94.4         |
| High needs                        | 37       | 67.3 | 86.0 | 75.7 | 85.8         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 39       | 74.4 | 84.1 | 76.9 | 85.1         |
| ELs                               | 8        | --   | 75.0 | 75.0 | 78.0         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 9        | 33.3 | 70.6 | 44.4 | 80.6         |

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

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

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 1,361    | 0.7  | 0.2  | 0.3  | 1.6          |
| African American/Black            | 318      | 2.0  | 0.7  | 0.3  | 2.2          |
| Asian                             | 80       | --   | --   | --   | 0.4          |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 222      | --   | --   | --   | 2.1          |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 109      | 2.0  | --   | --   | 1.8          |
| Native American                   | 6        | --   | --   | --   | 2.4          |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0        | --   | --   | --   | 1.9          |
| White                             | 626      | 0.1  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 1.4          |
| High needs                        | 848      | 0.7  | 0.4  | 0.5  | 2.2          |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 683      | --   | --   | 0.4  | 2.3          |
| ELs                               | 104      | --   | --   | --   | 1.4          |
| Students w/disabilities           | 285      | 0.8  | 0.4  | 0.4  | 2.8          |

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

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

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 1,361    | 3.9  | 1.7  | 3.2  | 3.1          |
| African American/Black            | 318      | 6.8  | 3.8  | 5.0  | 6.2          |
| Asian                             | 80       | --   | --   | --   | 0.7          |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 222      | --   | --   | --   | 4.9          |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 109      | 4.9  | --   | --   | 3.5          |
| Native American                   | 6        | --   | --   | --   | 4.3          |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0        | --   | --   | --   | 3.6          |
| White                             | 626      | 3.0  | 1.4  | 3.2  | 2.1          |
| High needs                        | 848      | 5.7  | 3.1  | 4.0  | 4.6          |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 683      | --   | --   | 4.1  | 5.2          |
| ELs                               | 104      | --   | --   | --   | 3.5          |
| Students w/disabilities           | 285      | 5.5  | 4.2  | 4.6  | 5.8          |

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

**Table E20. Holbrook Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 299      | 1.0  | 1.7  | 2.7  | 2.1          |
| African American/Black            | 86       | 1.1  | 1.3  | 4.7  | 2.8          |
| Asian                             | 26       | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.6          |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 46       | 2.6  | 2.2  | 2.2  | 4.3          |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 24       | 0.0  | 5.3  | 0.0  | 2.4          |
| Native American                   | 2        | --   | --   | --   | 4.3          |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | --   | 1.2          |
| White                             | 115      | 0.7  | 1.5  | 2.6  | 1.3          |
| High needs                        | 177      | 2.2  | 3.4  | 4.0  | 3.6          |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 139      | 3.2  | 3.7  | 3.6  | 3.8          |
| ELs                               | 17       | 10.0 | 0.0  | 17.6 | 7.8          |
| Students w/disabilities           | 54       | 4.2  | 4.0  | 11.1 | 3.4          |

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

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

| Group                             | N (2022) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | State (2022) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------|
| All students                      | 135      | 67.6 | 60.8 | 54.1 | 64.9         |
| African American/Black            | 40       | 61.0 | 43.3 | 42.5 | 55.5         |
| Asian                             | 12       | 66.7 | 83.3 | 66.7 | 84.9         |
| Hispanic/Latino                   | 16       | 70.6 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 49.2         |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino   | 10       | 83.3 | 28.6 | 70.0 | 66.1         |
| Native American                   | 1        | --   | --   | --   | 50.0         |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | --       | --   | --   | --   | 65.4         |
| White                             | 56       | 71.0 | 67.2 | 58.9 | 69.5         |
| High needs                        | 75       | 57.1 | 50.9 | 38.7 | 49.1         |
| Low income <sup>a</sup>           | 62       | 61.7 | 55.6 | 40.3 | 50.1         |
| ELs                               | 5        | --   | --   | --   | 30.0         |
| Students w/disabilities           | 19       | 47.1 | 28.6 | 31.6 | 34.3         |

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