

# Weymouth Public Schools

## Comprehensive District Review Report

November 2022

---

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

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

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

### **American Institutes for Research**

Education Systems and Policy

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



# Contents

- Executive Summary ..... 1
- Weymouth Public Schools: District Review Overview .....8
- Leadership and Governance ..... 13
- Curriculum and Instruction..... 21
- Assessment ..... 32
- Human Resources and Professional Development ..... 37
- Student Support..... 44
- Financial and Asset Management ..... 50
- 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 March 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 comprehensive review of Weymouth Public Schools (hereafter, Weymouth) in November 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness.<sup>1</sup>

### Leadership and Governance

The superintendent of Weymouth, Robert Wargo, began in this position in July 2021. He receives support from a district leadership team that includes the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, the executive director of elementary education, the executive director of student services, the executive director of human resources, and the newly established position of communications coordinator. These district officials, particularly the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, work closely with the elected school committee members who represent Weymouth residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has seven members: six are elected and serve four-year terms, and the seventh is the mayor who serves as a part of the responsibilities of the mayoral office.

The school committee has four main responsibilities: (a) hire and evaluate the performance of the superintendent; (b) partner with the schools' central administration to propose a budget that meets the needs of each school and matches the values of the broader community; (c) set the policies by which the schools operate; and (d) negotiate the contracts with collective bargaining units and individuals employed by the schools. To meet these responsibilities, the committee presides over meetings with the community and records meeting notes in a publicly accessible place on the school's website.

As of fall 2022, Weymouth does not have current district or school improvement plans, although there is a districtwide improvement goal: "By June 2023, the district will achieve an average student growth percentile of 60% or higher on the MCAS [Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System] assessment." This goal is driving improvement efforts during the 2022-2023 school year. The school committee and the superintendent are striving to create a strategic plan by July 31, 2023, which will serve as an educational roadmap for the district. The information gathered in this district report will help inform the development of Weymouth's district improvement plan.

---

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#">School committee governance</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has monthly budget subcommittee meetings throughout the budget season to facilitate planning and oversight of the budget.</li> <li>■ The district created a new communication coordinator position to improve communication across the district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Developing a formal, transparent evaluation process aligned to district goals</li> <li>■ Increasing communication and collaboration between the school committee and teachers' union with one of the major foci being to finalize a new collective bargaining agreement</li> </ul>
<a href="#">District and school leadership</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The superintendent reorganized the district's leadership to create new school-based roles (e.g., assistant principals, lead teachers, department heads) to increase schools' autonomy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Increasing awareness of the district's plans for improvement and academic goals</li> <li>■ Establishing a collaborative, communicative relationship between the school committee, district leadership, and school staff</li> </ul>
<a href="#">District and school improvement planning</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The superintendent has a clearly articulated districtwide goal to improve the average student growth percentile on MCAS and incorporates student data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Developing and implementing a district improvement plan to guide the development and implementation of school improvement plans</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Budget development</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has a well-defined process for financial planning.</li> <li>■ The budget book is transparent, comprehensive, and accessible to the general public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Using data to inform budget decisions, in particular disaggregated student data</li> </ul>

**[Curriculum and Instruction](#)**

In accordance with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Weymouth strives to ensure equitable and effective instruction for all students. The district's leaders and teachers have collaboratively developed curriculum maps for all grade levels and content areas. The curriculum maps follow the "understanding by design" (UbD) planning approach. The district uses a combination of published and district-created curricula, including Great Minds' Wit & Wisdom (K-6) for ELA, Big Ideas Math (K-11) for mathematics, and OpenSciEd (6-8) for science. Wit & Wisdom is a new literacy program for the district, with teachers implementing it for the first time during the 2022-2023 school year. At the secondary level, teachers locally create and develop much of the curricula following the UbD frameworks. The district also has a wide variety of academic offerings at the secondary level (e.g., exploratories, electives, and Advanced Placement [AP]). To support students in career exploration, the district has 10 career and technical education (CTE) programs that students apply to when they are transitioning into the high school.

Six observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Weymouth during the week of October 31, 2022. The observers conducted 116 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, instructional observations suggest generally strong evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement. For all three grade bands—K-5, 6-8, and 9-12—average scores in each area rounded to 5.0 or higher, with a maximum possible score of 7.0. Instructional observations suggest generally mixed evidence of rigorous instructional support, with each grade band averaging scores of approximately 4.0.

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Curriculum selection and use</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has an ELA review team to critically review and adopt a high-quality literacy curriculum at the elementary level.</li> <li>■ District leaders have increased the availability of instructional coaches to support teachers in planning and implementing the curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Supporting elementary teachers with aligning the Wit &amp; Wisdom program with a focus on small-group, student-centered instruction</li> <li>■ Ensuring teacher collaboration leads to changes in instruction and increased student engagement and learning</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Classroom instruction</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district is implementing standards-based, student-centered, and project-based instructional practices across schools.</li> <li>■ The district has clearly written documents, including the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan and description of Tiers 1, 2, and 3 documents, to support teachers in adjusting their instruction to meet student needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Embedding diversity, equity, and inclusion into curriculum and instruction</li> <li>■ Supporting students' development of social and emotional competencies (e.g., self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making)</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Student access to coursework</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Schools provide a variety of academic offerings that encourage students to pursue rigorous learning experiences and explore their interests.</li> <li>■ At Weymouth High School, all students are required to complete a capstone project, a rigorous independent learning experience, to demonstrate command of 21st-century skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensuring that all students have equitable access to the various learning opportunities available within the district</li> <li>■ Expanding access to career and technical education pathways so that more students can participate in these offerings</li> </ul>

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

## Assessment

Weymouth uses multiple assessments and data tools that vary by level to ensure that assessments are appropriate for the grade levels served and aligned with the curricula used. At the elementary level, Weymouth uses iReady Reading and Math, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Lexia, and MCAS. At the secondary level, the district recently transitioned from iReady to district-developed common formative assessments using the EdCite platform. Across grade levels, staff use several platforms, such as Aspen and Google Classroom, to track students' achievement and communicate with students and families about progress. The district has implemented systems for supporting data use, including three data meetings throughout the year and student intervention team (SIT) meetings at every school in the district.

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#">Data and assessment systems</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district uses multiple data sources that provide information about students' academic performance across grade levels and subject areas.</li> <li>At the middle and high schools, the district has adopted the new EdCite program to enable teachers to administer common assessments at for improved data-based decision making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing opportunities for professional development/support and creating buy-in for the implementation of EdCite</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Data use</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has formalized opportunities for school staff to review and discuss student data (e.g., data meetings, PLCs, SIT process).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying ways to streamline the SIT process so that students can receive supports in a timely manner</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Sharing results</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools provide progress updates for students and families that are available in various ways (e.g., Aspen, Google Classroom, report cards, Parent-teacher conferences).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing regular opportunities for students to meaningfully discuss their performance with teachers</li> <li>Providing regular and ongoing communication with parents about their child's progress</li> </ul>

## Human Resources and Professional Development

The human resources and professional development infrastructure in Weymouth onboards candidates into schools within the district, maintains staff credentials and certifications, and enhances employee culture. In July 2022, the human resources division was separated from finance and operations to become its own stand-alone department. Administrators in each school building, with support from the human resources department, primarily conduct hiring, supervision, evaluation, and recognition. Professional development offerings are primarily determined at the district level by the executive director of elementary education (for the elementary schools) and the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning (for the middle and high schools). For the 2022-

2023 school year, professional development has largely focused on the new elementary ELA curriculum and developing common assessments in the EdCite platform (for the middle and high schools). Weymouth is focusing on continuing to identify strategies to diversify candidate pools through partnerships with the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity and Education (to identify candidates for open positions) and Curry College (to support current Weymouth students of color in pursuing education careers and coming back to teach in the district).

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Infrastructure</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ District leaders recently created a new, separate human resources department.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#"><u>Recruitment, hiring, and assignment</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has some established partnerships with Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity and Education and Curry College to recruit a diverse pool of candidates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Developing a cohesive recruitment and hiring process that includes schools recruiting and hiring diverse candidates</li> <li>■ Creating a more comprehensive process for communicating with schools about teachers' licensure status</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Supervision, evaluation, and educator development</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Weymouth provides a variety of professional development opportunities on diversity, equity, and inclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Including goals on summative evaluation or "summative evidence collection" forms</li> <li>■ Creating an accountability system for ensuring administrator evaluations are consistently completed at the end of each evaluation cycle</li> <li>■ Providing educators with specific, actionable feedback on strengths and areas for improvement</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Recognition, leadership development, and advancement</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has a first-year mentorship program for new teachers based on the teachers' subject areas to build curriculum expertise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Raising teachers' awareness of the leadership opportunities available to them</li> </ul>



## Student Support

Weymouth is making conscious efforts to ensure that schools support students' safety, well-being, and sense of belonging by identifying and addressing students' needs and engaging families and students in planning and decision-making efforts to improve the school community. Weymouth is actively incorporating various practices to meet the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students. All schools across the district implement positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). In addition, Weymouth uses the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) framework to guide social-emotional support. Each building has an SIT that develops targeted (e.g., Tier 2) and/or intensive (e.g., Tier 3) support plans based on students' individual needs. The district communicates with families through weekly district- and school-level newsletters. Parents also can elect to participate on Weymouth's school and town parent councils: the special education advisory council (SEPAC) and the English Language Learners Advisory Council (ELLAC).

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Safe and supportive school climate and culture</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district promotes positive approaches to student behavior (e.g., restorative practices, positive behavioral interventions and supports).</li> <li>■ The district values and provides opportunities for student voice, especially related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensuring consistency in corrective measures across deans</li> <li>■ Ensuring that all families have equitable access to information by using translation and interpretation services</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Tiered systems of support</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district provides and teachers use the DCAP as a guiding document for supporting students.</li> <li>■ Each school uses the SIT process to make collaborative decisions about students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Communicating with and integrating families into the SIT process early when there are concerns about a student</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Families and students have opportunities to get involved in the district.</li> <li>■ The district recently opened a physical family engagement center and virtual engagement hub to provide parents with access to a variety of information about Weymouth schools and supports within the broader community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Increasing communication with students and families about the resources and supports that are available to them</li> </ul>

## Financial and Asset Management

Town and district leaders aim to ensure that allocation and use of funding and other resources improves students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes. The district organization includes 20 cost centers (11 schools and nine departments) that prepare a budget proposal for district review and monitor the use of funds throughout the year. District leaders collaborate with town leaders to efficiently develop the overall budget and complete regular audits of financial reports and the use of funds. There is a process for determining the overall amount of the town budget allocated to the district, and that amount exceeds net school spending requirements. To improve transparency, the superintendent created a new budget book that is intentionally developed to be clear, easy for the layperson to understand, and readily accessible on the district’s website. The budget book details the various funding sources; expenses broken down by cost center; and detailed information about fixed costs, salaries, maintenance costs, and other expenses.

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Budget documentation and reporting</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district’s budget documents are clear, detailed, and easily accessible on the district website.</li> <li>■ Principals have a high level of autonomy in budget development as they draft their capital needs request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Examining resource allocation for potential funding inequities between schools</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Adequate budget</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has a strong working relationship with town leaders, as exemplified by the first-ever passing of a debt-exclusion override to fund the building of a new middle school.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Developing a budgeting system which accounts for changing market conditions after the budget is finalized</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The assistant superintendent of finance and operations has monthly meetings with the school committee.</li> <li>■ The district has a transparent financial management system, which is available to appropriate town and district staff.</li> <li>■ The district has consistent monitoring procedures to ensure efficient and effective use of budgeted funds.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#"><u>Capital planning and facility maintenance</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district opened the newly built Chapman Middle School in fall 2022.</li> </ul>	

# Weymouth Public Schools: District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

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

## Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data 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 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 for 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 Weymouth was conducted during the week of October 31, 2022. The site visit included 21 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 120 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted four teacher focus groups with seven elementary school teachers, six middle school teachers, and eight high school teachers.

The site team also conducted 116 observations of classroom instruction in 10 schools using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

## District Profile

Weymouth is led by Robert Wargo, who was appointed superintendent in July 2021. The superintendent has support from a district leadership team consisting of 17 staff members, including the assistant superintendent of instructional services and support, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, the executive director of elementary education, the executive director of student services, the interim assistant director of special education, the executive director of human resources, and the directors of various departments (e.g., transportation, technology). The district is governed by a school committee composed of seven members, six of whom are elected for four-year terms plus the town mayor.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 458 teachers in the district, with 5,599 students enrolled in the district’s 11 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
Johnson Early Childhood Center	Early Childhood	PK	178
Academy Avenue Primary School	Elementary	K-5	344
Fredrick C. Murphy Primary School	Elementary	K-5	279
Lawrence W. Pingree Primary School	Elementary	K-5	258
Ralph Talbot	Elementary	K-5	259
Thomas V, Nash Jr. Primary School	Elementary	K-5	232
Thomas W. Hamilton Primary School	Elementary	K-5	350
Wessagusset Primary School	Elementary	K-5	341
William Seach Primary School	Elementary	K-5	356
Maria Weston Chapman Middle School	Middle	6-8	1,195
Weymouth High School	High	9-12	1,807
<b>Total</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>K-12</b>	<b>5,599</b>

Note. Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2021 and 2023, overall student enrollment for K-12 increased by 32 students. 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.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure, which was more than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for K-12 districts of similar size in fiscal year 2021, was \$18,306.98 for Weymouth compared with \$16,436 for similar districts and less than average state spending per pupil (\$18,560). Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

## School and Student Performance

In ELA in grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 12 percentage points, from 48 percent in 2019 to 36 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 41 percent. In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 9 percentage points, from 63 percent in 2019 to 54 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 58 percent. (Tables E3 and E4)

- In grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 3 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students, equal to the state rate for Low income students and English learners (EL) and former EL students, and below the state rate by 2 to 14 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 23 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and by 2 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and Low income students. The percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was equal to the state rate for high needs students, and below the state rate by 5 to 17 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

In math in grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 8 percentage points, from 43 percent in 2019 to 35 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 39 percent. In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 8 percentage points, from 50 percent in 2019 to 42 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 50 percent. (Tables E5 and E6)

- In grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 3 to 6 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students, Low income students, and ELs and former ELs. The percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was equal to the state rate for high needs students, and below the state rate by 2 to 14 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.
- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 6 to 8 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino student and ELs and former ELs, and above the state rate by one percentage point for Asian students. The percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was equal to the state rate for students with disabilities, and below the state rate by 2 to 15 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 by 2 percentage points, from 40 percent in 2019 to 38 percent in 2022, which is below the state rate of 42 percent. In grade 10, 54 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which is above the state rate of 47 percent. (Tables E7 and E8)

- In grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was above the state rate by 8 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students, and by 2 and 3 percentage points for high needs and Low income students. The percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by one percentage point for African American/Black students, and by 11 to 12 percentage points for Asian students, Multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students.
- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in science was above the state rate for each student group by up to 31 percentage points, except for White students, where the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 2 percentage points.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the MCAS assessments in grades 3-8 was 47.7 in ELA and 51.8 in math, which represent typical growth. In grade 10, the SGP was typical in ELA (44.3) and low in math (35.6)<sup>3</sup>. (Tables E9-E12)

- In grades 3-8, ELA SGPs were typical, ranging from 41.5 to 49.5. Math SGPs for most student groups were also typical, ranging from 40.7 to 54.7, except for Asian students, where growth in math was high (60.0).
- In grade 10, ELA SGPs were typical, ranging from 42.4 to 53.5. Math SGPs were low for most student groups, ranging from 32.6 to 37.4, except for Asian students and EL and former EL students, where growth in math was typical (53.2 and 41.2, respectively).

Weymouth's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 3.6 percentage points, from 85.3 percent in 2019 to 88.9 percent in 2021. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 1.6 percentage points, from 88.7 percent in 2018 to 90.3 percent in 2020. (Tables E18 and E19)

- The four-year-cohort graduation rate increased for most student groups between 2019 and 2021, except for Asian and Multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students, whose rates decreased. Four-year cohort graduation rates remained below the state rate for each student group with reportable data.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate increased between 2018 and 2020 for most student groups, except for Hispanic/Latino students and ELs, which decline. Rates remained below the state rate in 2020 for most groups, except for Asian students and Low income students, where the five-year cohort graduation rate for each group was above the state rate.

The district's annual dropout rate was 1.9 percent in 2022, which represents a 0.4 percentage point improvement from 2019. The district's dropout rate is above the state's rate in 2021 (1.5 percent). (Table E22)

---

<sup>3</sup> Average student growth percentile (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.

- The dropout rate for ELs improved 13.8 percentage points, from 26.5 percent in 2019 to 12.7 percent in 2021, but remained more than twice the state rate of 5.8 percent in 2021.

## Leadership and Governance

---

Robert Wargo leads Weymouth, beginning his tenure as superintendent in July 2021. He receives support from a district leadership team of 17 staff members, including the assistant superintendent of teaching and learning, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations, the executive director of elementary education, the executive director of student services, the executive director of human resources, and the newly established communications coordinator. The superintendent reports to the elected school committee, who represent Weymouth residents through their oversight of the district. The school committee has seven members, six of whom are elected and serve four-year terms, and the seventh is the mayor who serves by virtue of his office.

According to the district's website, the school committee has four main responsibilities: (a) hire and evaluate the performance of the superintendent; (b) partner with the schools' central administration to propose a budget that meets the needs of each school and matches the values of the broader community; (c) set the policies by which the schools operate; and (d) negotiate the contracts with collective bargaining units and individuals employed by the schools. To meet these responsibilities, the committee annually evaluates the superintendent, and the information from these written evaluations and meetings are available to the public. The committee also presides over meetings with the community and records meeting notes in a publicly accessible place on the school's website.

At the school level, an assistant principal assists each principal. Based on the evidence collected during the district review, there is no indication of individual schools having instructional leadership teams. Principals hire and oversee the teachers within their schools. Principals also develop a first draft of their school budget, which the school committee's budget subcommittee then reviews. Principals regularly report to the assistant superintendent of finance and operations about how their budget is spent.

Currently, Weymouth does not have a district improvement plan, although there is a districtwide improvement goal: "By June 2023, the district will achieve an average student growth percentile of 60% or higher on the MCAS assessment." This goal is driving improvement efforts during the 2022-2023 school year. The school committee and superintendent are working to complete a strategic plan that will serve as an educational roadmap for the district by July 31, 2023. The information gathered in this district report will help inform the development of Weymouth's school improvement plan.

Table 2 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in leadership and governance.



**Table 2. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Leadership and Governance Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#">School committee governance</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has monthly budget subcommittee meetings throughout the budget season to facilitate planning and oversight of the budget.</li> <li>The district created a new communication coordinator position to improve communication across the district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing a formal, transparent evaluation process aligned to district goals</li> <li>Increasing communication and collaboration between the school committee and teachers' union with one of the major foci being to finalize a new collective bargaining agreement</li> </ul>
<a href="#">District and school leadership</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The superintendent reorganized the district's leadership to create new school-based roles (e.g., assistant principals, lead teachers, department heads) to increase schools' autonomy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing awareness of the district's plans for improvement and academic goals</li> <li>Establishing a collaborative, communicative relationship between the school committee, district leadership, and school staff</li> </ul>
<a href="#">District and school improvement planning</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The superintendent has a clearly articulated districtwide goal to improve the average student growth percentile on MCAS and incorporates student data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing and implementing a district improvement plan to guide the development and implementation of school improvement plans</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Budget development</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has a well-defined process for financial planning.</li> <li>The budget book is transparent, comprehensive, and accessible to the general public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using data to inform budget decisions, in particular disaggregated student data</li> </ul>

## School Committee Governance

The school committee collaborates with district leaders to uphold Massachusetts laws and regulations, including hiring and evaluating the superintendent, overseeing the budget, and overseeing school policy. The school committee evaluates the superintendent's performance annually, based on seven goals set collaboratively by the school committee and the superintendent. With the newness of the current administration and the repeated turnover of superintendents, several school committee members noted the district's "growing pains" as they adapted to the new superintendent's leadership style, and they reported that they occasionally felt uninformed about some of the larger changes the superintendent has put in place.

With the recent transition in district leadership, the school committee created a list of seven goals that they planned to accomplish through early work with the new superintendent. According to documentation, these seven goals included

- supporting the superintendent as he transitioned into his new role and determining how to evaluate the superintendent,
- creating a districtwide communication plan,

- supporting the opening of the newly built Chapman Middle School (which opened in fall 2022),
- evaluating the need for and creating plans to revise the school zones,
- negotiating any outstanding district contracts as required by law,
- reviewing the district policy handbook, and
- approving the Weymouth budget.

The school committee elected to evaluate the superintendent in 2021 based on these seven goals instead of evaluating him based on alignment to a formal district strategic plan because a new strategic plan has not yet been developed. As described in focus groups, the committee also encouraged the superintendent to make his own SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-based) goals for the district and himself in the absence of a strategic plan. In the 2021 evaluation of the superintendent, a couple members of the school committee noted that the superintendent's goals were not fully aligned with their own list of seven goals. The development of a formal, transparent evaluation process aligned to district goals is an area of growth for the district.

As noted in the superintendent's 2021 evaluation, the superintendent made substantial changes to the district's staffing structure and developed several new roles to change the hierarchy of the district in alignment with his new goals; however, these changes were not consistently made in consultation with the school committee. As one school committee member noted in the superintendent's evaluation, which was echoed by others,

The prevailing theme throughout this evaluation is the need for meaningful, detailed communication from the superintendent to the school committee. In general, the committee has not been provided with specific evidence, artifacts, or data to support progress towards district, learning, or professional goals, nor has the committee been consistently kept up to date on matters regarding school operations and programs across the district.

The superintendent agreed that the district needs to improve the frequency and transparency of communication. In July 2022, the superintendent and the school committee created the communication coordinator position as a district-level assistant to the superintendent to begin to address this gap.

In addition, the school committee maintains fiduciary responsibilities to the district and the town of Weymouth, which they fulfill through their budget subcommittee. This subcommittee includes a subset of members from the school committee, including the mayor, and meets at least once per month during the budget season (from November to April). According to district leaders, the school committee reviews the capital requests submitted by the cost centers,<sup>4</sup> and then members of the school committee solicit additional information from representatives of each cost center about the district's evolving financial needs during these meetings. This regularly planned time where cost centers can advocate for their budgetary needs before the school committee is a strength of the district.

---

<sup>4</sup> Weymouth's organization includes 20 cost centers. Each of the 11 schools is a cost center, along with nine departments: health services, maintenance services, athletics, district instruction and curriculum, educational technology, professional development, transportation, districtwide needs, and special education.

As the employer of record on all collective bargaining agreements, the school committee takes an active and constructive role in developing timely and effective strategies for collective bargaining and managing negotiations. At the time of the district review, Weymouth teachers did not have a current contract, and the negotiation process between the district and the teachers' union had stalled. According to teacher leaders, union members feel unheard by district leadership and frustrated with their perceived lack of ability to advocate for themselves and their students. Similarly, students in the student focus group were aware of these stalled negotiations and articulated how the ongoing process has negatively impacted their educational experience. As one student stated,

[The teachers are] working without their contracts, meaning they . . . don't [have] to stay after school. Most teachers aren't staying after, so they leave. And the teachers not having a fair contract means the students don't get a fair education because we don't get the [extra] help we need.

Increased communication and collaboration between the school committee, district leadership, and the teachers' union is an area of growth for the district.

## District and School Leadership

A team of 17 district-level administrators supports the superintendent; this team includes two assistant superintendents (teaching and learning and finance and operations) and three executive directors (elementary education, student service, and human resources). As stated in a district leader interview, one of the superintendent's explicit leadership goals is to grant more autonomy to schools within the district. To accomplish this, the superintendent created new roles within each school, including assistant principals at the elementary schools, lead teachers at the middle school, and department heads at the high school. Additional special education leadership is in place to account for the district's large special education population.

At the district level, the superintendent communicates with the school committee and other district leaders via a weekly newsletter about happenings in the district. In the superintendent's 2021 evaluation completed by the school committee, a committee member described this weekly newsletter negatively as "fluff" and expressed a desire to have more concrete, detailed information about the policy, budget, and staffing happenings associated with the superintendent. Several other school committee members supported this sentiment in the same evaluation, and two of the seven school committee members noted that they were not consulted on important changes to the district's infrastructure, key staff's job descriptions, and school-level events, each of which, they argued, are crucial district-level policy decisions. Following this feedback, the superintendent appointed the communications coordinator to improve the quality of communication across the district. Since this appointment, there has not yet been another evaluation to gauge change and progress. Overall, detailed communication between the superintendent and district leaders, such as the school committee, is an area of growth.

At the school level, documentation and interviews describe increased communication between the superintendent and teachers via a weekly newsletter. According to the school committee's evaluation of the superintendent, the superintendent visits each school several times throughout the school year and assesses each school, although at the time of the district review, the school

committee had not yet received or reviewed documentation from these site visits. Overall, teachers in multiple focus groups described weak connections with district leadership at this time. Specifically, teachers reported feeling as if they do not have an adequate voice within the district, with the district primarily engaging in one-way communication in which “they talk and we listen.” District leaders echoed this sentiment in interviews: “We need to get so much better at two-way communication.” Although recently appointed, the communications coordinator has administered a teacher survey to get opinions on ways to improve the district. However, many teachers continue to report feeling as though their voices are not heard through these surveys, and real change based on their input is not enacted.

To communicate with parents and community members, the communications coordinator also sends a weekly newsletter as well as periodic surveys to gather feedback on how well the district is communicating and soliciting feedback. However, families in neither focus group described receiving a survey to provide feedback to the district. Families also had differing opinions on the clarity of information shared by the district and whether the district is truly open to community input. For example, during a family focus group, approximately one third of the parents disagreed, whereas another third agreed that the district is open to feedback. Overall, family focus group participants reported that they received adequate district communication on upcoming events but had little awareness of the district’s plans for improvement and academic goals, suggesting an area for future improvement.

## District and School Improvement Planning

In interviews and focus groups, stakeholders at all levels (including district leaders, school leaders, and teachers) all agreed that they need to develop district- and school- level improvement plans. According to documentation, the district has not yet developed a district improvement plan, although the school committee and the superintendent have committed to developing a strategic plan to serve as the educational roadmap for the district by July 31, 2023. In the meantime, the superintendent developed a districtwide goal based on MCAS results to guide improvement efforts for the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years: “By June 2023, the district will achieve an average student growth percentile of 60% or higher on the MCAS assessment.” A district leader explained the rationale behind this improvement goal as follows:

I know it’s easy for some people to say, “Well, MCAS isn’t the be all and end all.” It isn’t . . . [but] the standards are the same, the framework is the same, so what you’re trying to get your kids to understand and know is the same regardless of where you live, so [the district] will not and cannot tolerate any belief that because our kids look or come from a certain part of town that they can’t be successful academically. To me, if you’re below state average, you are not being successful academically.

The district plans to use this district review along with various data sources, some discussed in the Assessment section, to develop a district improvement plan. Developing and implementing a district improvement plan to guide the development and implementation of school improvement plans is an area of growth.

## Budget Development

District leaders and school committee members articulated a budget process with both considerable oversight and responsiveness to the needs at each school and cost center. New during the 2022-2023 school year, the superintendent transitioned Weymouth to a zero-based budget to more intentionally and accurately track spending, increase transparency, and empower school and department leaders to better advocate for their needs. District leaders concurred that cost centers have considerable agency over their individual budgets. After each cost center develops their proposed needs, the school committee explicitly takes responsibility for supporting the needs detailed by each school and department, within the constraints of the overall district budget.

Overall, as described in documents and focus groups, Weymouth has a well-defined process of financial planning. According to district and town leaders, the district begins by sending out a capital request to each cost center. Each cost center develops their own proposed budgets to advocate for their program area's unique needs in the upcoming fiscal school year. Although the schools do not have an instructional leadership team structure to provide input in these budgetary decisions, teacher focus groups confirmed that principals engage them in providing feedback on the budget through meetings and more informal opportunities.

Once the cost centers develop their budgets for the next fiscal year, the finance and operations team has individual sit-downs with all the cost center representatives to make sure that the team understands the budgets being presented and to help the cost center leaders prioritize their budgetary needs. After the cost centers submit their proposed budgets, the budget subcommittee starts to convene. As a district leader explained,

The budget subcommittee meets monthly during the budget season anywhere from, we call it the budget season from November into April/May for the school department piece of it, the detail of it. At the budget subcommittee meeting, that's where the superintendent and the executive team talk about our priorities, goals, and how the budget can support that. The public-facing portion of that is to the budget sub meeting with [the] school committee. And then typically at school committee it's just hearing the budget sub meetings and then we have the public hearing and vote in April for the budget.

Based on interviews and documentation, Weymouth has a well-defined process of financial planning, making this an area of strength for the district.

As mentioned previously, Weymouth recently transitioned to operating on a zero-based budget. From focus groups and interviews, there were mixed opinions on this change. Generally, district leaders appreciated the thoroughness of the zero-based budget, but they also described concerns with how the budget is impacted by recent increases in inflation and ongoing supply chain disruptions from the COVID-19 pandemic, which has made everything more expensive to procure and fix. A district leader explained, "Fill-in-the-blank is going to go up 24% or the fuel charges that you're going to get or the fact that you can no longer purchase five pounds of this item, you have to get an entire case [is impacting the district's budget]." Given that the budget is drafted a year before the fiscal year, and the zero-based budget approach requires every dollar to be accounted for, there are some difficulties in responding to these recent price increases.

In addition, teachers in focus groups reasoned that this combination of inflation increases, the lack of a current teacher contract, and the zero-based budget may account for some of the difficulties that Weymouth has experienced with hiring new faculty and staff to fill vacant positions. Teachers thought that the zero-based budget may make it difficult for the district to offer competitive wages, and, as a result, they are losing qualified applicants and having difficulties retaining longtime faculty because of budgetary constraints. This sentiment also was echoed in the school committee focus group, where it was revealed that the school committee and district leaders had previously suggested that they should add more flexibility in the zero-based budget because it is so difficult to add money to the budget once it had started its approval process through the town.

In addition to increasing transparency during the budgeting process, the superintendent wanted to be more open and clearer about the financial decisions made by the cost centers and how monies were being spent. This was accomplished by creating a new budget book for the district, as described by a district leader:

We created a new budget book talking about transparency and making sure that it was understandable to the layperson. It wasn't just taking a Munus [the district's financial management system] report and saying, "Here it is; here's the breakdown of all the numbers." When you look at Munus reporting, you're like, "I don't know what that means. What's line 107611 mean?" So now it now has more pictures, and it is just clean data and easy-to-read charts.

According to the district financial operations focus group, the proposed fiscal year 2023 operating budget was similarly designed to be transparent and easy for the public to access and understand. This intentionality and dedication to having a transparent budget book is an area of strength for the district.

One area that interview data and documents did not clearly explain is the relationship between budget needs and data use. School committee members and district leaders agreed that the budgetary needs explained were real and well justified, but rarely provided specifics on data use when discussing the budget determination process. An area for growth for the district is being more specific and clearer about how disaggregated student data are incorporated into the budget process.

## Recommendations

- The school committee should develop a formal, transparent process for evaluating the Superintendent, including criteria that aligns with district goals.
- District leadership, including the school committee, should ensure that there are increased opportunities for communication and collaboration between the school committee and teachers' union, especially with regards to collective bargaining.
- The district should ensure that regular communications with families include information about the district's plans for improvement and its academic goals.
- Practices and processes should be established to promote a collaborative, communicative relationship between the school committee, district leadership, and school staff.

- District leadership should prioritize the development and implementation of a district improvement plan to guide the development and implementation of school improvement plans.
- The district should establish consistent expectations for using data to inform budget decisions, in particular disaggregated student data, to better evaluate whether the programs or initiatives that receive funding are resulting in positive impacts at the school or district level.

## Curriculum and Instruction

---

In accordance with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Weymouth strives to ensure equitable and effective instruction for all students. The district's leaders and teachers have collaboratively developed curriculum maps for all grade levels and content areas in the last several years. The curriculum maps follow the UbD planning approach. The district's instructional expectations require that teachers adjust and modify their instruction to meet students' learning needs and learning styles within the general education classroom to provide an inclusive learning environment, as outlined in the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP). The district has a wide variety of academic offerings at the secondary level (e.g., exploratories, electives, and AP). To support students in career exploration, the district has 10 CTE programs that students apply to when they are transitioning into the high school. Aggregate instructional observations indicated that instructional expectations and rigorous instruction were not yet implemented consistently across all schools and classrooms. Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction.



**Table 3. 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>■ The district has an ELA review team to critically review and adopt a high-quality literacy curriculum at the elementary level.</li> <li>■ District leaders have increased the availability of instructional coaches to support teachers in planning and implementing the curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Supporting elementary teachers with aligning the Wit &amp; Wisdom program with a focus on small-group, student-centered instruction</li> <li>■ Ensuring teacher collaboration leads to changes in instruction and increased student engagement and learning</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Classroom instruction</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district is implementing standards-based, student-centered, and project-based instructional practices across schools.</li> <li>■ The district has clearly written documents, including the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan and description of Tiers 1, 2, and 3 documents, to support teachers in adjusting their instruction to meet student needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Embedding diversity, equity, and inclusion into curriculum and instruction</li> <li>■ Supporting students' development of social and emotional competencies (e.g., self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making)</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Student access to coursework</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Schools provide a variety of academic offerings that encourage students to pursue rigorous learning experiences and explore their interests.</li> <li>■ At Weymouth High School, all students are required to complete a capstone project, a rigorous independent learning experience, to demonstrate command of 21st-century skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensuring that all students have equitable access to the various learning opportunities available within the district</li> <li>■ Expanding access to career and technical education pathways so that more students can participate in these offerings</li> </ul>

## Curriculum Selection and Use

Curriculum selection and use is an area of focus for the district, particularly at the elementary level. A review of Weymouth's CURATE<sup>5</sup> table indicated that the district uses a combination of published and created curricula, including Great Minds' Wit & Wisdom (K-6) for ELA, Big Ideas Math (K-11) for mathematics, and OpenSciEd (6-8) for science. Wit & Wisdom is a new literacy program, with teachers implementing it for the first time during the 2022-2023 school year. According to CURATE and EdReports, Wit & Wisdom meets expectations, but Big Ideas Math does not meet expectations. The district's science program, OpenSciEd, is not currently rated on CURATE or EdReports.

Prior to adopting Wit & Wisdom, Weymouth engaged in a thorough and collaborative vetting process of several literacy curriculums to select a program that would best meet their needs. In Weymouth's

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

ELA pilot vision document, the district outlined their priorities, including alignment to standards, online components, differentiation for Tiers 1 and 2, accessibility for ELs and students with disabilities, rigor, diversity, and inclusivity. According to this document, the ELA review team consisted of district-level administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches; students and families were not included in the decision-making process. The ELA review team reviewed four potential programs, identifying two programs to pilot during the 2021-2022 school year. The team also solicited input from different subgroups of educators. An academic support teacher described how feedback from EL teachers were included in this process, “[The team] invited me . . . to give a lens on what worked for ELs, what was good, what was not so good.” Through this process, the district selected Wit & Wisdom using funds from a recently awarded \$200,000 grant from DESE to implement high-quality instruction. A district leader explained the team’s rationale as, “What we’re looking for is curriculum that represents the diversity of the district. From personal perspective and literacy, I wanted to see more authentic texts being used, the ability for student talk. So all those things came into play.” However, across several focus groups, some teachers and specialists were unaware of this piloting process, how teachers were involved, and how Wit & Wisdom was selected as the new literacy curriculum.

At the time of the district review, Weymouth was in the beginning stages of implementing Wit & Wisdom, and teachers were still familiarizing themselves with the new program. Thus far, early impressions of the program are mixed. Generally, principals and teachers liked how diversity was prioritized within the program. One teacher described it as follows: “Wit & Wisdom will allow us to bring literature and topics into our classrooms that are more culturally responsive.” However, teachers in both focus groups also described some early adoption challenges that they have been experiencing, particularly regarding how Wit & Wisdom aligns with the elementary focus on small group, student-centered instructional practices. An elementary teacher described, “Right now we’re all trying to put together [how] our small group push [aligns with] a program that’s primarily whole class.” In addition, teachers described how Wit & Wisdom does not have a strong emphasis on phonics, resulting in the district’s adoption of Foundations. Supporting teachers, instructional coaches, and school administrators in the implementation of Wit & Wisdom is an area of growth for the district.

In addition to the core curricula, the district also implements several supplemental programs at the elementary level to augment the core curriculum, including Foundations, Lively Letters, and Lexia for ELA, ST Math for mathematics, and Mystery Science for science. Foundations and Lively Letters also are new literacy programs this year, and it has been challenging for early elementary teachers to navigate implementing the new programs simultaneously. In addition to these published curricula, the curriculum lead teachers work to address gaps by writing supplements to the curriculum to better align with the curriculum standards.

At the middle and high school levels, most of the curricula are teacher created using UbD. One of the goals of the lead teachers and department head teachers is to review and update the curriculum. Prior to developing these positions, internal consistency was a challenge, and lots of variation existed across departments and individual teachers. Some departments described having strong curriculum maps (e.g., social studies), but teachers in other departments commented that “curriculum documents are vague” and “it has been a wild west of what we do.” At the time of the district review,

high school core curriculum leaders were rewriting curriculum to ensure alignment with standards. For noncore courses, the curriculum collaboration process is led by the teaching staff, organized into specific content groups. Teachers also modify and adjust the curriculum as needed (e.g., changing the pacing or sequencing of lessons) to meet the learning needs of their students.

Weymouth has some formal professional learning structures to support educators in effectively implementing the curriculum. At the elementary level, professional development on the Wit & Wisdom program is the priority this school year, and representatives from the program virtually joined professional development sessions in fall 2022. At the secondary level, staff professional development has primarily focused on trauma-sensitive instruction, social-emotional learning competencies, and understanding students' emotional responses to better respond to the increased needs resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, lead teachers and department heads have received training on the district's new EdCite system for creating assessments. For all new teachers, the district also has a new teacher induction program that meets monthly to support teachers who are new to the profession or the district. See Human Resources and Professional Development for more information on the professional development offered to Weymouth staff.

Although structures are in place to support professional learning, schools appear to vary in how much time is built into teachers' schedules to collaborate on curriculum and instruction alignment, as well as data and student academic progress. At the elementary level, core and grade-level teachers have time specifically carved into their schedules on a weekly basis to collaborate in their professional learning communities (PLCs) across similar content areas in small groups to discuss data, curriculum and instruction, and student academic progress. However, some specialist instructors at the elementary level reported that they do not have enough time for collaboration with each other or other teachers in the building. One specialist reported that the majority of their coordination happens through email, text messages, and quick meetings in the hallways during transitions. At the middle school, teachers are led by deans who specialize in specific content areas and report that they have 40 minutes every other week to collaborate, where they look at benchmarks and share updates about students. High school department heads lead PLC meetings that occur every seven days, but multiple teachers reported that there is not enough time set aside for instructors to look specifically at data. One teacher reported as follows:

We have data. We don't really have time to actually sit down in coherent groups to look at it and to actually change things. I think, individually, people have been great about it, but group-wise, I just think time is something that we've been wanting for a long time.

Although there are times carved out at all levels for PLC meetings with classroom teachers, a general consensus across the district is that this time is not always sufficient for comprehensive collaboration. A district leader described, "[We need to] ensure that teachers are effectively using their collaboration time in their common planning time to have those data driven discussions. It's work we need to do better at." Ensuring that this time is effectively being used is an area of growth for the district.

## Classroom Instruction

Interviews and a document review indicated that the district prioritizes standards-based, student-centered, and project-based instructional practices. Teachers and school leaders described the many ways in which teachers work to modify their instruction and physical classroom space to encourage these practices, such as using small groups, flexible seating, and a variety of projects. To make the general education curriculum accessible to all students, Weymouth's DCAP details a variety of resources and supports to meet the needs of diverse learners, such as word banks, graphic organizers, simplified directions, and extended time. Similarly, both special education and general education teachers identified clear expectations to adjust instruction and provide accommodations for students to best meet their needs.

Across the district, Weymouth incorporates standards-based, student-centered, and project-based instructional approaches. At the elementary level, teachers consistently described the district's emphasis on standards-based instruction, with report cards also being standards based through the fourth grade. At the middle school, teachers described an emphasis on project-based instruction. The new middle school was built in a "neighborhood" structure, in which all core subjects for each grade level are in the same part of the building, with a centralized workspace to facilitate interdisciplinary learning opportunities. The school also purchased furniture for each classroom that facilitates collaboration (e.g., flexible and alternative seating). According to a school leader, "We want the kids to start doing more project based, connecting it within the specialists, connecting it within the cohort of teachers in the classrooms in terms of themes, just so the day will flow and kids feel more actively engaged." To facilitate a project-based approach, Weymouth recently began to pilot a new initiative in which several teams of teachers implement core instruction in a project-based way. At the middle and high school levels, teachers described being student centered by allowing students opportunities to explore a variety of different offerings aligned with their interests (see Student Access to Coursework section).

For students needing more intensive supports, the district uses a multitiered system of support (MTSS; see Tiered Systems of Support for more information). According to the district's description of Tiers 1, 2, and 3 document, all students receive Tier 1 instruction in the general education classroom, which includes whole-class instruction with flexible groupings. Students with more intensive needs are referred to the SIT to establish additional, supplemental supports that go beyond Tier 1 instruction. For Tier 2, students receive targeted small-group instructional support, typically with MTSS interventionists and academic coaches. At the middle school, there is a weekly 45-minute "flex" block designed to facilitate meeting students' needs. At the high school level, several unlevelled courses are designed to assist students with developing the prerequisite skills and foundation that they need to be successful in other core courses (e.g., writing instructional lab, techniques of reading, mathematics lab). Peer tutoring is available four days per week after school. Students who do not make adequate progress within Tier 2 interventions are referred to Tier 3, where they receive individualized supports.

A review of "District Wide Special Education Program Descriptions" on the district website indicated that the district has five programs available throughout the district:

1. Communication Enhancement Program: Designed to meet the learning needs of students who require significant behavioral, social, communication, and/or academic supports based

on the principles of applied behavior analysis. This program is available PK-12 at select schools.

2. **Language Based Learning Center:** Designed for students with a language-based learning disability who require intensive specialized instruction in decoding/encoding in addition to fluency, reading comprehension, and/or written expression. This program is available K-12 at select schools.
3. **Life Skills Program:** Designed for students with significantly deficient intellectual functioning, with a focus on functional academics and access/entry level skills. This program is available PK-12 and is supported by a speech and language pathologist, an occupational therapist, and a physical therapist as needed.
4. **Student Academic and Individualized Learning:** Designed for students who require individualized, direct and explicit instruction with extensive curriculum modifications. This program is available K-12 at select schools.
5. **Therapeutic Learning Center:** Desired for students with a primary educational disability of emotional impairment. This program is not intended to be only a substantially separate program; students may participate in the general education setting for any ratio of time as deemed appropriate by the individualized education program (IEP) team. This program is available K-12 at select schools.

These five programs emphasize teaching students in the least restrictive environment that is appropriate for their needs.

Seven observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Weymouth during the week of November 1, 2022. The observers conducted 116 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 Weymouth, 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 Weymouth is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

In summary, the results from the Weymouth observations were as follows:

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were at the high end of the middle range for all grade bands (average 5.6 for K-5, 5.1 for 6-8, and 5.0 for 9-12).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (average 6.0 and 6.1, respectively) and at the high end of the middle range for the K-5 grade band (average: 5.8).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (average 4.2 for K-5, 4.2 for 6-8, and 4.0 for 9-12).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, average ratings were at the high end of the middle range for the 4-5 and 6-8 grade bands (5.8 and 5.3, respectively) and in the middle range for the 9-12 grade band (average 4.9).

Overall, instructional observations suggest generally strong evidence of emotional support, classroom organization, and student engagement. For each grade band, average scores in each area rounded to 5.0 or higher, with a maximum possible score of 7.0. Instructional observations suggest generally mixed evidence of rigorous instructional support, with each grade band averaging approximately 4.0.

Focus group data suggested some areas of improvement for classroom instruction that further support the observational findings. As described previously, small-group instruction is an ongoing instructional focus this year. However, with the new Wit & Wisdom curriculum, teachers are finding it challenging to navigate how to incorporate small-group instruction with the curriculum's focus on whole-group instruction. This sentiment was expressed in both elementary teacher focus groups and exemplified by the following comment:

Our new curriculum has made [small-group instruction] more challenging for reading. It's very whole-group driven, but we've been told to find the pieces that work and try to use the whole group but also try to pull in our small groups this year as well. But I know that's been a challenge across the grade levels at [the] elementary [level].

These early implementation challenges are reinforced by the instructional observations, in which instructional support was rated in the middle range for all grade bands.

Students described various methods of instruction across classes and subjects. For example, students said that some classes were characterized by interactive activities and group work,

whereas others primarily used independent online work. Students at the middle school level described working more in group settings, whereas at the high school level, students reported a mixture of independent, group work, and hybrid formats. A student shared about the positive impact that group work has in the classroom to encourage collaboration with peers:

I feel like you benefit a lot more being in groups. So I appreciate, especially this year, I found that most of my teachers are having us go for the more hands-on group stuff together, and I feel like that's been really helpful just because you get all the different ideas and the "Oh, I didn't think of that." And so I feel like that has been really good, and I feel like this year more so; I've been able to kind of get with other peers.

Weymouth is still in the early stages of embedding diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) into curriculum and instruction to foster learning, celebration, and engagement with different cultures and backgrounds. School staff described practices embedded explicitly into the curricula to allow students to expand their knowledge and understanding. As described in the Curriculum Selection and Use section, Wit & Wisdom was selected in part because of the diversity and inclusivity represented within the program. Elementary teachers also described incorporating diverse texts into their instruction, and some schools have established multicultural libraries. At the secondary level, students described how inclusive learning practices are starting to be incorporated into some of their courses. For example, at the high school level, one student shared the inclusive learning practices in an allied health program to care for patients of all backgrounds and understand specific healthcare needs. Generally, district and school staff highlighted embedding DEI into curriculum and instruction as an ongoing area for growth; as a support staff member summarized, "I think it's still a work in progress as far as diversity."

Although Weymouth understands the importance of developing students' social and emotional competencies, few formal structures are in place this year to help students do so, indicating an area for growth. During the pandemic, Weymouth had a team dedicated to social-emotional learning, led by an assistant director, two coaches, and an interventionist. During this time, the district also implemented Yale University's RULER program, a systematic approach to social-emotional learning for prekindergarten through 12th grade. However, these structures are no longer in place, and the district does not currently have a formalized social-emotional learning program. Student support specialists indicated this as an area of need, with one specialist commenting as follows: "I feel like the idea is there, and I think everybody values it, but it's unclear exactly what SEL is versus mental health, and what it truly looks like, and how we can embed it in everything that we're doing." More broadly, all schools are implementing PBIS, and there are social-emotional/mental health interventions available to support students struggling in this area. (See the Student Support section for more details.)

## Student Access to Coursework

Interviews and a document review showed that Weymouth offers a variety of educational offerings for students to engage in rigorous learning experiences. At the elementary level, rigorous learning experiences primarily take place in the classroom through hands-on materials, differentiation, and small-group instruction. Students also have access to elective classes, including art, gym, music, and

STEAM (science, technology, engineering, art, and mathematics). The district has several STEAM specialists who create challenges for students (e.g., building catapults, coding with Ozobots).

At the middle school, all students have access to a variety of opportunities, including exploratories and electives and core lab classes. According to the middle school's Program of Studies document, the school has a wide variety of exploratories and electives, including STEM labs (e.g., makerspace, automation, robotics), fine and performing arts (e.g., acting, scriptwriting, modern band, ceramics), humanities (e.g., world of change, journalism), and physical education/health and wellness (e.g., food science, farm/garden, weight training, mindful moments). In addition, six core labs are available to students at all grade levels. Some of the core labs provide students with the foundational skills they need to be successful in their core class (e.g., mathematics lab, reading lab, writing lab), whereas others provide students with advanced learning opportunities (e.g., accelerated mathematics lab). Aligned with the middle school's student-centered approach, students have autonomy to explore four electives per semester.

At the end of middle school, students can choose to apply to the high school's career and technical education (CTE) program, starting in ninth grade. According to Weymouth High School's CTE Admissions Policy document, the CTE Admissions Committee conducts an assembly for grades 7 and 8 students and their families to inform them of the various pathways available. Grade 8 students then participate in a tour of all 10 CTE programs as part of a field trip to the high school. If students are interested in participating in the CTE program, they apply in the fall of their eighth-grade year. The district uses several criteria in the CTE program application process, including discipline, attendance, grades, and a referral from a teacher. The selection process recently underwent adjustment to provide a total view of the whole student. However, parents in both focus groups expressed concerns about the equity of access to the CTE program for students with disabilities, as exemplified by the following quote:

I just wanted to give my opinion on the CTE piece . . . [the requirements] severely limits the students that require special education supports being accepted into there. I don't know how we address that, but I mean the need is there to let those students [participate], those students thrive in that environment. Students that can use their hands and use their minds in a different way, thrive in a CTE environment, and that opportunity is not given to them and that's not okay.

In addition, typically more students apply to the CTE program than there are spots available. Examining the students accepted to the program to ensure equitable access to the CTE program is an area for growth.

For students selected to the CTE pathways, they begin with the CTE Exploratory program, a two-part course designed to help students explore the CTE opportunities and match their skills and interests with a pathway. According to the high school's website, there are 10 pathways available: Allied Health, Automotive Technology, Construction Technology, Cosmetology, Culinary Arts, Drafting and Design Technology, Early Childhood Education, Graphic Communication, Information Technology, and Metal Fabrication. Once students select the pathway they would like to pursue, they participate in three years of study in their chosen field. With the limited number of spaces available, career academies are available only for students who are accepted into the program, and other high school



students cannot take CTE courses as electives. Students would like to see these opportunities expanded so that all interested students are able to participate in some of the CTE offerings, indicating an area for growth. One student explained, “I think if there was a way to offer like subclasses of the CTE shops, it’d be beneficial for the people who aren’t in the CTE program. So being able to take an allied health class when you’re not in the Allied Health program.” Another student added, “I do agree that there could be some way that [the CTE teachers] could just narrow down the information and allow it to be catered to everybody.”

For all high school students, a variety of opportunities exist outside the CTE pathways. According to the high school’s Program of Studies document, a wide variety of classes are available to students, including in art (e.g., sculpture, comic creation, film photography), business technology (e.g., business foundations, web design), English (e.g., public speaking, journalism), world language (e.g., French, Latin, Spanish, American Sign Language), health and physical education (e.g., nutrition and fitness, wellness, health issues), history and social science education (e.g., media literacy, legal studies, political affairs), mathematics (e.g. Java programming), music (e.g., guitar, percussion, piano), and science (e.g., botany, forensics, meteorology). The district also offers several AP courses that can lead to college credit, although students would like for more AP options to be available in the world languages department. Lastly, students also can participate in the dual enrollment program at Quincy College.

In addition to these various courses, students apply their learning beyond the classroom by participating in 40 hours of community service (10 hours per week) and completing a capstone project. The capstone project is an independent project through which students create a proposal; design and produce a rigorous project; and present the results to an audience of teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. During the final term of their junior year, all students participate in a junior capstone seminar to begin planning their project. All senior students then participate in a capstone seminar to mentor them through the process of completing their project. During the student focus group, several students described how their experience in the capstone project has been negatively impacted by ongoing staffing challenges at the high school. One student explained as follows:

With all the new teachers, they don’t know how to provide help to most of the seniors because they don’t know the project themselves . . . a couple of my friends just haven’t done anything because they don’t know what to do. They’re lost . . . this school could have done a better job at providing information on how to teach capstone or only use the teachers that have been here [previously].

The district is in the beginning stages of reviewing course enrollment to ensure that all students have equitable access to opportunities. The district started by examining enrollment in honor and AP courses and generally found a decline in enrollment in these advanced courses as students get older. A graduate student working with the superintendent also examined course enrollment by gender and found the following:

For the higher level ELA based courses, there’s more female students than male students [enrolled]. Then for math and sciences, it’s a little bit more male dominated, but still for the

most part . . . there's a lot more female-identifying students who are in these higher level courses, most specifically in the language- or English-based courses.

At the time of the district review, the district was still examining these data and planned to also look at enrollment in advanced courses by race/ethnicity. One way that the district is planning to address these preliminary findings is by trying to embed rigorous, challenging content into all classes. The superintendent summarized, "everyone should have that opportunity to do anything they want after high school, and if we somehow limited those opportunities during high school, then we have limited their opportunities for after high school."

## Recommendations

- District and school leaders should establish additional opportunities for elementary teachers to receive additional support with the Wit & Wisdom program, focusing on small-group, student-centered instruction.
- The district should ensure that there are sufficient, ongoing opportunities for teachers to engage in comprehensive collaboration that will ultimately lead to changes in instruction and increased student engagement and learning.
- District and school leaders should continue the work of embedding diversity, equity, and inclusion into curriculum and instruction.
- The district should establish formal structures for supporting students' development of social and emotional competencies, including the implementation of a district-wide SEL program.
- The district should continue its work of ensuring that all students have equitable access to the various learning opportunities that the district makes available.
- The district should consider expanding access to career and technical education pathways so that more students can participate in these offerings.

## Assessment

District and school leaders in Weymouth have established and support a culture that values the use of data in improving teaching, learning, and decision making. Focus groups and interviews with teachers and school and district leaders and a document review indicated that educators have access to a variety of data to inform their classroom instruction, including iReady, DIBELS, Lexia, district-developed common formative assessments using EdCite, and MCAS. The district has implemented systems for supporting data use, including three data meetings throughout the year and SIT meetings at every school in the district. The district transparently shares data with students' families in various ways, including physical report cards that are sent home and virtually using the Aspen program and Google Classroom, although parents would like more proactive and regular communication about their child's progress. Table 4 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment.

**Table 4. 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>Using multiple data sources that provide information about students' academic performance across grade levels and subject areas</li> <li>Adopting the new EdCite program to enable teachers to administer common assessments at the middle and high schools for improved data-based decision making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing opportunities for professional development/support and create buy-in for the implementation of EdCite</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Data use</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalized opportunities for school staff to review and discuss student data (e.g., data meetings, PLCs, SIT process)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying ways to streamline the SIT process so that students can receive supports in a timely manner</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Sharing results</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress updates for students and families available in various ways (e.g., Aspen, Google Classroom, report cards, Parent-teacher conferences)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing regular opportunities for students to meaningfully discuss their performance with teachers</li> <li>Providing regular and ongoing communication with families about their child's progress</li> </ul>

### Data and Assessment Systems

Weymouth ensures that multiple data sources are collected numerous times throughout the school year. The district's assessment chart references various assessments across school and subject levels. At the elementary level, teachers administer five assessments at least annually: DIBELS (K-4), Lexia (K-12), iReady Reading (grades 1-5), iReady Math (grades 1-5), and MCAS (grades 3-8). All assessments except MCAS are administered three times per year, in the fall, winter, and spring. DIBELS also is used for progress monitoring students' reading fluency every two weeks. In addition to

these assessments, the Big Ideas math curricula has assessments included that teachers administer according to the district's scope and sequence.

New this year, the district adopted the EdCite program to administer common, standards-based assessments at the middle and high schools. Because this process is new and assessments are developed by each department, the current expectation is for quarterly assessments. According to the district's assessment chart, EdCite is replacing iReady at the middle and high school levels, which overall is a positive change by school staff and district leaders. The high school also administers the MCAS (in ELA, mathematics, and science/engineering), SAT, PSAT, and AP exams annually for applicable students.

Before EdCite was adopted, teachers created their own assessments for their classes. Although these teacher-created assessments covered similar content across classrooms, the assessments were not exactly the same across all teachers. This created challenges when reviewing the data as a department because they were comparing "apples to oranges" as one teacher described. The new EdCite program addresses this challenge by having common assessments administered across the grade level/department/course. The 2022-2023 school year is a pilot year for this new program, and teachers are expected to administer common assessments quarterly at both the middle school and the high school. Thus far, designing the common assessments has been a collective effort across school personnel. The process is spearheaded by the middle school lead teachers and high school department chairs, although "department chairs, lead teachers, the principals, everybody's kind of in that process of creating quarterly assessments for their schools," a district leader explained.

With this common assessment process recently in place, teachers expressed some weariness about the new approach. Teachers at both schools expressed unease about the common assessments, especially pressure to maintain the same pacing as the other teachers so that the results of the assessment are valid. As a middle school teacher explained, "[there is pressure] to be in a certain spot [of the curriculum] at a certain time." Teachers also expressed unease about their perceived lack of control over the assessments being created. For example, in the previous system, teachers had the flexibility and autonomy to change the wording or structure of questions, and this flexibility is giving way to achieve greater consistency across teachers. Providing opportunities for professional development/support to create buy-in for the implementation of EdCite is an area of growth.

The district is still in the early stages of using data to drive improvement efforts. As described in the District and School Improvement Planning section, the district has not yet developed a district strategic plan. Instead, the superintendent developed a districtwide goal based on MCAS results to guide improvement efforts for the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years.

## Data Use

School and district leaders spoke about the expectations to use data to drive continuous improvement at all levels and ensure that educators, including district and school leaders, use data to guide instructional practices. A district leader explained the expectation as, "[using data] should be constant . . . [data] should improve what you do literally do 10 minutes from now, what should you do a day from now, what you should do a week from now." To better enable teachers to use data, the

district recently transitioned to the EdCite system at the secondary level and is currently creating common assessments that can better drive instructional decisions.

At the elementary level, each school has data meetings three times throughout the year, approximately every 12 weeks (at the beginning, middle, and end of the year). A school leader described these data meetings as “very informative” and explained how they function:

[The data meetings] do start off with where the areas of needs are and then what ways teachers are going to dive deep into the curriculum to meet those needs. So that part is good. Just really teaching teachers actually how to understand data and read it is very important . . . that is one thing that we are trying to focus on within our schools is to make sure teachers actually understand what they’re looking at in order for them to be able to improve . . . that’s our biggest goal is making sure data is used to drive the instruction.

An external consultant supports these formal data meetings. In between the formal data meetings, schools have “sense of urgency meetings” every six weeks to monitor students’ responsiveness to the interventions or supports that teams put in place during the data meetings. A district leader explained, “So we’re trying not to wait 12 weeks to see if an intervention works. We’re checking on it in between.” More frequently, elementary teachers are expected to have regular data-driven discussions within their common planning times.

At the secondary level, facilitating data-driven conversations is a primary responsibility of the lead teachers (at the middle school) and department chairs (at the high school). A district leader described this structure as a “work in progress” because at the time of the district review, these positions were still new to the district. The expectation is for the lead teachers or department heads to create the common assessments and to work within the PLCs to review the data and determine teachers’ next steps to support students. More formally, reviewing student data is embedded into content-based department chair meetings. These meetings occur monthly, and the focus alternates between working on school culture and academic content. During the academic content-focused meetings, the teams review data by examining EdCite and how students are meeting the standards.

In addition to these efforts, every school in the district has a student support team (SIT) process. Although the exact composition of the team varies by school, it generally includes a school leader, counselors, department heads or lead teachers, and others as needed. Students may be referred to the SIT by a teacher at any time if there are concerns about the student’s academics, behavior, engagement, or mental health needs. The purpose of the SIT process is to holistically review the student across multiple areas. For that reason, student assessment scores are not the sole reason of a referral. When making the referral, the teacher presents the student’s data (e.g., iReady, DIBELS, class tests) to document their concern. The SIT team then convenes to determine what interventions or supports should be put in place for the student (see Tiered Systems of Support for more information). The team then sets a time to reconvene to monitor the student’s progress. Teachers and support staff in multiple focus groups described the process as lengthy, with one teacher commenting as follows: “Lately it seems like that process is very slow, and [for] the kids that really need help right away, it takes a very long time to get that assistance and that support.” Identifying ways to streamline the process so that students can receive supports in a timely manner is an area for growth.

At the district level, leaders are reviewing data to identify areas for improvement. Specifically, MCAS results were used to inform the superintendent's current goal for the district. The district's leadership team meets formally three times per year to examine student data across schools, although data-informed discussions are happening regularly.

## Sharing Results

District leaders have ensured that teachers, educators, students, and families have easy access to relevant data by adopting online programs (e.g., Aspen, Google Classroom). Aspen is a comprehensive student information management system that provides data insights to teachers and school and district leaders as well as families. Google Classroom is an all-in-one place for teaching and learning, and educators use it to share assignments, input grades, send reminders of upcoming tests, and more. These two systems are the primary ways in which data are shared throughout the district with families and students.

Aspen is available directly on the district's website within the Family and Community tab (Family & Student Logins). "Aspen provides access for parents and caregivers to access student information and academic data." Parents and caregivers have separate accounts for each of their children, but they are able to create a family account that links multiple students within one family. Families can access the Aspen platform at any time to review how their child is doing. In addition to Aspen, multiple interview and focus group respondents indicated that Google Classroom was used to share data with students and families. According to the district's calendar of important dates, parents also receive four report cards and have two parent-teacher conferences during the school year. The availability of multiple systems and structures for communicating student progress is an area of strength in the district.

According to district and school leaders, empowering students to take ownership of their learning by sharing data with them regularly is a priority. A school leader explained, "[What] we've been asking our teachers to do is to actually talk to their students about showing them their data and understanding this is where you are and this is where we need you to be so they're part of that accountability talk. So they're actually involved in that process of change." However, students in both focus groups reported that these conversations are not yet happening consistently. Students described primarily using the Aspen and Google programs to check their grades, but some teachers do not input their grades in a timely manner, making it difficult to gauge how students are doing in class. A student commented, "For most teachers, the only way that you're going to know is if you check your Aspen and sometimes teachers don't even update their Aspen [account] until the end or when progress reports are coming up or report cards." When students are concerned about their grades, they report not consistently receiving help from their teachers. A student described her experience as, "So if you asked [a teacher] how you're doing in something or if you ask, 'Can I get extra help in something?'" Sometimes they don't necessarily have that answer." Several students echoed this sentiment. These comments suggest that providing students with opportunities to meaningfully discuss their performance and providing concrete support on how they can improve is an area for growth.

As with the students, despite various systems and structures to transparently share data with families, parents in the family focus groups described wanting more regular communication on how their child is doing. Although parents appreciated having parent-teacher conferences, they felt as if

the conferences were too short to be able to meaningfully discuss their child's performance. Specifically, families reported that parent-teacher conferences are only eight to 10 minutes long and that it can be difficult to schedule conferences. In between parent-teacher conferences and report cards, parents described receiving "little touch base or progress updates from teachers." Another parent expressed a similar sentiment, commenting as follows: "I feel like there's not a lot of direct communication about how your child is doing in school." These comments indicate that regular and ongoing communication with families about their child's progress is an area for growth.

## Recommendations

- District and school leadership should provide opportunities for teachers to participate in professional development and receive support in their implementation of EdCite and establish ways for teachers to formally provide feedback on the program and its assessments.
- The district should periodically review the SIT process to ensure that it is being conducted efficiently and that students are receiving supports in a timely manner.
- District and school leadership should support teachers in providing regular opportunities for students to meaningfully discuss their performance with teachers.
- The district should establish consistent expectations for engaging in authentic, two-way communication with families, with special consideration given to communication with families whose home language is not English.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

---

The human resources and professional development infrastructure in Weymouth onboards candidates into schools within the district, maintains staff credentials and certifications, and enhances employee culture. In July 2022, the human resources division was separated from finance and operations to become its own stand-alone department. As a result, district leaders described the new department as a “work in progress” and “a little clunky right now” as aspects of the new department’s role and purpose are still being determined. According to district leaders, at the time of the district review, hiring, supervision, evaluation, and recognition were primarily conducted by administrators in each school building, with support from the human resources department. The human resources department has systems and documents in place for schools, but the department remains a step removed from what is happening in the schools.

Weymouth is focusing on continuing to identify strategies to diversify candidate pools for open positions. Upon hire into the Weymouth school system, teachers are paired with a mentor teacher by the leadership at their new school. They stay with these mentors for their first year of hire to learn about the school’s climate, curriculum, systems, and processes, and more. The district also has various professional development programs provided by Wit & Wisdom, Curry College, Lesley University, Accept Collaborative, and other organizations that are useful platforms for teachers’ development and growth. Teachers within Weymouth desiring extra leadership opportunities have the opportunity to apply to become a head teacher within their school.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development.



**Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Infrastructure</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ District leaders recently created a new, separate human resources department.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#"><u>Recruitment, hiring, and assignment</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has some established partnerships with Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity and Education and Curry College to recruit a diverse pool of candidates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Developing a cohesive recruitment and hiring process that includes schools recruiting and hiring diverse candidates</li> <li>■ Creating a more comprehensive process for communicating with schools about teachers’ licensure status</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Supervision, evaluation, and educator development</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Weymouth provides a variety of professional development opportunities on diversity, equity, and inclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Including goals on summative evaluation or “summative evidence collection” forms</li> <li>■ Creating an accountability system for ensuring administrator evaluations are consistently completed at the end of each evaluation cycle</li> <li>■ Providing educators with specific, actionable feedback on strengths and areas for improvement</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Recognition, leadership development, and advancement</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has a first-year mentorship program for new teachers based on the teachers’ subject areas to build curriculum expertise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Raising teachers’ awareness of the leadership opportunities available to them</li> </ul>

## Infrastructure

Weymouth has human resources policies, procedures, and practices. According to district leaders, the district formed a separate human resources department in July 2022, previously being part of the finance and operations department. With this change, the department is still in the early stages of defining its roles and responsibilities. At the time of the district review, a district leader described the department as focusing on “delving into employee culture, recruitment, hiring and retaining, and diversifying the district so that our staff are more representative of our student populations.” According to documentation, four staff members are currently in Weymouth’s human resources department: an executive director and three analysts. This recently revised infrastructure alignment is a strength of the district.

District leaders agreed that the human resources department is responsible for “activities that span a wide variety of core functions, which include staffing, development, compensation, employee

safety and health, and employee/labor relations.” Interviews with district and school leaders indicated that principals determine the staffing needs in buildings. Principals’ job posting requests are reviewed by human resources and the school committee before being posted for candidates to respond. However, according to documentation of the school committee, this collaboration between the human resources department and the school committee on job descriptions may not be consistently happening. Once a hiring decision is made, the human resources department reviews the candidate (e.g., to ensure proper licensures) and makes the final approval. Once staff members begin their employment in Weymouth, the human resources department educates staff on the district’s processes, procures, regulations, and best practices.

## Recruitment, Hiring, and Assignment

District leaders self-identified hiring, retaining, and recruiting processes as areas for growth. Reportedly, the district has historically “been a very paper-driven district,” but with the restructuring of the human resources department, the district is finally “in the process of implementing an onboarding system through PowerSchool [a digitized platform] so that it can increase the effectiveness, the efficiencies around hiring,” according to one district leader. The human resources department hopes that this digital process will help them attract more candidates to fill open positions. According to a wide variety of stakeholders, filling vacant educator positions has been a challenge this year, and at the time of the district review, there were several open positions. The district’s Administrators Guide to Human Resources Procedures outlines the district’s hiring commitments and procedures, including its Equal Employment Opportunity statement, which describes its intention to base hiring decisions on qualifications without regard to individual characteristics. The guide’s Cultural Proficiency statement also describes Weymouth’s efforts to improve hiring practices in a culturally responsive manner to recruit and hire a diverse and inclusive workforce.

School committee members, district and school leaders, and teachers all voiced concern that staff lack diversity in both race and gender. Although the district is committed to increasing diversity in staff, especially with the growing diversity in the Weymouth community, they have not yet identified a reliable strategy to diversify their applicant pool. A district leader described the situation as follows:

We have about 67% White, we have about 13% Hispanic, 6% or 7% African American, 6% or 7% Asian, and our demographics are changing. Over the last 10, 15 years, we are seeing two things, a decrease in [the] overall student population and an increase in our non-White population. You look at our staff, we’ve increased our staff, but we’ve not diversified our staff at the same time, so how can we put educators in front of our children that look like our children? There’s been intentional work on trying to, again, diversify our talent pool when it comes to the hiring and retention of who works in our buildings.

To address this need, Weymouth has partnered with the Massachusetts Partnership for Diversity and Education. Through this partnership, the district participates in different meetings and focus groups to connect with candidates of color. At the time of the district review, the district was working on a grant through DESE that would “gain some funds to assist some of our underrepresented staff members to obtain bachelor’s degrees,” so that they can grow their careers within Weymouth. According to school committee members, the district’s prioritization on diversifying the staff has had some small successes, “we recently finally added some African American representation in our

principal staff, and I think our percentage on the faculty is increasing. I'm pleased with the direction that's going." However, as identified by participants across nearly all focus groups, hiring a diverse, representational staff remains an area of growth for the district.

Long-term, Weymouth is working with Curry College to invest in a diverse, representational workforce. A district leader described how this grant will enable the district to "identify students at the high school that represent subgroups traditionally not in education and then [give them] scholarships to go towards Curry [College] and then support them in coming back and doing student teaching [in Weymouth]." Reportedly, this pathway for educator development will help Weymouth attract a more diverse workforce that is better representative of the students who attend Weymouth schools.

Although human resources has a larger role in recruiting candidates, it has more limited involvement in the hiring process. According to a district leader, "Principals are the hiring authority for their buildings, and then they move those candidates forward to the human resources office [for final approval]." Within each school, hiring decisions are made through a hiring committee structure, chaired by the principal. However, interview data and documents did not clearly explain the composition of these hiring committees. For example, according to teacher focus groups, teachers are rarely included on these hiring committees. In one reported instance, a teacher was able to participate in the hiring process after making a request to the principal, but this experience is not representative of other teachers. In addition, none of the interviews or focus groups described the inclusion of parent or student representatives in the hiring process.

Because hiring decisions are made at the school level, district leaders described how the process is not consistently aligned with district priorities. According to a district leader focus group, "the pressure of needing to get someone in front of the students unfortunately takes over, and we're not always keeping the same priorities in mind." As a result, the district will occasionally hire candidates who are less qualified or not aligned with the district's priorities to fill vacant positions. As corroborated by multiple focus groups, difficulties hiring for vacant positions also is exacerbated by the district's budgeting process that, according to stakeholders, often results in less competitive wages to candidates (see Budget Development section for more information).

Teacher assignment in Weymouth and the communication of qualifications and licensing is an area for growth within the district. According to the "Administrator's Guide to Human Resources Procedures" and district focus groups, employee records are housed within the human resources department, which reports on staff qualifications and other important licensing information to the principals and department heads via a monthly email. The principals and department heads are then responsible for relaying the information to the staff members. As a district leader stated, "that's pretty much what it is right now. It's just an email to the principal asking them to check with their staff," alluding to a perceived need to develop a more comprehensive system of informing staff members about their qualifications and certifications.

## **Supervision, Evaluation, and Educator Development**

The assistant superintendent for teaching and learning (at the secondary level) and the executive director for elementary education (at the elementary level) oversee staff professional development. However, some districtwide professional development opportunities are available to all teachers,

regardless of grade levels taught. The district's partnership with Curry College includes a course for current Weymouth staff focused on culturally responsive practices in the classroom. According to a district leader, "25 of our staff have signed up for that, and then they will be offering another one that's filled up in the spring." There also is a four-course trauma sensitivity training offered through Lesley University to staff as a professional development option. These opportunities align with Weymouth's priority to increase professional development on topics related to DEI, according to a professional development form provided by the district.

In addition to these opportunities, professional development topics target specific needs by level (elementary and secondary). As described in the Curriculum Selection and Use section, at the elementary level, professional development on the Wit & Wisdom program is the priority this school year, and representatives from the program have virtually joined professional development sessions. At the secondary level, staff professional development has primarily focused on trauma-sensitive instruction, social-emotional learning competencies, and understanding students' emotional responses to better respond to the increased needs resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, lead teachers and department heads have received training on the district's new EdCite system for creating assessments. For all new teachers, the district has a new teacher induction program that meets monthly to support teachers who are new to the profession or the district (see the Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement section).

In terms of evaluations, Weymouth started using Vector Evaluations+, formally known as TeachPoint, for educator evaluations in 2021-2022. District records suggest that teacher evaluations are consistently uploaded to an educator evaluation system. A review of the educator evaluation system indicated that teachers received ratings and feedback on their performance based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice. Simple random sampling was used to select a sample of 10 percent of 151 professional teacher status teachers who were scheduled for a summative evaluation in 2021-2022. One of 15 summative evaluations randomly selected for review was not available as a result of noncompletion; however, this educator did complete other requirements, such as providing multiple sources of evidence and developing a student learning and professional goal. Fourteen of the 15 evaluations (93 percent) were marked as complete and were not missing the required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. A review of evaluation records shows the expected development of SMART goals is not consistent because only nine of the 15 evaluations (60 percent) had student learning SMART goals, and ten of the 15 evaluations (67 percent) had professional learning SMART goals on the summative evaluation or goal-setting forms. Fourteen of the 15 educator evaluations (93 percent) included multiple sources of evidence, such as observations, student work samples, or other evidence to support progress toward student learning goals, professional learning goals, standards, and indicators. Eleven of the 15 summative evaluations (73 percent) included feedback for each standard, and most of the evaluations (86 percent) included feedback identifying strengths, whereas less than one third of the evaluation feedback (20 percent) included areas of improvement.

Administrator evaluations also are stored using Vector Evaluations+. Twenty-three administrators were due for a summative evaluation at the end of 2021-2022; however, only nine summative evaluations were available for review complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. Of the summative evaluations reviewed, six evaluations included student

learning goals and professional practice goals. Seven evaluations included multiple sources of evidence to assess performance on summative evaluation standards. Six summative administrator evaluations included evaluator comments with specific, actionable feedback identifying each administrator's strengths, but only one evaluation included areas for improvement.

According to district leaders, providing educators with actionable feedback is critical to improving teaching and learning. To build evaluators' capacity to provide high-quality feedback, this topic is embedded into most administrator meetings. A district leader described that "every other week, we have a full administrator meeting where we have been consistently talking about how vital and important feedback is." In addition, the district has partnered with Carol Gregory, an external consultant from Ribas Associates, to support school leaders in this process. Despite these supports, a review of the educator evaluation system indicates that evaluators are not yet providing specific, actionable feedback consistently. According to interviews, teachers also did not seem to be aware of these additional supports and opportunities for hearing specific, actionable feedback.

## Recognition, Leadership Development, and Advancement

Teachers and school leaders view the district's new educator mentoring program as a leadership opportunity for experienced teachers. According to documentation, the new educator program is not overseen by the human resources department but is housed within the schools and overseen by the principals. As part of the new educator program, teachers participate in a two-to-three-day induction at the start of the year (covering topics such as human resources and technology) and then have monthly meetings throughout the year. New teachers are assigned mentors to provide them with support and feedback throughout their first year. According to teachers, each building's administration assigns the teachers a mentor. Mentors are assigned based on the number of years they have been teaching and their skills as an educator. The administration also tries to match mentor and mentee teachers within subject areas so that mentee teachers can benefit from their mentor teacher's curriculum expertise. This subject area matching mentorship program is a strength of the district.

Teachers who desire to take on additional responsibilities can become teacher leaders in their schools (e.g., lead teachers, department heads). However, according to interviews and focus groups, school staffs' awareness of these opportunities was mixed. When asked about the opportunities available, there were a wide range of responses (e.g., leading clubs, participating on SIT), and some were unaware of any opportunities. This inconsistency in awareness of teacher leadership opportunities is an area of growth for the district.

## Recommendations

- District leadership should develop a cohesive recruitment and hiring process that prioritizes the recruitment and hiring of diverse candidates, in alignment with the district's priorities.
- The district should establish a formal, comprehensive process for communicating with school leaders about the licensure status of their teachers.
- The district should ensure that teacher evaluations include all required components, including student learning and professional learning SMART goals.

- The district should establish a system for ensuring all administrator evaluations are consistently completed at the end of each evaluation cycle.
- District and school leaders should ensure that evaluators are consistently providing educators with specific, actionable feedback on strengths and areas for improvement, and that educators are aware of the supports and opportunities available to improve this practice.
- The district should actively promote opportunities for teachers to take on leadership roles and consider additional ways for teachers participate in decision-making processes.

## Student Support

As described in focus groups and interviews with teachers and school and district leaders and a document review, Weymouth is making conscious efforts to ensure that schools support students' safety, well-being, and sense of belonging by identifying and addressing students' needs and engaging families and students in planning and decision-making efforts to improve the school community. Weymouth is actively incorporating various practices to meet the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students. The district actively engages with multiple community partners that provide resources and services to students and families. To continue adequately supporting the school community, Weymouth must make a concerted effort to reduce community barriers and integrate families into interventions. Table 6 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support.

**Table 6. 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>The district promotes positive approaches to student behavior (e.g., restorative practices, positive behavioral interventions and supports).</li> <li>The district values and provides opportunities for student voice, especially related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring consistency in corrective measures across deans</li> <li>Ensuring that all families have equitable access to information by using translation and interpretation services</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Tiered systems of support</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district provides and teachers use the DCAP as a guiding document for supporting students.</li> <li>Each school uses the SIT process to make collaborative decisions about students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communicating with and integrating families into the SIT process early when there are concerns about a student</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Families and students have opportunities to get involved in the district.</li> <li>The district recently opened a physical family engagement center and virtual engagement hub to provide parents with access to a variety of information about Weymouth schools and supports within the broader community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing communication with students and families about the resources and supports that are available to them</li> </ul>

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

The district strives to support students' and staff's safety and well-being. The DCAP and district and school stakeholders consistently described implementing positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), an evidence-based framework, to promote a safe and supportive environment although implementation varies across schools. Weymouth also uses the Collaborative for Academic,

Social, and Emotional Learning framework to guide social-emotional support, although the district does not currently have a formal social-emotional program. According to the Districtwide Instructional Observation Report, observation scores at the high end of the middle range for Emotional Support dimension of the CLASS tool suggest that teachers and students share warm and supportive relationships.

Weymouth's positive behavioral approaches to supporting students is a strength of the district, as evidenced by instructional observations, staff focus groups, and district documents. Instructional observation scores at the high end of the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (5.4 and 5.9, respectively) and the high range for the K-5 grand band (6.2) suggest that rules and guidelines for behavior are generally clear and consistently reinforced by teachers. The district currently implements restorative practices and PBIS. District leaders prioritize strong adult-student relationships, and they view restorative justice practices as "systemically trying to restore relationships with families and help kids reestablish the relationships with anyone in the building that they may have had an issue with." As part of PBIS, all schools use the acronym ROAR (respect, ownership, achievement, and responsibility) to guide student behavior, and each level (elementary, middle, and high) has a student handbook that defines the expectations. To positively celebrate student behavior, the elementary schools host schoolwide assemblies; send out principal newsletters to celebrate positive student behavior; and have monthly school-based activities encouraging parents, families, and students to participate.

At the secondary level, recent staffing changes have been made to better align with the district's PBIS framework. The middle school now has three assistant principals at each grade level, and the high school has deans that meet to focus on discipline regularly to discuss students at risk and develop plans to mitigate risks. School deans follow the school handbook, approved by the school committee, which outlines a code of conduct for unacceptable behaviors. For incidents involving students receiving special education services, district student support liaisons provide support to the students, parents, and staff. In addition, deans are working with counselors and students with restorative practices to reduce the number of suspensions. One goal for the school deans is to ensure they are "consistent and respectful" regardless of who is involved in the discipline. Ensuring that deans align equitably across corrective measures is an area of growth.

District leaders also shared that Weymouth is working to create an environment that fosters social-emotional learning and DEI and ensures that "every one of our students feels safe and secure and valued in our schools." The district adopts this practice through a "Three E's" initiative: engagement, empowerment, and equity. The district ensures that schools promote meaningful student engagement and leadership. For example, Weymouth High School's diversity committee hosted a DEI summit in April 2022 that allowed staff and students at all grade levels to engage in conversations celebrating DEI through educational workshops, discussion panels, and art exhibits. The various student affinity groups hosted the workshops during the summit, a strong example of student advocacy and empowerment that the district encourages. A high school teacher reported other ways that students get involved:

Many of the students will come to faculty meetings; they'll present, talk, and answer questions. There was a whole bunch of students who came up and talked about how students like to identify with their gender identity. All educated us as educators, which was



fantastic. And I think it really empowered them to educate their peers. So it was very positive for sure.

Providing opportunities for student voice, especially related to DEI, is an area of strength for the district.

However, results from the Views of Climate and Learning student survey indicate some room for improvement in making sure that all students have positive school experiences. Students across the elementary schools and the middle school reported relatively strong school climate, as evidenced by overall school climate scores in the favorable range (51 to 70; maximum score is 100). The only exception in the district was the high school; the results for Weymouth High School indicated an overall school climate score in the somewhat favorable range (31 to 50; maximum score is 100). These data suggest that there is room for improvement in cultivating a safe, challenging, and supportive learning environment at the high school for students.

To keep parents informed of what is happening in schools, principals send out a weekly newsletter to families that was positively received by families. One parent described the weekly communication they receive from their child's school:

We get a Sunday email every week from the principal, and if there are any issues there, they're addressed. I think the high school does a really good job of communicating any problems, not just problems, but accomplishments too in the messages . . . I think parents and students clearly understand what is happening.

In addition, the district has access to translated language services for telecommunication via a phone line, although there is a cost for using it. School staff described that these costs can limit the feasibility of using this service, and the time required to connect with a translator is prohibitive for short meetings (e.g., parent-teacher conferences) or intervention meetings (e.g., counseling services, SIT team meetings). Ensuring that all families have equitable access to information by using translation and interpretation services is an area of growth for the district.

## Tiered Systems of Support

Weymouth is actively implementing MTSS for students at each school and grade level. All students receive Tier 1 instruction and support, including access to guidance counselors, parent outreach, and incentive plans and receiving supports as needed from the DCAP (as previously described in the Classroom Instruction section).

According to the district's description of Tiers 1, 2, and 3 document, Tier 1 supports are universal practices in general education classrooms. Tier 1 academic supports include standards-based instruction and the scaffolds and modifications described in the district's DCAP. At the middle school level, there is a weekly 45-minute "flex" block that serves as a designated time for students to receive interventions, help from teachers in specific classes, or other supports. Behavioral supports include districtwide PBIS practices (as described in the Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture section). To provide social-emotional supports, schools have dedicated time to teach social-emotional learning lessons within the classrooms, although there is no longer a formalized curriculum used for this purpose (previously the Ruler Approach was used in K-5 classrooms).

As described in this same document, Tier 2 intervention includes small-group instructional support with MTSS interventionists and academic coaches. At the high school level, several unlevelled courses assist students with developing the prerequisite skills and foundation they need to be successful in other core courses (e.g., writing instructional lab, techniques of reading, mathematics lab). Students are assigned to these courses by teacher recommendation, and these courses do not fulfill graduation requirements. In addition, peer tutoring is available four days per week at the high school; academically strong upper-class students provide supports to their peers. Behavioral support includes behavior intervention plans and small-group social skills groups (targeting topics such as self-awareness, peer relationships, stress, and anger management). Social-emotional support is provided through school counseling, the Pathways program, wraparound counselors, and a transition room. The transition room at the high school is used as a re-integration technique for students who have been out of school primarily caused by hospitalization or other illness and serves as an “in-between” before transitioning back to a full schedule.

According to the descriptions document, Tier 3 supports include consultations with board-certified behavior analysts, referring students to the Pathways at Chard Street program, and districtwide special education programming. According to an overview document, Pathways at Chard Street is a short-term program, typically about eight weeks, for students with significant difficulties with social-emotional functioning. While enrolled in the program, an intervention plan is developed for each student to facilitate their return to their home school. The program includes two clinicians, an ELA teacher, a mathematics teacher, a consulting school psychologist, and a board-certified behavior analyst.

Students with disabilities receive services through a variety of programs depending on their needs, as outlined in their IEP. As described in the Classroom Instruction section, Weymouth has five special education programs that are available at schools throughout the district: the Communication Enhancement Program, the Language Based Learning Center, the Life Skills Program, the Student Academic and Individualized Learning Program, and the Therapeutic Learning Center. Students are taught in inclusive classrooms with the support of education support professionals as much as possible.

When there is a concern about a student, either academic, behavioral, emotional, or their engagement, the SIT process is initiated. As described in the Data Use section, the SIT process is used throughout the district to support students currently struggling academically, behaviorally, or social emotionally. The process begins with a teacher referring a student to the SIT when there is an academic or nonacademic concern. The team then reviews the data presented and determines what support(s) best align with the student’s needs. After meeting on a specific student, the SIT will regularly revisit that student’s needs and monitor progress.

Interview and focus group data indicated that the district still has room for improvement regarding school communication with families when there is a concern about their child. Although the district has a parent SIT letter that notifies parents that their child is being referred to the SIT and asks them gather some preliminary health information about the child, school leaders agreed that parents could be better integrated into this process. One school leader shared as follows:

We’ve also discussed a lot [about] the fact that one of the very first interventions we should be trying is reaching out to the family consistently instead of that being something that’s

decided in the SIT meeting that someone's going to reach out to the family. That's something that needs to be consistently documented prior to.

Communicating with and integrating families into the SIT process early when there are concerns about a student is an area of growth for the district.

## Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Interviews and focus groups indicated that Weymouth recognizes the importance of engaging with families, students, and the broader Weymouth community. Stakeholders shared that district- and school-parent communication was an expectation, with weekly newsletters sent to parents. The district highly encourages student advocacy and leadership opportunities, particularly at the middle and high school levels. At the middle school, Weymouth is implementing a student action council to encourage student leadership. At the high school, students have an active role in promoting DEI, with district leaders describing students as the leaders of this work.

Weymouth's school and town parent councils—including SEPAC and ELLAC—are ways for parents and families to contribute to the betterment of the district. Active parent councils are at each school, and there is a larger council for the entire town. Parent council meetings occur monthly and are parent led, with members elected to the board as officers. As outlined on Weymouth's website, the purpose of these councils is to “network information to parents/guardians in the Weymouth Public Schools and to act as a liaison between parents and administrators.” Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, these meetings occurred in person; since the pandemic, meetings switched to a virtual format. This shift makes attending the meetings more accessible to some families, although parents reported that the timing of the parent council meetings are limiting to many. Weymouth's SEPAC also is active in the district. According to the district's website, the purpose of the SEPAC is to serve as a resource for information about the special education process, promote a network of parents and caregivers of students with special needs, promote a community-wide understanding of special education issues, foster collaboration within the schools and community, and encourage full access and inclusion for all Weymouth students. The SEPAC meets virtually monthly and includes trainings and facilitated discussions for parents on topics such as applied behavior analysis, autism, and understanding the IEP. Lastly, the district has a parent group specific to ELL parents. The recently established ELLAC has been “very helpful and impactful to the community,” according to student support specialists.

Families have some opportunities to have a voice in district planning and decision-making. According to district leaders, feedback from families is invaluable and highly considered in school developments and decisions. For example, in the development of the new middle school, parents and community members were encouraged to participate and engage in focus groups, which contributed to overall planning and implementation for establishing the school in the district. Parent councils also assist with fundraising efforts, bring in speakers for students, and are an avenue for parents to get information about the curriculum. A parent summarized, “we have strong parent councils across all of our schools; . . . we have very active and dedicated families in Weymouth.”

Stakeholders spoke about several strategies for increasing parents' awareness of the supports available within the Weymouth community. New this year, the district established a family engagement center that serves as a centralized location for bridging “school to the community.” The

district also established a resource hub that serves as an online repository of information for parents, which includes the district calendar, before- and afterschool care, food service, transportation, sports registration, and links to available resources within the broader community. For example, the hub houses a social-emotional learning directory that provides links and contact information for crisis hotlines, outpatient therapy, group therapy, substance abuse, and grief and loss support. Weymouth also hosts English as a second language classes for families across different languages in the summer, and these classes are free and open to the public. These efforts are coordinated by a community relations liaison, who also oversees Weymouth community partnerships. Schools also distribute information about upcoming community events and resources via weekly newsletters that are sent to students and families.

Weymouth has established numerous community partnerships to help meet the needs of students and families. Most recently, the district partnered with the Weymouth Food Pantry and the Greater Boston Food Bank to combat food insecurity in the local school community. Weymouth has created and established a community partnership with Quincy Family Resource Center, a community-based counseling center that offers a wide range of services that follow a tiered system of support model related to mental health, support planning, and events for families.

Despite the district's effort to increase communication of available resources to families and the broader community, families described communication about available services and supports as an ongoing area for improvement. Parents described having to educate themselves on the supports that are available to their child. As one parent explained, "I don't think that [available supports are] clearly explained to parents at all in a way that parents understand. I think some of this stuff comes as educational jargon that most parents just wouldn't understand." This sentiment is illustrative of other parents' experiences as well, suggesting that increasing communication around the availability of services and resources is an area for growth.

## Recommendations

- District and school leaders should establish protocols and expectations for ensuring consistency in corrective measures, especially at the high school level.
- The district should establish consistent expectations for the use of translation and interpretation services to ensure that all families have equitable access to information.
- District and school leaders should review the SIT process to ensure that families are communicated with and meaningfully involved early in the process.
- The district should continue its work with town and community leaders to support the needs of students and families and include in this work increased communication around the availability of services and resources.

## Financial and Asset Management

---

Town and district leaders aim to ensure that allocation and use of funding and other resources improves students' performance, opportunities, and outcomes. Weymouth's approach to budget development empowers the principals and heads of cost centers by relying on them to draft their own budgets, called capital needs requests, for the upcoming school year. Once these requests are drafted, the department of finance and operations reviews the proposed budgets. District leaders collaborate with town leaders to efficiently develop the overall budget and complete regular audits of financial reports and the use of funds. There is an agreed-on process for determining the overall amount of the town budget allocated to the district, and that amount exceeds net school spending requirements. The school's budget books are intentionally developed each year to be transparent, easy for the layperson to understand, and readily accessible on the district's website.

Weymouth has an extensive capital plan as described in their 2023 budget book. In fall 2022, the district's newly built Chapman Middle School opened to students, the funding for came from a debt-exclusion override passed by Weymouth residents. A town leader explained how raising support for this override was a collaborative effort, commenting, "The town had never passed any sort of override in its history before Chapman and that was an incredible collaboration between the superintendents, the school committee, and then the town side." The district also has plans for multiple other maintenance projects on buildings within the district. The district's capital improvement plan is publicly available on the school's website as a part of the annual budget book. The total budget for the district's capital improvement plan for the 2022-2023 school year is \$6,220,650 for high-priority items in three main areas: curriculum, instructional technology, and operations and maintenance.

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management.

**Table 7. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard**

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
<a href="#"><u>Budget documentation and reporting</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district’s budget documents are clear, detailed, and easily accessible on the district website.</li> <li>■ Principals have a high level of autonomy in budget development as they draft their capital needs request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Examining resource allocation for potential funding inequities between schools</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Adequate budget</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district has a strong working relationship with town leaders, as exemplified by the first-ever passing of a debt-exclusion override to fund the building of a new middle school.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Developing a budgeting system which accounts for changing market conditions after the budget is finalized</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>Financial tracking, forecasting, controls, and audits</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The assistant superintendent of finance and operations has monthly meetings with the school committee.</li> <li>■ The district has a transparent financial management system, which is available to appropriate town and district staff.</li> <li>■ The district has consistent monitoring procedures to ensure efficient and effective use of budgeted funds.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#"><u>Capital planning and facility maintenance</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The district opened the newly built Chapman Middle School in fall 2022.</li> </ul>	

## Budget Documentation and Reporting

Weymouth maintains clear and accurate budget documents that include information about all sources of funds and the allocation of resources. District budgets from fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2023 are publicly available on the district’s website. Weymouth’s budget documents and presentation to the school committee include pertinent information about the allocation of resources and the sources of funds. The current budget book provides information on funding sources, including town funding, Chapter 70 state aid funding, grants, and other revolving funding.

Budget presentations and documents contain expenses broken down by school in an easy-to-read budget book that is meant to be understandable by the average Weymouth citizen. This budget book contains detailed information about fixed costs, salaries, maintenance costs, CTE program costs, and other school expenses. Alongside the proposed budget for the school year in advance, the current operating budget of the school is presented in an easily comparable chart format. Budget

documents are a strength of the district; they are clear, accurate, complete, and user-friendly, and they provide easily accessible historical spending data from the prior fiscal year for comparisons. Details are sufficient for stakeholders to understand the current year's resource allocation and explanations for needed resources.

District leaders described collaboration between school administrators, town officials, and district central office staff in developing the overall budget. For example, district leaders reported that the principals were the first to draft their budgets for the next school year, using specific data and knowledge about their current spending habits. Principals drafted these budgets first using a zero-based budget system that accounts for every dollar proposed to be spent in the district during the next school year (see Budget Development section for more information). The high level of principal autonomy in developing their own budgets to meet their school's needs is an area of strength within the district.

One area that interview data and budget documents did not clearly explain is how—if at all—the district is examining existing resource allocation for potential funding inequities between schools. Reviewing funding allocations to determine whether schools with greater needs receive greater funding is an area of growth.

## Adequate Budget

According to a district leader, Weymouth has an \$81.2 million operating budget for 2022-2023. More than half of that money comes from the town, and an additional 30% of that budget comes from "Chapter 70 through state aid." The additional 14% comes from a combination of federal, state, and private/foundation grants. Currently, Weymouth receives the minimum amount of state aid per student, about \$60 per student, and the rest of the money required is gained through federal funding, grants, or the local population.

According to a district leader, the district previously had breakage in their budget, or additional money from grants or other onetime sources that does not have a plan to be spent. The district developed a capital program to account for these monies, and schools could develop a capital funds request to advocate for the needs of their schools. For example, in fiscal year 2023, according to the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Presentation document, \$100,000 of Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds were used for materials to support career and technical training within the CTE programs at Weymouth High School.

Although the district has a capital program to account for additional grant money, district leaders explained that the district is currently experiencing negative breakage. Previously, when experienced staff retired with higher salaries, the school would hire less-experienced teachers with lower salaries to fill these positions, resulting in more money in their budget. However, with the current economy and the need to be competitive with other neighboring districts, new teachers are hired with higher starting salaries, resulting in negative breakage. According to district financial leaders, the recent economic impacts on staffing are more pronounced because the budget is created 12-18 months ahead of spending, meaning that these increased costs are not well accounted for. Because staffing accounts for 90% of Weymouth's annual expenses, examining how the district's zero-based budgeting practice is affecting teacher recruitment and retention efforts is an area of growth for the district.

According to a town leader, there is availability in the budget to adjust costs and expenses resulting from inflation that may have occurred in between budget development and spending time, but there is not a similar process to adjust staff salaries in a similar way. According to district and teacher focus groups, this process has made it challenging to fill current vacancies and retain experienced staff. The district struggles to offer competitive salaries with neighboring districts (see the Budget Development section for more information).

As mentioned previously, Weymouth recently finished construction on the new Maria Weston Chapman Middle School to replace the previous Abigail Adams Middle School. According to district leaders and school committee members, the school committee was actively involved and passionate about getting the town to pass a debt-exclusion override to build the new school, which was passed in 2019. According to the district website, this new middle school cost approximately \$165,000,000, and the district and school leaders see this new building as an investment in their future. District and town leaders and school committee members agreed that there is a good working relationship and cite this collaboration as being critical to their success in passing the override to fund the new middle school.

## **Financial Tracking, Forecasting, Controls, and Audits**

According to district leaders, Weymouth meets all end-of-year reporting requirements. The assistant superintendent of finance and budget has monthly meetings with the school committee to discuss the current status of the budget. All information disclosed in these meetings and other important documents are shared with the town manager for transparency. Twice a year, the school committee receives detailed reports about what money from the budget has been spent. The school committee also receives a quarterly report about revolving budgetary accounts so that they can track budgetary items that they are most concerned with.

According to district leaders, Venus Municipals is the district's financial management system, but they also use Excel spreadsheets to better address their operational needs by creating "more customized, detailed information" for cost centers. Reportedly, all administrators who manage a budget and all cost centers have access to the records in Venus Municipals. The district's human resources department and appropriate town officials also have access to the Venus Municipals records.

The department of finance and operations meets three or four times per year with each cost center, depending on their needs. According to interviews, the assistant superintendent of finance and operations sits down with the heads of each cost center after they submit their capital needs request for the upcoming year. This regular communication between the finance and operations department and the cost centers is a strength of the district.

According to district leaders, the district uses an independent financial auditing service to do a "single audit" at the end of the year. This same auditing service also completes the annual audit for the town of Weymouth. In addition to the external independent financial auditing service, the district relies on an internal auditor to conduct a periodic audit on a category of assets within the district, for example, on a fleet of vehicles or technological equipment.



The district recently developed a five-year forecasting process to better estimate their long-term needs. Two district leaders are currently participating in Georgetown University’s Edunomics Center, which prompted the need for improved modeling. A district leader described this process as follows:

So we built [a model] internally, and it really forecasts out over the next five years. [It] takes a number of assumptions . . . so projecting out all the cost-of-living increases, changes . . . we do apply the 50-year average for inflation of like 3.55 percent or something. So that’s another tool is; we now have this five-year forecaster that we then use to help build our budgets.

According to district leaders, this modeling will help to improve the budgeting process moving forward.

## Capital Planning and Facility Maintenance

As described in the publicly available 2023 budget book, Weymouth maintains a capital improvement plan that focuses on three main areas: curriculum, instructional technology, and operations and maintenance. According to the pages dedicated to the district’s capital improvement plan, Weymouth allocated \$899,650 to curriculum, \$820,000 to instructional technology, and \$4,501,000 to operations and maintenance. The funds in these three areas were budgeted for priorities such as maintenance of current assets, expansion, and investment in new materials. To develop these budget amounts, Weymouth school department members “reviewed all prior Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) needs” to determine spending amounts, and according to documentation, “all administrators and departments were provided an opportunity to submit requests for consideration for the CIP.”

Under the category of operations and maintenance, the area with the largest budget of the three referenced in the capital improvement plan, several large maintenance projects were mentioned, including fixing the heating coils and ducts in Ralph Talbot Primary School; fixing the boilers in the Johnson Early Childhood Center; renovating the ducts in the old Abigail Adams Middle School; replacing the roof in the maintenance garage; constructing a new building to house district vehicles and replacing several district vehicles; buying a van for small-group activities for Weymouth High School; renovating the rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems on Weymouth High School; and installing crosswalk lights in front of Abigail Adams Middle School and Weymouth High School. The district plans to use ESSER fundings for these types of capital needs. These maintenance capital improvement plan components are planned expenses in the 2023 financial budget book; however, some of the components will carry over into additional school years.

The district and town recently finished building the new Chapman Middle School. As described in the Adequate Funds section, construction of this new building was funded through the town’s debt extension override. In fall 2022, the new middle school was open to teachers and students. The old middle school building, Abigail Adams, will become a new childcare building in upcoming years because the district anticipates increases in student enrollment and wants to be prepared. A school committee member described it as follows:

We’re going to make it a larger preschool. Abigail Adams is going to become a town-wide preschool [as part of] Weymouth Public Schools, because Johnson Early Childhood [Center] is

getting too small. And we realize that the government may do free preschool at some point and that we need to be prepared and have a great central location.

To serve this new purpose, the old Abigail Adams building requires maintenance.

## Recommendations

- The district should consider examining its resource allocation practices for potential funding inequities between schools, specifically focusing on ensuring that school funding levels equitably support the staffing and programming needs of each school.
- The district should examine its budgeting practices to determine its impact on teacher recruitment and retention efforts.

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

---

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Weymouth. The team conducted 116 classroom observations during the week of November 1, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups between October 31 and November 2, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- Data on the district's staffing and finances
- Curricular review process and timeline
- Weymouth curriculum unit template
- District documents such as school committee minutes and policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district's end-of-year financial reports
- All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations

# Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

---

## *Weymouth Public Schools*

### Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

# Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

November 2023



# Contents

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





## Introduction

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

Seven observers visited Weymouth Public Schools during the week of November 1, 2022. Observers conducted 116 observations in a sample of classrooms across ten schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely

evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support or attention, was unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students' problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

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

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

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

## Positive Climate

---

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

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

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

#### **Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.6**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	0	0	2	3	15	16	9	116	5.6
Grades K-5	0	0	2	3	15	16	9	45	5.6
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	5	5	14	6	31	5.6
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	4	14	13	8	40	5.6

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 4] + [4 \times 12] + [5 \times 34] + [6 \times 43] + [7 \times 23]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

**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\*: 5.6**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	0	0	0	5	12	18	10	116	5.6
Grades K-5	0	0	0	5	12	18	10	45	5.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	2	6	5	13	5	31	5.4
Grades 9-12	0	1	0	8	8	16	7	40	5.5

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 2] + [4 \times 19] + [5 \times 25] + [6 \times 47] + [7 \times 22]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

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

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

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

## Regard for Student Perspectives

---

*Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

### Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 4.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
								<b>116</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Grades K-5	0	3	13	11	14	4	0	45	4.1
Grades 6-8	0	1	6	12	6	6	0	31	4.3
Grades 9-12	1	5	7	12	9	5	1	40	4.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 9] + [3 \times 26] + [4 \times 35] + [5 \times 29] + [6 \times 15] + [7 \times 1]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

**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	0	1	44	45	7.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	31	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	1	6	33	40	6.8

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:  $([5 \times 1] + [6 \times 9] + [7 \times 106]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

**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\*: 5.8**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	2	5	17	20	45	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	3	2	3	5	9	9	31	5.4
Grades 9-12	0	0	4	3	5	11	17	40	5.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 3] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 37] + [7 \times 46]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 5.8$

**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\*: 5.9**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	1	1	10	11	22	45	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	1	0	4	6	10	10	31	5.7
Grades 9-12	0	0	4	5	3	16	12	40	5.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 19] + [6 \times 37] + [7 \times 44]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 5.9$

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

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

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



## Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

**Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 4.9**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	0	0	3	8	20	7	7	45	5.2
Grades 6-8	0	1	1	5	13	9	2	31	5.1
Grades 9-12	1	3	8	6	11	11	0	40	4.4

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 1] + [2 \times 4] + [3 \times 12] + [4 \times 19] + [5 \times 44] + [6 \times 27] + [7 \times 9]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 4.9$

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

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

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

## Concept Development

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Concept Development District Average\*: 3.6**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	7	8	7	7	2	0	31	3.6

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 7] + [3 \times 8] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 2]) \div 31 \text{ observations} = 3.6$

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

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

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

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

## Content Understanding

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12*

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

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

**Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.7**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	3	2	5	1	3	14	4.9
Grades 6-8	0	2	8	5	9	6	1	31	4.4
Grades 9-12	0	2	5	8	13	8	4	40	4.8

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 4] + [3 \times 16] + [4 \times 15] + [5 \times 27] + [6 \times 15] + [7 \times 8]) \div 85 \text{ observations} = 4.7$

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

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

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

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

## Analysis and Inquiry

---

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

**Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 3.6**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	6	2	5	1	0	14	4.1
Grades 6-8	2	3	11	3	9	3	0	31	3.7
Grades 9-12	5	8	10	5	7	4	1	40	3.4

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 7] + [2 \times 11] + [3 \times 27] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 21] + [6 \times 8] + [7 \times 1]) \div 85 \text{ observations} = 3.6$

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

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

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

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

## Quality of Feedback

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–12*

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

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

**Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 4.0**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-5	1	3	9	15	6	7	4	45	4.3
Grades 6-8	2	4	7	8	6	2	2	31	3.8
Grades 9-12	3	8	12	3	7	5	2	40	3.7

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 6] + [2 \times 15] + [3 \times 28] + [4 \times 26] + [5 \times 19] + [6 \times 14] + [7 \times 8]) \div 116 \text{ observations} = 4.0$

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

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

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

## Language Modeling

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3*

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

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

**Language Modeling District Average\*: 4.1**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades K-3**	0	2	10	8	6	4	1	31	4.1

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 10] + [4 \times 8] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 4] + [7 \times 1]) \div 31 \text{ observations} = 4.1$

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

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

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

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

## Instructional Dialogue

---

*Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–12*

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

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

**Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.9**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	1	1	4	3	4	1	14	4.8
Grades 6-8	2	4	7	6	5	6	1	31	4.0
Grades 9-12	7	6	6	8	7	5	1	40	3.5

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:  $([1 \times 9] + [2 \times 11] + [3 \times 14] + [4 \times 18] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 15] + [7 \times 3]) \div 85 \text{ observations} = 3.9$

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

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

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

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

# Student Engagement

---

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–12

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

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

**Student Engagement District Average\*: 5.2**

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	0	7	3	4	14	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	3	3	8	15	2	31	5.3
Grades 9-12	0	2	4	8	12	9	5	40	4.9

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:  $([2 \times 2] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 11] + [5 \times 27] + [6 \times 27] + [7 \times 11]) \div 85 \text{ observations} = 5.2$

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

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

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

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



## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>5.6</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	2	3	15	16	9	45	5.6
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	44	45	7.0
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	5	12	18	10	45	5.7
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	3	13	11	14	4	0	45	4.1
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>5.8</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	1	2	5	17	20	45	6.2
Productivity	0	0	1	1	10	11	22	45	6.2
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	3	8	20	7	7	45	5.2
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	7	8	7	7	2	0	31	3.6
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	0	3	2	5	1	3	14	4.9
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	0	0	6	2	5	1	0	14	4.1
Quality of Feedback	1	3	9	15	6	7	4	45	4.3
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	2	10	8	6	4	1	31	4.1
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	0	1	1	4	3	4	1	14	4.8
<b>Student Engagement (UE only)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5.8</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 2] + [4 \times 3] + [5 \times 15] + [6 \times 16] + [7 \times 9]) \div 45 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 44]) \div 45 \text{ observations} = 7.0$ . In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5.1</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	1	5	5	14	6	31	5.6
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	2	6	5	13	5	31	5.4
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	1	6	12	6	6	0	31	4.3
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>6.0</b>
Behavior Management	0	3	2	3	5	9	9	31	5.4
Productivity	0	1	0	4	6	10	10	31	5.7
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	31	6.9
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	0	1	1	5	13	9	2	31	5.1
Content Understanding	0	2	8	5	9	6	1	31	4.4
Analysis and Inquiry	2	3	11	3	9	3	0	31	3.7
Quality of Feedback	2	4	7	8	6	2	2	31	3.8
Instructional Dialogue	2	4	7	6	5	6	1	31	4.0
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>5.3</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 14] + [7 \times 6]) \div 31 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

\*\*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:  $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 29]) \div 31 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

## Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<b>Emotional Support Domain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Positive Climate	0	0	1	4	14	13	8	40	5.6
Teacher Sensitivity	0	1	0	8	8	16	7	40	5.5
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	5	7	12	9	5	1	40	4.1
<b>Classroom Organization Domain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>6.1</b>
Behavior Management	0	0	4	3	5	11	17	40	5.9
Productivity	0	0	4	5	3	16	12	40	5.7
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	1	6	33	40	6.8
<b>Instructional Support Domain</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Instructional Learning Formats	1	3	8	6	11	11	0	40	4.4
Content Understanding	0	2	5	8	13	8	4	40	4.8
Analysis and Inquiry	5	8	10	5	7	4	1	40	3.4
Quality of Feedback	3	8	12	3	7	5	2	40	3.7
Instructional Dialogue	7	6	6	8	7	5	1	40	3.5
<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4.9</b>

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as:  $([3 \times 1] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 14] + [6 \times 13] + [7 \times 8]) \div 40 \text{ observations} = 5.6$

\*\*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:  $([5 \times 1] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 33]) \div 40 \text{ observations} = 6.8$

## References

---

- Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf>
- MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from [http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS\\_10\\_29\\_10.pdf](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 Leadership and Governance**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting (SBB)</a> from Education Resource Strategies	This guide describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs.
<a href="#">Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook</a>	A series of modules designed to support novice principals and their mentors in the development of antiracist leadership competencies aligned to the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership.
<a href="#">Coherence Guidebook</a>	This guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision.

**Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Curriculum Matters</a> Webpage	Suite of resources to support the use of high-quality curriculum, including <a href="#">IMplement MA</a> , our recommended four-phase process to prepare for, select, launch, and implement new high-quality instructional materials with key tasks and action steps. Also includes <a href="#">CURATE</a> , which 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.
<a href="#">Curriculum Frameworks Resources</a>	Some of the most frequently used resources include “ <a href="#">What to Look For</a> ” classroom observation guides; the <a href="#">Family Guides</a> to help families understand what students are expected to know and do by the end of each grade; and the Standards Navigator tool and app, which can be used to explore the standards, see how they are connected to other standards and related student work samples, reference guides, and definitions.
<a href="#">Mass Literacy</a> Guide	An interactive site with research, information, and resources on evidence-based practices for early literacy that are culturally responsive and sustaining. There is current information on complex text, fluent word reading, language comprehension, students experiencing reading difficulties, equity in literacy, how to support an MTSS for ELA/literacy, and much more.
<a href="#">Coherence Guidebook</a>	This guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision.

**Table C3. 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 C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources</a>	A suite of resources and practical tools that reflect feedback from educators on how to implement educator evaluation in support of more equitable, culturally responsive schools and classrooms for all. These resources include Focus Indicators, a subset of indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the 2022-2023 school year.
<a href="#">Guide to Building Supportive Talent Systems</a>	Resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on racial equity.
<a href="#">Professional Learning Partner Guide</a>	A free, online, searchable list of vetted professional development providers who have expertise in specific sets of high-quality instructional materials. Schools and districts can use this guide to easily find professional development providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials.

**Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Safe and Supportive Schools 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 in creating 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 MTSS resource offers a framework for how districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.
<a href="#">Strengthening Partnerships: A Framework for Prenatal through Young Adulthood Family Engagement in 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 <a href="#">Youth Risk Behavior Survey</a>	State and local student survey data can provide information about student experiences, strengths, and needs. They also can help prompt additional local inquiry through focus groups, advisories, and ongoing communication with students, families, staff, and partners to inform continuous improvement efforts.

**Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management**

Resource	Description
<a href="#">Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most From School District Budgets</a> (scroll down to Research section)	A discussion of the top 10 opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities.
<a href="#">Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)</a>	RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions.
<a href="#">Planning for Success</a>	An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support.
<a href="#">DESE spending comparisons website</a>	A clearinghouse of school finance data reports and other resources available to district users and the public.

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	5,599	100.0%	913,735	100.0%
African American	469	8.4%	85,662	9.4%
Asian	367	6.6%	67,010	7.3%
Hispanic	787	14.1%	221,044	24.2%
Native American	10	0.2%	2,155	0.2%
White	3,672	65.6%	496,800	54.4%
Native Hawaiian	7	0.1%	787	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic/Latino	287	5.1%	40,277	4.4%

Note. As of October 1, 2022.

**Table D2. Weymouth Public Schools: 2022-2023 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Group	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of state
All students with high needs	3,128	100.0%	55.1%	508,820	100.0%	55.1%
Students with disabilities	1,304	41.7%	23.0%	179,095	35.2%	19.4%
Low-income households	2,335	74.6%	41.7%	386,060	75.9%	42.3%
ELs and former ELs	457	14.6%	8.2%	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 5,676; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 923,349.



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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	3-year change	State (2022)
All	5,930	13.9	23.1	30.0	+16.1	27.7
African American/Black	491	13.3	34.9	38.5	+25.2	32.0
Asian	398	8.5	8.8	14.1	+5.6	15.4
Hispanic/Latino	816	20.3	39.9	42.0	+21.7	42.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	303	18.1	31.9	32.3	+14.2	28.4
White	3,901	13.1	19.6	27.8	+14.7	22.1
High needs	3,427	19.9	33.3	37.8	+17.9	37.1
Low income <sup>b</sup>	2,717	—	—	40.0	—	40.6
ELs	470	16.5	30.3	38.1	+21.6	39.9
Students with disabilities	1,317	23.1	36.8	40.3	+17.2	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. Weymouth Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2020-2022**

	Fiscal year 2019		Fiscal year 2020		Fiscal year 2021	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
<b>Expenditures</b>						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	\$73,619,894	\$73,245,366	\$74,392,873	\$75,330,010	\$78,135,121	\$78,554,302
By municipality	\$21,365,365	\$28,602,343	\$25,013,306	\$25,050,654	\$24,139,984	\$34,024,634
Total from local appropriations	\$94,985,259	\$101,847,709	\$99,406,179	\$100,380,664	\$102,275,105	\$112,578,936
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$10,523,945	--	\$11,301,247	--	\$12,122,993
Total expenditures	--	\$112,371,654	--	\$111,681,911	--	\$124,701,929
Chapter 70 state aid <sup>a</sup>	--	\$28,253,945	--	\$28,433,255	--	\$28,433,225
Required local contribution	--	\$51,161,839	--	\$54,222,905	--	\$56,687,928
Required net school spending <sup>b</sup>	--	\$79,415,784	--	\$82,656,130	--	\$85,121,153
Actual net school spending	--	\$85,364,088	--	\$89,819,183	--	\$92,917,256
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$5,948,304	--	\$7,163,053	--	\$7,796,103
Over/under required (%)	--	7.5%	--	8.7%	--	9.2%

Note. Data as of June 1, 2022, and sourced from fiscal year 2021 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. Weymouth Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2019-2021**

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	\$628	\$633	\$605
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$956	\$988	\$1,011
Teachers	\$6,178	\$6,295	\$7,397
Other teaching services	\$1,237	\$1,269	\$1,313
Professional development	\$59	\$54	\$37
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	\$357	\$354	\$591
Guidance, counseling, and testing services	\$673	\$720	\$789
Pupil services	\$1,355	\$1,817	\$1,332
Operations and maintenance	\$1,225	\$1,062	\$1,176
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	\$2,530	\$2,870	\$3,007
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$15,198	\$16,061	\$17,259

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. Weymouth Public Schools: 2022-2023 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
African American/Black	469	8.4%	85,662	9.4%
Asian	367	6.6%	67,010	7.3%
Hispanic	787	14.1%	221,044	24.2%
Native American	10	0.2%	2,155	0.2%
White	3,672	65.6%	496,800	54.4%
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	7	0.1%	787	0.1%
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	287	5.1%	40,277	4.4%
<b>All students</b>	<b>5,599</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>913,735</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note. As of October 1, 2022.

**Table E2. Weymouth Public Schools: 2022-2023 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student groups	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of state
Students w/disabilities	1,304	41.7%	23.0%	179,095	35.2%	19.4%
Low income <sup>a</sup>	2,335	74.6%	41.7%	386,060	75.9%	42.3%
ELs and former ELs	457	14.6%	8.2%	110,554	21.7%	12.1%
High needs	3,128	100.0%	55.1%	508,820	100.0%	55.1%

Note. As of October 1, 2022. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and students with high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 5,676; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 923,349.

<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. Weymouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 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	2,399	48	42	36	41	10	17	18	17
African American/Black	191	24	25	23	26	20	34	26	27
Asian	167	67	64	51	63	5	7	7	8
Hispanic/Latino	321	39	31	25	22	16	27	30	31
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	114	53	47	34	48	13	15	18	14
Native American	5	—	—	—	29	—	—	—	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	2	—	—	—	43	—	—	—	17
White	1,599	50	44	38	48	9	14	16	11
High needs	1,404	30	27	22	24	19	28	29	28
Low income <sup>a</sup>	1,103	—	—	24	24	—	—	27	28
ELs and former ELs	262	34	28	20	20	18	32	34	34
Students w/disabilities	587	10	11	7	11	35	47	50	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 E4. Weymouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS ELA 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	426	63	59	54	58	7	10	7	8
African American/Black	45	41	43	24	41	25	19	18	13
Asian	24	78	81	71	79	0	0	8	4
Hispanic/Latino	40	54	39	40	38	20	29	5	17
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	13	50	27	85	62	7	7	0	6
Native American	1	—	—	—	53	—	—	—	8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	45	—	—	—	16
White	302	66	63	58	65	5	8	5	4
High needs	230	35	33	38	38	20	24	12	15
Low income <sup>a</sup>	186	—	—	42	40	—	—	8	14
ELs and former ELs	15	11	17	13	21	37	52	33	30
Students w/disabilities	97	12	13	15	20	36	35	24	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 E5. Weymouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 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	2,404	43	30	35	39	12	20	17	17
African American/Black	190	18	10	16	19	27	44	32	31
Asian	167	71	59	67	69	5	10	4	6
Hispanic/Latino	320	32	16	21	18	18	34	29	32
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	116	47	24	30	44	9	22	16	16
Native American	5	—	—	—	27	—	—	—	23
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	2	—	—	—	39	—	—	—	19
White	1,604	45	32	37	47	10	16	14	11
High needs	1,408	26	16	22	22	21	33	27	28
Low income <sup>a</sup>	1,106	—	—	24	20	—	—	26	29
ELs and former ELs	261	33	22	27	21	23	34	26	32
Students w/disabilities	585	8	5	6	12	39	51	46	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 E6. Weymouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Mathematics 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	426	50	42	42	50	8	12	11	10
African American/Black	44	23	25	14	26	27	30	30	20
Asian	24	74	75	79	78	0	6	0	4
Hispanic/Latino	41	29	23	32	26	20	27	12	21
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	13	31	20	38	53	15	20	0	10
Native American	1	—	—	—	37	—	—	—	16
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	48	—	—	—	19
White	302	54	45	44	59	6	9	9	6
High needs	231	23	19	26	28	22	25	19	19
Low income <sup>a</sup>	187	—	—	27	29	—	—	17	19
ELs and former ELs	16	26	14	25	17	37	33	38	32
Students w/disabilities	98	5	6	15	15	37	38	35	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 E7. Weymouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 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	828	40	35	38	42	14	18	14	18
African American/Black	61	20	16	20	21	27	28	21	31
Asian	53	61	45	53	65	4	9	4	8
Hispanic/Latino	115	24	21	28	20	19	38	24	33
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	38	31	30	37	48	20	13	16	15
Native American	1	—	—	—	28	—	—	—	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	41	—	—	—	20
White	560	43	38	40	52	13	15	13	10
High needs	454	24	20	26	24	26	32	25	29
Low income <sup>a</sup>	361	—	—	26	23	—	—	25	30
ELs and former ELs	78	34	23	27	18	25	39	32	37
Students w/disabilities	176	8	13	10	15	46	44	44	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 E8. Weymouth 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	383	—	—	54	47	—	—	10	14
African American/Black	35	—	—	29	25	—	—	40	25
Asian	22	—	—	86	70	—	—	5	6
Hispanic/Latino	32	—	—	44	23	—	—	0	28
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	11	—	—	82	51	—	—	0	12
Native American	1	—	—	—	38	—	—	—	14
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	45	—	—	—	23
White	281	—	—	54	56	—	—	8	8
High needs	201	—	—	38	26	—	—	18	24
Low income <sup>a</sup>	162	—	—	42	26	—	—	16	25
ELs and former ELs	10	—	—	20	13	—	—	30	43
Students w/disabilities	89	—	—	17	16	—	—	28	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 E9. Weymouth Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,880	42.6	44.8	49.8
African American/Black	126	41.3	48.0	48.8
Asian	117	47.4	55.6	58.5
Hispanic/Latino	243	40.3	43.1	46.5
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	81	37.4	43.6	51.5
Native American	2	—	—	46.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	51.7
White	1,310	42.8	44.0	50.0
High needs	1,055	40.6	43.2	46.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	825	—	43.2	46.5
ELs and former ELs	183	44.0	47.0	47.7
Students w/disabilities	438	39.9	39.4	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 E10. Weymouth Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	367	47.7	49.2	50.0
African American/Black	34	31.3	45.6	49.8
Asian	22	56.1	51.1	56.0
Hispanic/Latino	32	42.0	42.4	47.6
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	—	—	50.6
Native American	1	—	—	54.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	49.5
White	265	48.9	49.8	50.1
High needs	190	37.6	46.8	47.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	158	—	49.4	47.2
ELs and former ELs	4	—	—	50.5
Students w/disabilities	80	32.1	41.1	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 E11. Weymouth Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,880	46.2	45.2	49.9
African American/Black	126	41.2	47.3	47.0
Asian	118	51.4	54.2	59.8
Hispanic/Latino	241	45.5	42.9	46.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	83	47.7	45.5	51.0
Native American	2	—	—	49.5
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	49.9
White	1,309	46.3	44.7	50.4
High needs	1,054	45.1	44.2	47.1
Low income <sup>a</sup>	825	—	43.5	46.4
ELs and former ELs	180	44.2	47.5	48.6
Students w/disabilities	434	43.4	41.1	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 E12. Weymouth Public Schools: Math Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	367	46.3	49.0	50.0
African American/Black	34	39.8	42.3	45.6
Asian	22	61.1	62.8	57.3
Hispanic/Latino	33	38.2	46.6	44.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	—	—	50.0
Native American	1	—	—	46.6
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	41.2
White	264	47.1	48.6	51.6
High needs	191	35.6	47.3	46.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	158	—	47.8	45.6
ELs and former ELs	6	—	—	48.9
Students w/disabilities	82	30.4	43.3	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 E13. Weymouth 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	375	57	46	44	44	6	12	12	15
4	390	58	51	41	38	4	13	16	16
5	394	49	44	36	41	7	13	11	13
6	382	53	47	27	41	15	21	24	22
7	410	37	38	33	41	15	19	23	19
8	448	38	31	35	42	16	20	23	18
3-8	2,399	48	42	36	41	10	17	18	17
10	426	63	59	54	58	7	10	7	8

**Table E14. Weymouth Public Schools: Next-Generation MCAS Math 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	375	49	31	44	41	10	29	18	20
4	393	48	37	47	42	8	16	13	17
5	396	41	30	34	36	11	17	12	16
6	382	44	29	36	42	11	22	14	15
7	409	38	31	25	37	16	18	26	19
8	449	39	22	26	36	15	20	16	17
3-8	2,404	43	30	35	39	12	20	17	17
10	426	50	42	42	50	8	12	11	10

**Table E15. Weymouth 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	394	43	43	44	43	13	14	12	18
8	434	37	26	32	42	16	23	16	18
5 and 8	828	40	35	38	42	14	18	14	18
10	383	—	—	54	47	—	—	10	14

Note. Grade 10 results for spring 2021 STE (Science and Technology/Engineering test) 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 E16. Weymouth Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	356	50.9	55.7	50.0
5	368	36.5	47.2	49.9
6	353	47.3	40.9	49.8
7	375	38.8	38.9	49.7
8	428	39.5	42.0	49.7
3-8	1,880	42.6	44.8	49.8
10	367	47.7	49.2	50.0

**Table E17. Weymouth Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019-2022**

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	358	51.2	57.5	50.0
5	370	37.9	42.0	50.0
6	353	52.3	43.2	49.8
7	374	48.3	40.0	49.9
8	425	41.3	44.0	49.8
3-8	1,880	46.2	45.2	49.9
10	367	46.3	49.0	50.0

**Table E18. Weymouth Public Schools: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2018-2021**

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	460	85.3	87.9	88.9	89.8
African American/Black	30	71.4	83.3	80.0	84.4
Asian	26	93.3	96.4	92.3	96.1
Hispanic/Latino	44	62.5	69.2	72.7	80.0
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	18	81.3	62.5	77.8	88.8
Native American	1	—	—	—	82.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	86.0
White	341	88.1	90.7	92.4	93.2
High needs	201	70.4	79.3	77.1	82.4
Low income <sup>a</sup>	183	73.1	81.2	77.0	81.7
ELs	15	34.8	65.4	66.7	71.8
Students w/disabilities	83	59.3	65.9	67.5	76.6

<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 E19. Weymouth Public Schools: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2018-2020**

Group	N (2020)	2018	2019	2020	State (2020)
All students	503	88.7	87.9	90.3	91.0
African American/Black	24	72.7	81.0	83.3	87.2
Asian	28	90.5	93.3	96.4	95.8
Hispanic/Latino	52	81.8	62.5	71.2	81.0
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	8	73.3	87.5	75.0	90.8
Native American	2	—	—	—	90.8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	95.2
White	388	90.7	90.5	93.0	94.4
High needs	266	78.0	75.7	83.1	84.5
Low income <sup>a</sup>	223	77.1	77.2	85.2	84.1
ELs	26	77.8	43.5	65.4	74.7
Students w/disabilities	91	67.0	68.1	70.3	79.3

<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 E20. Weymouth Public Schools: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	5,916	4.8	0.6	6.2	1.6
African American/Black	498	7.9	1.6	11.8	2.2
Asian	397	—	—	1.8	0.4
Hispanic/Latino	823	6.2	0.8	8.0	2.1
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	305	7.7	0.7	6.2	1.8
Native American	13	—	—	—	2.4
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	7	—	—	—	1.9
White	3,873	4.5	0.5	5.5	1.4
High needs	3,445	6.7	1.0	8.6	2.2
Low income <sup>a</sup>	2,706	—	—	8.9	2.3
ELs	475	3.6	—	6.9	1.4
Students w/disabilities	1,387	8.3	1.6	9.9	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 E21. Weymouth Public Schools: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	5,916	2.0	1.2	4.2	3.1
African American/Black	498	2.9	3.4	8.6	6.2
Asian	397	—	—	0.3	0.7
Hispanic/Latino	823	3.9	1.6	5.7	4.9
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	305	2.6	1.8	4.9	3.5
Native American	13	—	—	—	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	7	—	—	—	3.6
White	3,873	1.8	0.9	3.7	2.1
High needs	3,445	3.0	1.7	6.0	4.6
Low income <sup>a</sup>	2,706	—	—	6.1	5.2
ELs	475	3.0	—	4.4	3.5
Students w/disabilities	1,387	4.3	2.7	7.9	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 E22. Weymouth Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021**

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	1,796	2.0	1.4	1.6	1.5
African American/Black	128	4.2	1.0	1.6	1.8
Asian	91	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	190	8.2	4.3	5.8	3.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	66	0.0	3.0	1.5	1.4
Native American	3	—	—	—	3.4
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	3	—	—	—	2.0
White	1,315	1.4	0.9	1.1	1.0
High needs	763	4.7	2.8	3.0	2.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	563	5.6	2.5	2.8	2.9
ELs	55	26.5	8.9	12.7	5.8
Students w/disabilities	327	2.5	3.4	2.4	2.4

<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 E23. Weymouth Public Schools: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021**

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	878	53.7	66.2	63.2	65.3
African American/Black	54	40.5	44.4	46.3	54.9
Asian	49	87.0	84.9	89.8	84.3
Hispanic/Latino	75	40.3	56.8	53.3	50.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	36	34.8	38.5	52.8	65.5
Native American	—	—	—	—	53.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	61.0
White	663	54.1	68.4	64.3	69.6
High needs	333	30.4	47.8	40.8	47.7
Low income <sup>a</sup>	246	35.1	53.2	46.7	49.0
ELs	18	7.7	29.4	27.8	28.1
Students w/disabilities	140	7.3	26.1	18.6	33.1

<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 E24. Weymouth Public Schools: Chronic Absence Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022**

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	5,930	13.9	23.1	30.0	27.7
African American/Black	491	13.3	34.9	38.5	32.0
Asian	398	8.5	8.8	14.1	15.4
Hispanic/Latino	816	20.3	39.9	42.0	42.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	303	18.1	31.9	32.3	28.4
Native American	14	23.1	16.7	42.9	37.8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	7	16.7	16.7	28.6	32.1
White	3,901	13.1	19.6	27.8	22.1
High needs	3,427	19.9	33.3	37.8	37.1
Low income <sup>a</sup>	2,717	—	—	40.0	40.6
ELs	470	16.5	30.3	38.1	39.9
Students w/disabilities	1,317	23.1	36.8	40.3	36.9

<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.