Bourne Public Schools

Targeted District Review Report

March 2023

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of District Reviews and Monitoring
75 Pleasant Street
Malden, MA 02148-4906
781-338-3000
www.doe.mass.edu

American Institutes for Research
Education Systems and Policy
201 Jones Road, Suite 100
Waltham, MA 02451
202-403-5000
www.air.org

Contents

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 July 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.

This document printed on recycled paper.

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

Executive Summary

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

Curriculum and Instruction

Bourne strives to ensure equitable, inclusive, and effective instruction for all students. The district's thorough curricular review process ensures that a diversity of stakeholders can weigh in on curriculum options that align with DESE standards and provide scaffolded support for all students. Likewise, the district adopted Universal Design for Learning (UDL), which emphasizes inclusivity in instruction, and provides teachers with relevant professional learning related to UDL principles. Interviews with Bourne instructional leaders, parents, and students consistently indicated that the district has student-centered and state-standards-aligned instructional practices. The middle and high schools provide a variety of postsecondary learning opportunities—including college and career readiness classes, an Innovation Pathways program, a dual enrollment program, and a senior internship—that are open to all students.

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Bourne during the week of March 20, 2023. The observers conducted 58 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,[2] 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, in the K-5 grade band, instructional observations provide generally mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, classroom organization, instructional support, and student engagement (Grades 4-5). In both the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands, instructional observations provide mixed evidence of consistently strong emotional support, instructional support, and student engagement, as well as evidence of strong classroom organization.

In terms of strengths, the curricula across the district largely align to state standards and are documented in CURATE[3] as applicable, meeting or partially meeting expectations. The selection process for curricula involves an assessment of student need plus diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) considerations. Bourne has developed multiple initiatives related to instructional practices, including a UDL framework, inclusive learning practices, and social-emotional learning

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

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

[3] CURATE: CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers. See https:///www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate.

competencies. Teachers are very familiar with these initiatives, and they indicated receiving consistent messaging about the initiatives from the administration. The district also has developed several initiatives to expand student access to rigorous learning and coursework, such as the pre-AP program and the "AP for All Initiative." Lastly, students have access to a large selection of postsecondary courses at both the middle and high schools.

Areas for growth are fewer and include insufficient support and clarity for instructional staff to prioritize the large number of changes related to the curriculum and inconsistencies in the use of classroom observations and evaluations to support and improve on instructional practices.

Assessment

District and school leaders have established a culture that values the use of data in improving teaching, learning, and decision making. In the 2020-2021 school year, Bourne implemented school- and districtwide WIN (What I Need) blocks that enable all students to receive targeted academic intervention based on their performance on benchmark assessments in the core academic subjects. Subsequently, Bourne teachers administer regular benchmark assessments to identify and monitor the progress of WIN interventions; these assessments occur at least three times per year. Each school also established data teams, consisting of administrators and school staff, that promote the regular and informed use of data for all school staff. The district transparently shares data with students' families in various ways, including using PowerSchool, parent/caregiver conferences, and benchmark letters that summarize their children's' progress in their WIN interventions.

Bourne has several strengths in its approach to data and assessment. First, the district developed consistent and comprehensive assessment systems, and its staff use multiple sources of data to determine interventions and monitor progress. In terms of data use, there is consistent encouragement from district leaders, as well as built-in structures, about the regular use of data to inform decision making at the school and classroom levels. Teachers reported using data-informed practices in classrooms. Lastly, the district has multiple structures for sharing data with school leaders, teachers, and families. The district regularly communicates student progress, including providing updates on benchmark assessments and accomplishments related to positive behaviors. Areas for growth include a lack of data systems for teachers to gauge student capacity across school years; insufficient skill-building for all teachers for understanding and using available data systems; and inconsistent communication with parents and students, from both schools and teachers.

Student Support

Bourne demonstrates a commitment to ensuring a safe, equitable, and inclusive environment for all students. According to the district's *Professional Development Handbook* and various interviews, Bourne has provided extensive professional development opportunities and trainings related to cultural competence, inclusivity, and UDL. Through its district- and schoolwide multitiered system of support (MTSS) committees, Bourne has clear systems and protocols for engaging students and families in the tiered supports system. Each school also has its own student support team (SST), which regularly reviews data to assign students to the multiple tiered supports available. Finally, the district consistently reviews behavioral and academic data to support fidelity and equity within MTSS. District staff attempt to engage parents in two-way communication and provide multiple

opportunities for engagement and youth and parent leadership. The district also maintains long-standing partnerships with cultural groups and mental health services providers to address student and family needs.

Strengths include a strong commitment to developing the cultural competency of its staff, a wide variety of academic and social-emotional learning supports for students—particularly Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports, the school committee's involvement of students in policy discussions, and the cultivation of relationships with diverse community partners—with an emphasis on cultural competence and supporting family needs. Areas for growth include inconsistencies in consequences for misbehavior, professional development that lacks skill-building related to tiered interventions, a lack of professional development around social-emotional learning, and inconsistent communication and engagement with parents in the middle and high schools.

Bourne Public Schools: District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Methodology

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

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

Site Visit

The site visit to Bourne was conducted during the week of March 20, 2023. The site visit included 14 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 60 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and students' families. The review team conducted three teacher focus groups with 10 elementary school teachers, six middle school teachers, and five high school teachers, as well as two family focus groups with 12 participants in total. There were two student focus groups, one comprised of eight middle school students, the other six high school students.

The site team also conducted 58 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

District Profile

Dr. Kerri Anne Quinlan-Zhou was appointed superintendent in 2020. She receives support from an assistant superintendent of schools for teaching and learning, a director of special education and student services, a director of business services, and a director of technology. The district is governed by a school committee composed of seven members who are elected for three-year terms.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 150 teachers in the district, with 1,554 students enrolled in the district's four 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
Bournedale Elementary School	Prekindergarten and Elementary	PK-2	402
Bourne Intermediate School	Elementary	3-5	370
Bourne Middle School	Middle	6-8	431
Bourne High School	High	9-12	351
Total			**1554**

Note. Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2020 and 2023, overall student enrollment decreased by 96 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 was greater than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for K-12 districts of similar size in fiscal year 2021—$20,905 for Bourne compared with $17,343 for similar districts and greater than average state spending per pupil ($19,536). 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.

Student Performance

In ELA in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) declined 18 percentage points, from 49 percent in 2019 to 31 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 41 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations decreased by 27 percentage points, from 70 percent in 2019 to 43 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 58 percent (see Tables E1 and E2 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was greater than the state rate by 2 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students; below the state rate by 46 percentage points for Asian students; below the state rate by 10 percentage points to 18 percentage points for ELs and former ELs, African American/Black students, White students, and Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students; and below the state rate by 2 percentage points to 7 percentage points for students from low-income households, high needs students, and students with disabilities.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 22 percentage points for White students and by 9 percentage points to 12 percentage points for high needs students, students from low-income households, and students with disabilities.

In mathematics in Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 12 percentage points, from 41 percent in 2019 to 29 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 39 percent. In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined 15 percentage points, from 48 percent in 2019 to 33 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 50 percent (see Tables E3 and E4 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was above the state rate by 9 percentage points for ELs and former ELs; below the state rate by 36 percentage points for Asian students; below the state rate by 11 percentage points to 16 percentage points for African American/Black students, students with disabilities, Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students; and below the state rate by 2 percentage points to 7 percentage points for every other student group with reportable data.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations was below the state rate by 25 percentage points for White students and below the state rate by 6 percentage points to 13 percentage points for students with disabilities, high needs students, and students from low-income households.

In science in Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 7 percentage points, from 45 percent in 2019 to 38 percent in 2022, which was below the 2022 state rate of 42 percent. In Grade 10, 28 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which was below the state rate of 47 percent (see Tables E5 and E6 in Appendix E).

- In Grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in science was greater than the state rate by a percentage point for students from low-income households; below the state rate by 23 percentage points for Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students; below the state rate by 11 percentage points for White students and students with disabilities; and below the state rate by 3 percentage points for high needs students.
- In Grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in science was below the state rate by 27 percentage points for White students and by

14 percentage points and 16 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income households, respectively.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the 2022 MCAS in Grades 3-8 was 45.3 in ELA and 45.6 in mathematics, which represents typical growth. In Grade 10, SGPs were typical in ELA (40.7) and mathematics (43.7)[4] (see Tables E7-E10 in Appendix E).

- SGPs in Grades 3-8 in ELA were typical, ranging from 42.5 to 49.6 for Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino students; White students; high needs students; and students from low-income households; SGPs were low for Hispanic/Latino students (39.0) and students with disabilities (32.3). Mathematics SGPs were typical for each student group with reportable data ranging from 43.3 to 45.6, except for students with disabilities, which was low (36.0).
- In Grade 10, ELA SGPs were typical for each student group with reportable data, ranging from 40.1 to 43.2. Mathematics SGPs were typical for each student group with reportable data, ranging from 41.5 to 43.3.

Bourne's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students increased 5.3 percentage points from 88.6 percent in 2020 to 93.9 percent in 2022, which was above the state rate of 90.1 percent. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students increased 3.5 percentage points from 90.0 percent in 2019 to 93.5 percent in 2021, which was above the state rate of 91.8 percent (see Tables E16 and E17 in Appendix E).

- The four-year-cohort graduation rate was below the state rate in 2022 by 0.2 percentage points for students with disabilities, above the state rate by 0.8 percentage points for White students, and above the state rate by 7.2 percentage points and 8.8 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income households, respectively.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate was below the state rate by 0.8 percentage points for students from low-income households; equal to the state rate for White students; above the state rate by 16 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students; and above the state rate by 4.1 percentage points and 1.5 percentage points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively.

The district's annual dropout rate increased from 0.4 percent in 2020 to 1.6 percent in 2022, which was below the state rate of 2.1 percent (see Table E20 in Appendix E). The dropout rate in Bourne for Native American students, White students, high needs students, and students from low-income households was lower than their statewide peers; it was above the state rate for Asian students, Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, and students with disabilities.

[4] Average SGP ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0—29.9, Low Growth = 30.0—39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0—59.9, High Growth = 60.0 or higher.

Curriculum and Instruction

Bourne strives to ensure equitable, inclusive, and effective instruction for all students. The district's thorough curricular review process ensures that a diversity of stakeholders can weigh in on curriculum options that align with DESE standards and provide scaffolded support for all students. Likewise, the district has adopted the UDL framework, which emphasizes inclusivity in instruction, and provides teachers with relevant professional learning related to UDL principles.

Interviews with Bourne instructional leaders, parents, and students all show that the district has developed student-centered and state-standards-aligned instructional practices that emphasize accessibility. In addition, Bourne has several new curriculum initiatives, including a pre-AP program intended to provide all students with rigorous course content that can prepare them for AP programs. The middle and high schools provide a variety of postsecondary learning opportunities, including college and career readiness classes, an Innovation Pathways program, a dual enrollment program, and a senior internship. These programs are open to all students.

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

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Curriculum selection and use	■ Curricula largely align to state-standards and are documented in CURATE as applicable. ■ The curriculum selection process involves an assessment of student need and DEI considerations.	■ A need for support in implementing curricular initiatives, including instructional support
Classroom instruction	■ Bourne has developed multiple initiatives related to instructional practices, including a UDL framework, inclusive learning practices, and social-emotional learning competencies. ■ Teachers are familiar with these initiatives and indicated consistent messaging from administrators related to the initiatives.	■ Inconsistencies in the use of classroom observations and evaluations to support and improve on instructional practices
Student access to coursework	■ The district has developed initiatives to expand equity in student access to rigorous learning and coursework in the high school through the pre-AP program and the AP for All Initiative. ■ A large selection of courses that prepare students for postsecondary opportunities are available at the middle and high schools.	

Curriculum Selection and Use

Bourne provides teachers access to curricula in which some content areas at least partially meet expectations on CURATE and others are not rated on CURATE. Included in the unrated curricula are pre-AP, teacher-created, and newly piloted curricula. Multiple interviews and focus groups indicated that the K-12 curriculum is standards based, even as teachers have autonomy in how to apply the

curriculum in the classroom. In Grades K-5, Bourne's core ELA and mathematics curricula (American Reading Company and Eureka Math) Meet Expectations. Its science curriculum (Mystery Science) and history/social studies curriculum (Inquiry Journeys) for Grades K-5 are not CURATE rated. The ELA curriculum for Grades 6-10 (SpringBoards) is relatively new and Meets Expectations on CURATE. The mathematics curriculum for Grades 6-8 (Big Ideas) Partially Meets Expectations. In Grades 11-12, Prentice Hall Literature for ELA is not rated, nor is Pearson Math used for Grades 10-11. Various stakeholders described adopting a pre-AP program in 2022 for Grade 9 science, history, mathematics, and English; these pre-AP curricula are primarily locally created materials not reviewed by CURATE. Bourne encourages teachers to explore new and evidence-based curricula and resources via pilot programs, which is evident through the implementation of the OpenSciEd curriculum for seventh-grade science and Investigating History for sixth-grade social studies. Neither curriculum program has a CURATE rating. The selection of curricula largely aligned to state standards and documented in CURATE as applicable is a strength for the district.

As outlined by the *Bourne Public Schools Curriculum Review & Adoption Process* and school committee policy, Bourne has a rigorous curricular review process, which several district leaders articulated. This process includes an annual collaborative review by a team of district- and school-level personnel that, according to the document, includes the assistant superintendent, two curriculum directors, and Bourne instructional staff. This information is then incorporated into a review that determines if the current curriculum meets the district's current needs, addresses DEI, and includes scaffolding. A school leader revealed an example of what the team looks for in the review: "[SpringBoard] literally provides teachers scaffolding and ideas, stop here and ask this question. I mean, it's really helping to model for our teachers how to implement those lessons in a meaningful way with embedded scaffolds." In this case, the sample curriculum, SpringBoard, earned high marks not only for content but also for scaffolding and supports.

Furthermore, various stakeholders, including district leaders and teachers, referred to a January 2023 comprehensive review of core curricula and materials. The purpose of this review was to ensure that these materials meet standards related to DEI and cultural competency in addition to providing instructional supports.

The district's curriculum selection process, which helps select curricula that meet students' learning needs and DEI principles, is a strength for the district. The process of exploring and adopting a new curriculum involves the formation of a major resource team (MRT) comprising district and school-based staff. The MRT considers a combination of criteria, including state standards, CURATE and EdReports rubrics, DEI considerations, and the specific needs of the district when reviewing proposed curricula. Along these lines, several school and district leaders explained that one of the primary reasons that the MRT selected American Reading Company for K-5 ELA was because it "ticks a good amount of boxes around diversity, equity and inclusion for all students" and can be scaffolded to support students at different reading competencies. The district's UDL framework also influences curricular selection.

Since 2020, Bourne has used the curriculum platform Atlas to house and archive locally developed curricula, as well as help with the design of lesson plans and units. Teachers have access to common planning time guiding materials, such as agendas and curriculum mapping tools, via

separate Google Drives for each school. According to district leaders and teachers, Bourne's two curriculum directors (one serves PK-5; the other serves 6-12) are responsible for "overseeing the fidelity of the curriculum that the teachers are expected to use," which they do during common planning time and targeted professional development sessions. District and school leaders described an initiative to create a vertical unified arts PK-12 curriculum via professional development from external consultants, which also required teacher collaboration. Several teachers agreed that these types of opportunities to collaborate were important; for example, teachers in one focus group feel as if they "operate in silos" and have little understanding of what is happening in other classrooms.

Overall, as articulated by several district and school leaders and instructional staff, since returning to in-person instruction, Bourne has engaged in many curriculum and instructional initiatives, including launching new curricula (pre-AP, SpringBoard), and participated in DESE-funded literacy and mathematics academies to help meet needs expressed by both teachers and administrators. Several teacher and school staff focus groups reported that the number of initiatives can be overwhelming, with one group describing it as "overload" and another saying, "We're trying to do a lot of things at once." Relatedly, teachers pointed to the phasing out of instructional coaches at the high school as an area of concern, with one teacher explaining, "That instructional support position is something that our district is missing, because with the institution of all these initiatives and digital platforms and everything else, teachers have very little support in that way."

The need for support for implementing curricular initiatives, including instructional support, is an area of growth for the district.

Classroom Instruction

Three observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Bourne during the week of March 20, 2023. The observers conducted 58 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 Bourne, 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 Bourne is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

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

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (5.4 for Grades K-5, 4.4 for Grades 6-8, and 4.4 for Grades 9-12).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the middle range (5.5) for Grades K-5 and in the high range for Grades 6-8 and 9-12 (6.8 and 6.6, respectively).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the middle range for all grade bands (3.2 for Grades K-5, 3.3 for Grades 6-8, and 3.7 for Grades 9-12).
- **Student Engagement.** For Grades 4 and up, where student engagement was measured as an independent domain, ratings were in the middle range for all grades (5.0 for Grades 4-5, 4.8 for Grades 6-8, and 4.4 for Grades 9-12).

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

District and school leaders and teachers described classroom environments that balance state standards with student-centered instructional approaches that incorporate personalized learning and student choice. For example, teachers in one focus group described using “learning plans and playlists” intended to “give kids choices as to how they want to be involved”; teachers in another focus group described basing lessons on students’ preferred topics of interest. School leaders and teachers also described a “push” toward project- and problem-based learning experiences, particularly in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and the social sciences. One school leader explained that with the new instructional initiatives in 2022-2023, “definitely more work is put on the students to do some of the heavy lifting in the classroom.” Both students and teachers confirmed that courses, particularly the new pre-AP program, center student learning and engagement while maintaining a high degree of rigor. There is some divergence between these depictions and data from the instructional observations, which found that engagement and instructional support were in the middle ranges and inconsistent across classrooms.

However, both students and parents expressed concerns that the rigorous instructional environments may be difficult for some students. For example, several students in one focus group

described challenging learning environments, and one student described teachers as being primarily "hands off," leaving some students to feel as if "you're kind of thrown to the dogs for a while trying to, I guess, figure it out yourself." Parents in one focus group also described challenging learning environments for some students, particularly starting from the middle school onward, that encourage student independence without sufficient scaffolding, particularly for students returning to in-person learning after a period of remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Multiple parents in a focus group agreed with one parent's suggestion that "kids aren't where they were" compared with years prior to the pandemic, which created a "disconnect" between student readiness and teacher strategies as teachers tried to return to the "pre-COVID types of learning." Despite these comments from parents, both teachers and students acknowledged that teachers readily provide additional support when needed, with middle school student focus group participants generally agreeing with the following sentiment that one student expressed:

> I feel like, especially in math, when I don't get something, knowing that my teacher won't judge me for not getting it right away, but they'll definitely be willing to spend more individual time so you won't feel sorry about it.

Bourne's combination of challenging learning experience with individualized support for all students is in line with UDL principles, according to district interviews and documents. As articulated by almost all the district and school stakeholders interviewed, as well as the District Strategic Action Plan (DSAP), individual school improvement plans, and the *Professional Development Handbook*, both the UDL framework and the general incorporation of inclusive learning practices are major priorities for the district. District leaders reported contracting with Commonwealth Consulting to provide a variety of trainings on UDL that they encourage all teachers to take. Teachers and district leaders also described an instructional emphasis on inclusion and coteaching, with teachers receiving professional development from external consultants on the coteaching model.

Likewise, district learning walks that check for high-quality learning practices reinforce UDL and inclusive learning. School and district leaders reported that these walks involve observations of classrooms by district staff who use a rubric with specific UDL and DEI elements. From there, teachers receive feedback from the walks, and administrators attempt to use their observations from the walks to inform future professional development topics offered. Although teachers acknowledged that these learning walks occur, there was disagreement between the different focus groups as to whether the walks were helpful, as teachers did not consistently receive feedback during the walks. Additionally, multiple teachers in one focus group stated that teacher evaluations are inconsistent in terms of supporting classroom instruction. Inconsistencies in the use of classroom observations and evaluations to support and improve on instructional practices is an area of growth for the district.

In addition to using a UDL framework, the district is developing social-emotional learning competencies via a variety of programs. Practically all stakeholder groups, including students, parents, teachers, and district leaders, shared that the district's motto of B2B (Bourne to Be Respectful, Responsible, and Safe) generally supports a shared understanding of positive behavior. District leaders and support specialists also described the "PAX program" at Bournedale Elementary School that teaches behavioral self-regulation. The emphasis on UDL, inclusive learning practices, and the development of social-emotional learning competencies is a strength of the district.

Student Access to Coursework

Bourne ensures that all students have access to a range of rigorous coursework and enrichment opportunities. At the high school, teachers and students, along with the Bourne High School *Program of Studies* document, described many accelerated learning and enrichment offerings, including multiple AP courses, STEM classes, and arts and music classes. At the elementary and middle schools, students receive enrichment via their WIN blocks, with one elementary school teacher explaining that each student receives a "round of something—art, music, turtle club" during the school year. Middle school students also described having a variety of enrichment opportunities, along with extracurriculars. Finally, the DSAP outlines several strategic initiatives related to increasing access to rigorous coursework and enrichment, including ensuring that "all students have the opportunity to participate in high-quality academic, civic, creative, social, innovative, athletic and wellness learning" and identifying ways to leverage scheduling and programming to "maximize personalized intervention, acceleration, and enrichment opportunities for all students."

Various stakeholders, including district leaders, teachers, and parents, reported that the AP for All Initiative and the pre-AP program provided all high school students in the district equitable access to advanced coursework. Teachers or guidance counselors predominantly refer students to AP classes; however, as one district leader explained, there are no specific prerequisites and "if you want to take an AP class, you're going to get in." High school students confirmed this accessibility, with one student explaining "if someone was passionate enough to want to take a higher level, I'm sure that they'd be allowed to." Likewise, the pre-AP curriculum that all students take provides a foundation for rigorous content, including supports and scaffolds, so that all students can be prepared for AP classes. The equity of access enabled by initiatives such as the pre-AP program and the AP for All Initiative is a strength for the district.

At the middle school, students provided examples of taking accelerated courses, such as statistics and algebra, during their WIN blocks. However, several stakeholders, including both parents and teachers, expressed a concern at the lack of programming available for gifted students. For example, one parent described the lack of a gifted and talented program at the middle school, to which another parent added as follows:

> I feel like higher performing children aren't on the radar in general across the district, that most of the focus appears to be on bringing other students up, which is wonderful. But . . . it's based on test scoring for the state and report cards for other people. So I feel like the higher performing students are kind of left behind.

Teachers at the middle school shared a similar sentiment, with one teacher saying, "there's no way to handle a gifted student… There's nothing you can do."

A strength for Bourne is the array of postsecondary preparation courses offered at the middle and high schools that prepare students for life after school. Bourne High School offers an Innovation Pathways program, which provides specific coursework related to postsecondary fields, such as life and environmental sciences and information technology. At the middle school, students and school staff described the Massachusetts Educational Financing Authority Pathways program, which helps students with building résumés and identifying possible careers. In addition to AP classes and the

Innovation Pathways program, Bourne High School's *Program of Studies* document outlines a variety of college and career pathways programming offered at the high school, including a dual enrollment and senior internship/capstone program. Several students enrolled in the latter described the internship program positively, with one student explaining as follows:

> Some kids just don't go and don't like their internship, but a lot of the kids that do go and do really enjoy it, learn a lot. And I think it's a really good way to, say, if I wanted to be a doctor and I started going and then I'm like, oh wait, I don't want to do this. And it's good to decide before I go to college.

Likewise, parents generally reported that they felt their children were prepared for college and life after school. One district leader noted that the Innovation Pathways program, which focuses on career pathways that both do and do not require further postsecondary education, enables "student centered" learning for all types of students.

Recommendations

- The district should consider ways to collaborate with its teachers when implementing new curricular initiatives to ensure fidelity and instructional support.
- The district should conduct an evaluation of its system for classroom walkthroughs and observations to diagnose issues around district-wide consistency and ensure teachers are receiving actionable feedback that they can incorporate into daily instruction.
- The district should identify ways to better challenge high performing middle school students, whether through differentiation, accelerated pathways, or other avenues.

Assessment

District and school leaders at Bourne have established a culture that values the use of data in improving teaching, learning, and decision making. In 2020-2021, Bourne implemented school- and districtwide WIN blocks that enable all students to receive targeted academic intervention based on their performance on benchmark assessments in the core academic subjects. Subsequently, Bourne teachers regularly administer benchmark assessments to identify and monitor the progress of WIN interventions; these assessments occur at least three times per year. Each school also established data teams, comprising administrators and school staff, that promote the regular and informed use of data for all school staff. The district transparently shares data with students' families in various ways, including using PowerSchool, parent/caregiver conferences, and benchmark letters that summarize their children's' progress in their WIN interventions.

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

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Data and assessment systems	■ The district has developed consistent and comprehensive assessment systems. ■ The district uses multiple sources of data to determine interventions and monitor progress.	■ The lack of data systems for teachers to gauge student capacity across school years
Data use	■ There is consistent encouragement from district leaders, as well as built-in structures, about the regular use of data to inform decision making at the school and classroom levels. ■ Teachers use data-informed practices in classrooms.	■ Insufficient skill-building among all teachers for understanding and using available data systems ■ Insufficient communication with families related to the use of data
Sharing results	■ The district has created multiple structures for sharing data with school leaders and teachers. ■ The district regularly communicates with families of elementary school students regarding student progress, including providing updates on benchmark assessments and accomplishments related to positive behaviors.	■ Inconsistent communication regarding student progress with students and families in the middle and high schools

Data and Assessment Systems

Bourne ensures the collection of multiple data sources throughout the school year that paint a detailed picture of student and school performance. The district's assessment inventory references various assessments across school and subject levels. At the elementary level (Grades 1-5), teachers administer the following benchmark assessments three times per year: (a) Imagine Language and Literature; (b) Imagine Math; (c) IRLA (Independent Reading Level Assessment), which is part of the American Reading Company curriculum); (d) a homegrown writing prompt assessment; and (e) the Eureka Module Assessment. Starting from Grade 3 through Grade 10, teachers

administer Galileo for ELA and mathematics three times per year. Galileo for science is administered three times per year beginning at Grade 6. In addition to the MCAS, the high school administers the pre-AP Learning Checkpoint four times per year for all students in pre-AP courses, as well as the PSAT, SAT, and AP examinations annually as students are eligible. The use of multiple assessment systems to monitor progress for all students is a strength for the district.

As outlined in the DSAP and articulated by various district and school leaders and teachers, a major focus for the district has been the strategic use of benchmark and common assessments to monitor student progress and identify intervention and acceleration opportunities. Various stakeholders reported that the district onboarded Galileo and Imagine Learning as part of an aligned benchmarking system that teachers can use to determine and monitor the effectiveness of their students' WIN intervention blocks. In this system, teachers administer pre- and post-tests based on specific curriculum standards for students to demonstrate progress toward specific content. At Bournedale Elementary School and Bourne Intermediate school, WIN block teachers are responsible for inputting benchmark data into grade-level spreadsheets and analyzing the data after each benchmarking round (occurring three times per year) to determine growth on grade-level standards.

At the high school, the creation of common unit assessments within disciplines has been another area of focus, with one school leader explaining that common assessments "give a much more complete data picture." District leaders and teachers from multiple focus groups also referenced the use of other data systems, such as the School-Wide Information System (SWIS), which tracks behavioral referrals and MTSS data, and the Massachusetts Early Warning Indicator System, which helps the district identify high school students who may be at a risk of dropping out of school. Teachers consistently reported the full implementation of these assessment and data systems at their schools. The emphasis on creating and aligning multiple sources of data to determine interventions and monitor progress is a strength for the district.

One district leader indicated that teachers are generally "involved in the development" of assessments, but that leader also admitted that the Galileo initiative "felt a lot more top down." Relatedly, teachers across multiple schools questioned the effectiveness of the current assessments used for benchmarking, with one high school teacher explaining that they "haven't necessarily yielded us the information as teachers we need." This teacher explained that teachers lack sufficient and timely data to assess student learning needs and readiness at the start of each year and that (a) the district can do a better job of sharing MCAS data to track students from grade to grade, and (b) Galileo and similar systems were insufficient for that purpose. Some teachers agreed with the need for better year-to-year tracking, even though few reported issues with Galileo or similar systems. The lack of data systems for teachers to gauge student capacity across school years is an area of growth for the district.

Data Use

As outlined in the DSAP, expanding the capacity of all educators in the district to effectively use data is a major emphasis for Bourne. Interview and focus group data support this assertion. Central to this strategic initiative has been the formation of district- and building-based data teams—consisting of school-based administrators, school staff, and the curriculum directors—that meet to identify potential equity and achievement gaps, develop mechanisms and protocols for progress monitoring,

and generally support a climate and culture of data use. As reported by district leaders and elucidated in the district's *Professional Development Handbook & Plan*, the building-based data teams meet at least quarterly to review and discuss practices surrounding data usage at their schools. These data teams also received extensive professional development about best practices on data usage from an external consultant. One district leader explained as follows:

> They're doing all this professional development with very specific things around data. And then the next steps, you'll see this in some of our plans for year two, is that they'll now be, think of it like train the trainer, they'll now go and train their colleagues in all the things that they learned . . . Because we believe that some of the best professional development is done by your peers who've also been highly trained.

One district leader described the expectations for using data to inform instruction as "emerging," but district leaders and teachers generally agreed that teachers use these practices on a daily basis. Leadership expects teachers to regularly monitor instruction and determine when interventions or instructional modifications may be necessary. The district's learning walk rubric includes several components regarding the use of data to inform instruction, and all teachers had the option to attend workshops on data use prior to the start of the 2022-2023 school year. Likewise, teachers and school leaders reported using their common planning time to review benchmark data and determine WIN block groupings. One district leader explained that "all teachers at all levels" are expected to be involved in conversations about WIN interventions because, in his words, "they know their students, they know the ones in their WIN group, and they're creating lessons that are going to get them to meet that standard by the end of the cycle." The curriculum directors also ensure that teachers have access to WIN data via Google spreadsheets; the spreadsheets are updated during every WIN cycle change. The consistent messaging from district leaders, as well as structures such as WIN blocks, to encourage the use of data to inform decisions at the school and classroom levels are strengths of the district.

A review of school improvement plans, school committee minutes, and findings from district leaders show that MCAS and other relevant data drive improvement planning at the district level. District leaders also reported that an increasing priority for the district is to ensure that school leaders and instructional staff alike have easy access to data systems. For example, several district leaders referenced a recent contract with Open Architects, which is software that will improve district leader access to multiple data sources, including benchmarks, MCAS, and behavioral data.

Although Bourne provides several opportunities and initiatives concerning data usage, some teachers still report that teachers' understanding of data usage is a "real area of weakness" for the district. For example, one teacher explained as follows:

> A lot of teachers really don't understand how the grade book works. Not to call anybody out, but a lot of teachers don't really fundamentally understand the mathematics of how the grade book operates in a way that makes them feel confident about how they assign grades, for example. And that's really the basic data instruction that schools never offer, but that I actually think new teachers would really benefit from.

Likewise, one district leader acknowledged that "we're not there yet" when it comes to all educators being able to use data effectively to identify need and monitor progress. Further, parents expressed

a lack of clarity related to how data are used to address students' needs. For example, one parent expressed frustration with a lack of communication about how and why students are placed in WIN blocks and why those students need the specific enrichment services that they are receiving. This parent felt that the school was not using WIN block time in the most effective way. Parent interviews also suggested a lack of communication about benchmarking, with one parent specifically expressing confusion about pre- and posttests, saying, "Why are you measuring them and saying that they're not meeting something if you haven't even taught it?" Insufficient skill-building for all teachers to better understand and use available data systems is an area of growth for the district, as is insufficient communication with families related to the use of data.

Sharing Results

School and district staff share data using multiple platforms and in multiple formats. School committee focus group data, along with committee meeting minutes, indicate that the district's administrative team shares MCAS and other end-of-year data at the start of every school year to drive improvement planning. District administrators reported sharing MCAS scores and other appropriate data with school staff, primarily during common planning time. At Bourne Intermediate School, the administration, the data team, and grade-level teachers analyze the lowest performing 20% of MCAS scores. Teachers largely confirmed that they review WIN benchmark data during common planning time; however, it is less clear whether district leaders share more generalized data that identify district strengths and weaknesses and/or achievement, access, and opportunity gaps disaggregated across different student groups. One district leader shared that although more work is necessary regarding the sharing of equity data, district leaders have been "working hard to look at subgroup data to really look at equity and opportunity gaps to understand what that means." Examining and planning about those differences in the subgroup data is a priority area for the district. The development of multiple structures for sharing data with school leaders and teachers is a strength for the district.

The district shares data with families through multiple formats, including access to the PowerSchool Parent Portal, during annual parent/caregiver conferences, and through benchmark data sheets sent home at the middle of the year. According to a district-provided document describing the building-based data teams, the communication of WIN data to families is a major goal. Bournedale Elementary School's data team created standardized parent letters, a WIN summary letter, and a student summary report that WIN teachers fill out and send home to parents. These reports summarize student performance. The district also uploads all benchmark data into the Parent Portal at the end of the school year and uses the SwiftRead communications system to notify families. Finally, school and district leaders and school staff reported that at the two elementary schools, teachers regularly share behavioral data (i.e., discipline incidences, successes with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports [PBIS]) with each other, parents, and even students. This regular communication of student progress and behaviors is a strength for the district.

Parents generally reported feeling informed of their children's progress, but several parents noted a drop-off in communication when students move from the elementary school to the middle school, and this trend continues into the high school. One parent specifically shared that "information gets lost" with their child in the middle school, whereas another parent of two children observed that she receives more information about her child at Bournedale Elementary School (specifically referencing

the WIN block teacher) than for her children at the upper elementary and middle schools. Finally, another parent expressed frustration with their schools' parent/caregiver conferences, saying,

> And then the conferences are not helpful because it's two minutes or less with each teacher and you're not really getting anything from those two minutes, eight teachers at a time . . . I came out of that and was like bawling. I was like, "What did I do wrong? Where am I?" I was overwhelmed.

According to interviews with both teachers and students, families have access to PowerSchool and Google Classroom to stay informed on student performance and attendance. Student satisfaction with the sharing of data varied by school level, with students at the high school less satisfied with the regularity in which their teachers updated PowerSchool. One parent also acknowledged the occasional lag in their child's teacher updating PowerSchool, explaining, "They're not updated consistently. The different teachers. Some of them aren't updated for one or two months at a time. So I have not found PowerSchool to be helpful across the board."

Parents reported that these issues with communication were less about a total lack of communication and more about inconsistency. Inconsistent communication with both parents and students across secondary schools and between teachers is an area of growth for the district.

Recommendations

- The district should identify and implement data systems that allow for tracking of student capacity across school years.
- The district should continue to build teacher skills and fidelity to district data systems through professional development, coaching, and regular check-ins to ensure staff is able to utilize these new tools.
- The district should review common parent misunderstandings around the use of data and identify ways to better clarify information with families.
- The district should set expectations around consistent, regular communication between teachers and parents – particularly at the middle and high school levels.

Student Support

Bourne demonstrates a commitment to ensuring a safe, equitable, and inclusive environment for all students. As demonstrated by the district's *Professional Development Handbook* and various interviews, Bourne provides extensive professional development opportunities and trainings related to cultural competence, inclusivity, and UDL. Through its district- and schoolwide MTSS committees, Bourne has clear systems and protocols for engaging students and families in the tiered supports system. Each school also has its own SST, which regularly reviews data to assign students to the multiple tiered supports available. Finally, the district consistently reviews behavioral and academic data to support fidelity and equity within the MTSS.

District staff attempt to engage parents in two-way communication and provide multiple opportunities for engagement and youth and parent leadership. The district also maintains long-standing partnerships with cultural groups and mental health services providers to address student and family needs.

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

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

Indicator	Strengths	Areas for growth
Safe and supportive school climate and culture	■ Bourne demonstrates a strong commitment to developing the cultural competency of its staff.	■ Consequences for misbehavior not handled in a consistent manner, as perceived by students and parents
Tiered systems of support	■ A wide variety of academic and social-emotional learning supports are available to students, including multiple Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports.	■ Professional development related to tiered interventions not consistently useful to teachers ■ Lack of professional development related to social-emotional learning in the classroom setting
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	■ The school committee intentionally and meaningfully involves students in policy discussions. ■ The district establishes and maintains partnerships with diverse community groups to support family and student needs.	■ Inconsistent communication and engagement with parents at the middle and high schools

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

The DSAP reflects a commitment to fostering a safe, welcoming, and diverse learning environment that actively promotes an equitable and inclusive culture. As stated in the Classroom Instruction section, virtually all stakeholder groups—including students, parents, teachers, and district leaders—described school environments as positive. Most explained that the district's B2B motto reinforces cultural competency. For example, several parents praised their children's' schools for communicating those values (i.e., respect, responsibility, and safety), with one parent explaining,

> I feel like those values are talked about over and over again, and it just creates a very welcoming environment for everybody . . . I feel like just the messaging to the students and throughout the schools, the things on the walls, just the constant messaging from the younger grades is definitely very inclusive and welcoming.

Bourne's approach to fostering a safe and welcoming environment for all also is evident in district documents. Results from the Views of Climate and Learning student survey indicate a relatively strong school climate across all school levels and student subgroups, as evidenced by overall school climate scores in the "favorable" range (50, with a maximum score of 100). This cumulative score was generally consistent across racial, gender, and income groups, as well as for students with disabilities and ELs. There were some inconsistencies across age groups, however; the high school and middle school scored in the "somewhat favorable" range (34 and 45, respectively), whereas both elementary schools scored 60.

Bourne is building the cultural competency of its staff, including by offering a variety of trainings, workshops, and courses on DEI. Multiple district leaders and teachers referenced one training hosted by KW Diversity and the DESE Safe Schools Program that focused on ensuring a safe and supportive environment for LGBTQ students. As the *Professional Development Handbook* and interviews corroborated, all Bourne staff members also received training how to use DESE-approved tools for resource evaluation through the lens of DEI. Finally, Bourne has several initiatives centered on recruiting a diverse workforce, including participating in DESE's Teacher Diversification Pilot Program, which includes partnerships with Black, Indigenous, and People of Color teacher pipelines. The district's commitment to building the cultural competency of its staff is a strength.

Another way in which Bourne fosters a safe and inclusive environment is through its DEI committee, which consists of school and community members. According to its 2022-2023 *Vision, Mission, and Norms* document, this committee works to listen to students and advise members of the school community on DEI issues. This work includes administering student surveys, holding student listening sessions, and planning community-wide events. The committee administered a climate survey in December 2021, which found that students generally feel respected by their teachers and peers. Interviews with students, staff, and teachers also corroborated a culture in which different identities are respected and valued. Several groups of stakeholders referenced the middle and high schools' Gay Straight Alliances, which, according to one district leader, led a professional development session at the high school about the use of pronouns. That same district leader explained that Bourne is "always trying to get better" because "we still have a ways to go around understanding bias and cultural identity."

Regarding the district's approach to promoting positive behaviors and conduct, several district leaders and staff described using PBIS at the elementary, intermediate, and middle schools. Interview data and documents further show that Bourne actively develops staff capacity to identify, understand, and respond to the underlying causes of student behavior by providing trauma-informed professional development and frequent analysis of their SWIS data. One district leader explained that by reviewing behavioral data, the SST and the MTSS team can identify the root causes of misbehavior:

> You're able to drill down into individual kids, subgroups, or into the school in general, and then try to address target areas, not just the kids. So, for example, if there's a ton of reports of, you know, minor incidences in the cafeteria at the intermediate school, well, that's a problem in the cafeteria, not with the kids.

Bourne works to ensure that its students and parents are aware of behavioral expectations by disseminating its student handbook, which parents and students must sign at the beginning of every school year. Both district leaders and parents shared that the handbook itself was revamped in 2022 with feedback from both parents and students. Although interviews generally indicated that students are aware of their schools' behavioral expectations and consequences, some parents and students reported incidences of student misconduct that were not being adequately addressed. For example, one parent with students at the high school shared that rules and regulations are "not enforced," and "teachers are overwhelmed" by the high incidences of misbehavior. Similarly, a student said that despite multiple presentations on B2B, they don't believe that it is "super well enforced." Another student recalled a harassment incident, but the perpetrator was not dealt with, leading the student to feel unsafe. Still, instructional observation scores in the high range for the Behavior Management dimension (average score is 6.8 districtwide) suggest that rules and guidelines for behavior are clear and consistently reinforced by teachers. The discrepancy between family interview data and instructional observation data indicates that an area of growth for the district is inconsistencies in dealing with incidents of misbehavior.

Tiered Systems of Support

Bourne provides a tiered system to support the needs of all students by using data-driven decision making to develop and monitor appropriate interventions and supports. As described by the DSAP, the MTSS handbook, and various district- and school-level stakeholders, a primary initiative for the district has been the development and implementation of an MTSS, and this process has been led by a districtwide MTSS committee. According to district leaders and support specialists, a primary responsibility of this committee has been to gather feedback from the community and generate parent and student buy–in. Separately, each school has a multidisciplinary MTSS team that meets approximately once per month to review all student behavioral data, monitor the effectiveness of interventions, and determine how to implement the district's best practices and expectations about MTSS at the school level. The MTSS committee also is working on a corrective action plan to address specific special education standards that were not fully implemented as of the 2022 *Tiered Focused Monitoring Report.*

According to the MTSS Handbook and confirmed by interviews with district- and school-level staff, each school has its own SST, which consists of a variety of administrators, teachers, nurses, and counselors. The SST reviews student referrals and relevant student data and then creates an action plan with appropriate interventions or accommodations. After implementation of the action plan, the SST re-reviews student cases, usually on a four- to six-week cycle. Teachers, district leaders, and documents provided by the district indicate that Bourne uses a combination of assessment tools to make decisions about student interventions, including SWIS behavioral data, Galileo, Imagine Learning, IRLA benchmark data, and data from SAEBRS (Social, Academic, Emotional Behavior Risk Screener). SAEBRS is administered three times per year across all grade levels to determine the

need for nonacademic supports. As explained previously, the MTSS team also regularly reviews SWIS and other relevant data to determine whether interventions are structured and assigned equitably.

A strength for the district is the variety of Tier 1 academic and social-emotional learning supports available to students. As outlined by the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan and supported by interviews with support staff and parents, Bourne provides a variety of Tier 1 instructional and environmental accommodations to all students. As described in previous sections, all students have targeted WIN blocks that provide flexible options to fit their learning needs. At the elementary and middle schools, WIN interventions are determined by benchmark testing and reevaluated on a six- to eight-week cycle. At the high school, all students have a 30-minute built-in WIN period during which they can sign up or be referred to teachers in classes in which they are struggling. Regarding social and emotional supports, a variety of stakeholders, including district and school leaders, support specialists, students, and parents, reported that all schools have many types of counselors and other support specialists available to students, including, for example, guidance counselors, adjustment counselors, and behavioral interventionists. As explained by one district leader,

> We're very well staffed as far as our social and emotional supports. So at each of our schools, we have, depending on the grade level, for example, we have four counselors at the high school of 400 kids. They're guidance, they're adjustment. We have three at the middle school level. So there's one for each grade level. So, we have groups coming together with the counselors. We have one-on-one. We have BCBAs [Board Certified Behavior Analysts]. We have you name it. There's all these supports in place for kiddos.

Although all Bourne students have access to these academic and behavioral supports, these vary from school to school with varying levels of effectiveness. For example, both students and teachers at the high school shared that the 30-minute WIN block could be insufficient for students struggling in multiple subjects, with one teacher explaining that the period "becomes [like] wrestling for students who need support in different environments." Bourne continues to measure the effectiveness of its WIN blocks through benchmark assessments, as described in the Data Use section.

Bourne also provides a variety of Tier 2 behavioral and instructional supports and interventions, including multiple assessment and feedback systems, such as SWIS, supports in several of the WIN blocks, meetings with counselors, and more. Bourne also has inclusion classrooms, in which general education teachers and special education teachers work together to meet the instructional needs of students. A variety of Tier 2 social-emotional learning supports are available to students, particularly at the elementary and intermediate schools, such as a Check-In/Check-Out program and small groups, that target topics such as peer relationships, self-regulation, executive functioning, and anxiety. Tier 3 intensive supports include placement into an alternative learning program for students struggling with social and emotional issues. Finally, students with disabilities receive services through a variety of programs depending on their needs, as outlined in their individualized education program. Overall, adjustment counselors operate on a push-in (rather than a pull-out) model, although substantially separate classrooms exist for students requiring intensive supports.

The emphasis on inclusive practices and streamlining special education services to ensure that every student receives instruction in the least restrictive environment is a strategic initiative for the district, as echoed by virtually all stakeholders interviewed. In line with this initiative, the district has offered

ongoing professional development and training on both UDL and inclusive practices since 2021. According to the district's *Professional Development Handbook*, for example, special education and coteachers have received specific training in the coteaching model, with an external consultant observing classroom practices and providing targeted feedback. District leaders have praised the inclusion and coteaching professional development sessions for incorporating a DEI framework and providing the district with opportunities to streamline their own special education protocols.

Even though teachers and support specialists generally acknowledged either participating in or being aware of professional development related to UDL and inclusive practices, they had mixed opinions on whether the ongoing professional development about tiered interventions has led to sufficient understanding from staff. For example, both teachers and support specialists described a general approach to professional development that favored efficiency over understanding, with one teacher explaining that the training they receive (e.g., on SAEBRS) may be too short and taught by someone who attended only a brief workshop and was not an expert on the subject. Student support specialists also shared that teachers need more professional development focused on social-emotional learning, with the responsibility for teaching social-emotional concepts usually falling into the hands of support staff who are already overloaded. This need for SEL-based professional development is an area for growth, as are the reports of inconsistencies with the usefulness of professional development related to tiered interventions.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Bourne ensures that both students and families have multiple opportunities to engage with the district and support students' academic progress and general well-being. As outlined in the DSAP and echoed by various district leaders, family and community engagement has been a strategic focus for the district. Currently, the district and schools communicate to families through a variety of platforms, including emails; newsletters; social media; and applications such as PowerSchool, Remind, and Class Dojo. Various district leaders and support specialists also described a culture of "regular, two-way communication" with parents and families. Finally, district documents and interviews showed that the district regularly engages families through community and parent events held throughout the school year, such as open houses and curriculum nights.

However, almost all parents interviewed indicated that communication and engagement decreases as students move into the middle and high schools; this inconsistency in communication with families across schools is an area for growth. For example, parents with students at the middle and high schools were more likely to describe their communication with the schools as "sparse" or "spotty," whereas parents with children at Bournedale Elementary School were generally satisfied with communication from the school. One parent, whose child transitioned from the intermediate school to the middle school described a "breakdown" in communication after the move, whereas another parent described a "marked difference" between her experience with Bournedale and the other schools, saying,

> I cannot say enough wonderful things about our experience [at Bournedale Elementary] and the communication and it was just great. In the intermediate, I'm not . . . it's not that it's bad; it is different. It is a marked difference between . . . and it's just no apps. We can email but . . . and then there was one parent-teacher conference that it ended up being seven minutes

> for each of my children, and I can't say anything in seven minutes. So that was tough. It just feels like the priority shifts when you get out of the elementary school, and I'd like to see that stay like it is in elementary [school] all the way through high school.

District documents, including *Bournedale Elementary's Strategic Improvement Plan* and several school-specific documents titled *Family Engagement Measures and Opportunities*, also show that the elementary and intermediate schools generally hold more parent events and provide more opportunities for parent engagement, such as volunteering.

Similarly, district leaders described multiple opportunities for parents to get involved in planning and decision making, such as through parent-teacher organizations, school councils, and the DEI and MTSS committees, but interviews indicated that parent involvement in these groups is lagging. Both parents and district leaders provided multiple explanations for the lack of parent involvement, such as challenges with balancing work schedules, a lack of communication and recruitment efforts about these opportunities, and a general decline in parent involvement since COVID-19. However, parents agreed that the district provides opportunities for parents to provide input, such as the surveys and focus groups during improvement planning and parent input into the student handbook.

The district provides multiple opportunities for student leadership, such as the peer leadership committee at the middle school and the student council at the high school. Likewise, students have opportunities to attend school committee meetings and/or serve on the committee's student advisory board. Bourne High School's school council also selects a student representative to regularly serve on the district's school committee and attend meetings. Both school committee members and students spoke positively about youth involvement on the school committee. Opportunities for student leadership is a strength for the district.

Developing and maintaining partnerships with diverse community organizations, as part of an emphasis on cultural competence, is another focus for the district, as exemplified by its Building Bridges program, which aims to connect members of the district with community organizations, information, and services. The DSAP also emphasizes the district's commitment to expanding and strengthening its partnerships, with action items for creating and annually updating an inventory of all ongoing partnerships. District documents and interviews with district and school leaders also demonstrate the presence of strong community partners, such as the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which provides programming to students. Support specialists and district leaders also reported that the district has systems and protocols for procuring vendors to deliver mental health services, including monitoring the effectiveness of the vendors through evaluations of the tiered supports. Finally, both district documents and interviews showed that Bourne provides a variety of supports to families in need, including a backpack program, in which families can receive supplementary food and clothing donations. The cultivation of relationships with diverse community partners, with an emphasis on cultural competence and supporting family needs, is a strength for the district.

Recommendations

- The district should work with parents and students to better understand the perception of inconsistent consequences and responses to student behavior.

- The district should conduct an evaluation of its existing professional development offerings related to tiered interventions to better diagnose inconsistencies and address critical feedback of current trainings.
- The district should introduce or expand professional development focused on integrating social emotional learning into general classroom instruction.

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Bourne. The team conducted 58 classroom observations during the week of March 20, 2023, and held interviews and focus groups between March 21 and March 23, 2023. 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
- Principals
- Teachers
- Support specialists
- Parents
- Students

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- Curricular review process and timeline
- Bourne curriculum unit template
- Published educational reports on the district by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, and handbooks

Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

MASSACHUSETTS
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Bourne Public Schools

Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

March 2023

201 Jones Road
Waltham, Massachusetts
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499
www.air.org

Contents

Introduction

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

Three observers visited Bourne Public Schools during the week of March 20, 2023. Observers conducted 58 observations in a sample of classrooms across four 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
■ Positive Climate ■ Negative Climate ■ Teacher Sensitivity ■ Regard for Student Perspectives	■ Behavior Management ■ Productivity ■ Instructional Learning Formats	■ Concept Development ■ Quality of Feedback ■ Language Modeling

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

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
■ Positive Climate ■ Teacher Sensitivity ■ Regard for Student Perspectives	■ Behavior Management ■ Productivity ■ Negative Climate	■ Instructional Learning Formats ■ Content Understanding ■ Analysis and Inquiry ■ Quality of Feedback ■ Instructional Dialogue
Student Engagement		

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

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

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

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

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

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Positive Climate District Average*: 4.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**58**	**4.8**
Grades K-5	0	0	1	6	6	5	2	20	5.1
Grades 6-8	0	0	6	2	5	5	0	18	4.5
Grades 9-12	0	2	2	4	4	5	3	20	4.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 15] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 58 observations = 4.8

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average*: 5.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**58**	**5.2**
Grades K-5	0	0	0	6	4	5	5	20	5.5
Grades 6-8	0	0	2	5	5	1	5	18	5.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	4	4	4	2	6	20	5.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 6] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 16]) ÷ 58 observations = 5.2

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

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average*: 3.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**58**	**3.6**
Grades K-5	0	1	8	4	2	5	0	20	4.1
Grades 6-8	0	4	8	3	1	1	1	18	3.4
Grades 9-12	2	6	2	7	3	0	0	20	3.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 2] + [2 x 11] + [3 x 18] + [4 x 14] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 58 observations = 3.6

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

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

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

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K – 3
Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Negative Climate District Average*: 6.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	58	6.9
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	20	7.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	18	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	20	7.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as: ([6 x 3] + [7 x 55]) ÷ 58 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.

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

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Behavior Management District Average*: 6.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**58**	**6.4**
Grades K-5	0	0	0	2	6	7	5	20	5.8
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	7.0
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	0	1	2	16	20	6.6

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 39]) ÷ 58 observations = 6.4

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

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

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

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Productivity District Average*: 6.2

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**58**	**6.2**
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	20	6.2
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	0	3	2	12	18	6.3
Grades 9-12	1	0	0	1	1	5	12	20	6.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 14] + [7 x 33]) ÷ 58 observations = 6.2

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

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K–3
Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Learning Formats District Average*: 4.5

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	58	4.5
Grades K-5	0	0	2	10	6	2	0	20	4.4
Grades 6-8	0	0	5	5	2	4	2	18	4.6
Grades 9-12	1	1	4	1	7	5	1	20	4.6

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [2 x 1] + [3 x 11] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 15] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 58 observations = 4.5

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*: 3.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	15	3.1
Grades K-3**	0	8	2	2	1	2	0	15	3.1

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 8] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 15 observations = 3.1

**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*: 4.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**43**	**4.0**
Grades 4-5**	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	5	4.0
Grades 6-8	3	0	5	4	3	3	0	18	3.7
Grades 9-12	2	2	3	3	5	4	1	20	4.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 5] + [2 x 2] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 43 observations = 4.0

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average*: 2.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**43**	**2.6**
Grades 4-5**	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	5	4.2
Grades 6-8	8	5	1	2	2	0	0	18	2.2
Grades 9-12	5	7	2	2	4	0	0	20	2.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 13] + [2 x 12] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 43 observations = 2.6

**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*: 3.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	58	3.4
Grades K-5	3	6	5	2	3	1	0	20	3.0
Grades 6-8	5	3	2	3	3	0	2	18	3.2
Grades 9-12	3	1	5	4	1	5	1	20	3.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 11] + [2 x 10] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 9] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 58 observations = 3.4

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K–3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average*: 3.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**15**	**3.0**
Grades K-3**	0	4	8	2	1	0	0	15	3.0

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 4] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 1]) ÷ 15 observations = 3.0

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average*: 2.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**43**	**2.9**
Grades 4-5**	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	3.0
Grades 6-8	8	3	1	3	2	0	1	18	2.6
Grades 9-12	3	5	4	4	2	2	0	20	3.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 11] + [2 x 9] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 43 observations = 2.9

**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*: 4.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**43**	**4.7**
Grades 4-5**	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	5	5.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	3	5	5	2	3	18	4.8
Grades 9-12	0	1	5	5	4	4	1	20	4.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 8] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 12] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 43 observations = 4.7

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	**0**	**1**	**9**	**16**	**12**	**16**	**26**	**80**	**5.4**
Positive Climate	0	0	1	6	6	5	2	20	5.1
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	20	7.0
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	0	6	4	5	5	20	5.5
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	1	8	4	2	5	0	20	4.1
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**2**	**13**	**15**	**16**	**14**	**60**	**5.5**
Behavior Management	0	0	0	2	6	7	5	20	5.8
Productivity	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	20	6.2
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	2	10	6	2	0	20	4.4
Instructional Support Domain	**3**	**19**	**20**	**13**	**6**	**4**	**0**	**65**	**3.2**
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	8	2	2	1	2	0	15	3.1
Content Understanding (UE only)	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	5	4.0
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	5	4.2
Quality of Feedback	3	6	5	2	3	1	0	20	3.0
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	4	8	2	1	0	0	15	3.0
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	3.0
Student Engagement (UE only)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**5.0**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.1

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 19]) ÷ 20 observations = 7.0. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	**0**	**4**	**16**	**10**	**11**	**7**	**6**	**54**	**4.4**
Positive Climate	0	0	6	2	5	5	0	18	4.5
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	2	5	5	1	5	18	5.1
Regard for Student Perspectives	0	4	8	3	1	1	1	18	3.4
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**47**	**54**	**6.8**
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	7.0
Productivity	0	0	1	0	3	2	12	18	6.3
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	18	6.9
Instructional Support Domain	**24**	**11**	**14**	**17**	**12**	**7**	**5**	**90**	**3.3**
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	5	5	2	4	2	18	4.6
Content Understanding	3	0	5	4	3	3	0	18	3.7
Analysis and Inquiry	8	5	1	2	2	0	0	18	2.2
Quality of Feedback	5	3	2	3	3	0	2	18	3.2
Instructional Dialogue	8	3	1	3	2	0	1	18	2.6
Student Engagement	**0**	**0**	**3**	**5**	**5**	**2**	**3**	**18**	**4.8**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 6] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 5]) ÷ 18 observations = 4.5

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	**2**	**8**	**8**	**15**	**11**	**7**	**9**	**60**	**4.4**
Positive Climate	0	2	2	4	4	5	3	20	4.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	4	4	4	2	6	20	5.1
Regard for Student Perspectives	2	6	2	7	3	0	0	20	3.2
Classroom Organization Domain	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**8**	**47**	**60**	**6.6**
Behavior Management	0	0	1	0	1	2	16	20	6.6
Productivity	1	0	0	1	1	5	12	20	6.2
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	20	7.0
Instructional Support Domain	**14**	**16**	**18**	**14**	**19**	**16**	**3**	**100**	**3.7**
Instructional Learning Formats	1	1	4	1	7	5	1	20	4.6
Content Understanding	2	2	3	3	5	4	1	20	4.2
Analysis and Inquiry	5	7	2	2	4	0	0	20	2.7
Quality of Feedback	3	1	5	4	1	5	1	20	3.9
Instructional Dialogue	3	5	4	4	2	2	0	20	3.2
Student Engagement	**0**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**20**	**4.4**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 3]) ÷ 20 observations = 4.9

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 19]) ÷ 20 observations = 7.0

References

Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf

MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary.* Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary.* Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K–3.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

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

Table C1. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

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

Table C2. Resources to Support Assessment

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

Table C3. Resources to Support Student Support

Resource	Description
Safe and Supportive Schools (SaSS) Framework and Self-Reflection Tool	Based on Five Essential Elements, these resources (see At-a-Glance Overview) can help guide school- and district-based teams create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures. Through a phased process (with preliminary and deeper dive self-reflection options), teams can create plans based on local context and data and through examination of six areas of school operation.
MTSS Blueprint	This resource offers a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.
Prenatal Through Young Adulthood Family Engagement Framework for Massachusetts	This resource offers a roadmap for practitioners and families in health, human services, and education. A companion document is the Family, School and Community Partnership Fundamentals Self-Assessment Version 2.0
State and local student survey data such as Views of Climate and Learning and the Youth Risk Behavior Survey	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.

Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	1,554	100.0%	913,735	100.0%
African American	20	1.3%	85,662	9.4%
Asian	39	2.5%	67,010	7.3%
Hispanic	98	6.3%	221,044	24.2%
Native American	9	0.6%	2,155	0.2%
White	1,279	82.3%	496,800	54.4%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.1%	787	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	108	6.9%	40,277	4.4%

Note. As of October 1, 2022.

Table D2. Bourne Public Schools: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2022-2023

	District			State		
Group	*N*	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of district	*N*	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of state
All students with high needs	748	100.0%	47.7%	508,820	100.0%	55.1%
Students with disabilities	332	44.4%	21.2%	179,095	35.2%	19.4%
Low-income households	545	72.9%	35.1%	386,060	75.9%	42.3%
ELs and former ELs	23	3.1%	1.5%	110,554	21.7%	12.1%

Note. As of October 1, 2022. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,568; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 923,349.

Table D3. Bourne Public Schools: Chronic Absence[a] Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,653	11.0	24.2	27.8	27.7
African American/Black	26	16.2	46.9	30.8	32.0
Asian	37	8.3	18.2	13.5	15.4
Hispanic/Latino	95	10.9	26.9	31.6	42.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	104	16.7	38.4	34.6	28.4
Native American	14	5.6	36.8	50.0	37.8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	32.1
White	1,376	10.6	22.8	27.1	22.1
High needs	854	16.2	37.1	34.0	37.1
Low income[b]	693	—	—	37.2	40.6
ELs	23	6.7	41.2	39.1	39.9
Students w/disabilities	338	13.6	35.6	27.8	36.9

[a] The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. [b] 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. Bourne Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2020-2022

	Fiscal Year 2020		Fiscal Year 2021		Fiscal Year 2022	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	$23,357,407	$23,373,935	$23,944,555	$23,794,921	$24,251,247	$24,487,543
By municipality	$16,321,688	$18,188,320	$16,181,661	$17,801,922	$16,867,084	$16,760,192
Total from local appropriations	$39,679,095	$41,562,256	$40,126,216	$41,596,842	$41,118,331	$41,247,736
From revolving funds and grants	—	$3,794,323	—	$5,590,494	—	$4,406,387
Total expenditures	—	$45,356,579	—	$47,187,336	—	$45,654,122
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid[a]	—	$5,215,213	—	$5,215,213	—	$5,268,883
Required local contribution	—	$18,252,187	—	$18,697,802	—	$17,285,207
Required net school spending[b]	—	$23,467,400	—	$23,913,015	—	$22,554,090
Actual net school spending	—	$30,357,476	—	$30,813,906	—	$32,225,447
Over/under required ($)	—	$6,890,076	—	$6,900,891	—	$9,671,357
Over/under required (%)	—	29.4%	—	28.9%	—	42.9%

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

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

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

Expenditure category	2020	2021	2022
Administration	$411	$452	$503
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$1,142	$1,274	$1,354
Teachers	$6,477	$8,003	$8,358
Other teaching services	$1,389	$1,552	$1,841
Professional development	$230	$128	$240
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	$338	$878	$397
Guidance, counseling, and testing services	$586	$695	$760
Pupil services	$1,644	$2,002	$2,169
Operations and maintenance	$1,108	$1,713	$1,170
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	$3,856	$4,209	$4,873
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$17,180	$20,905	$21,665

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. Bourne 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	814	49	39	31	41	8	18	19	17
African American/Black	13	25	33	15	26	25	25	31	27
Asian	18	40	15	17	63	7	8	11	8
Hispanic/Latino	38	35	42	24	22	5	16	18	31
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	40	66	42	30	48	3	12	15	14
Native American	7	50	–	–	29	10	–	–	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	–	43	–	–	–	17
White	698	50	40	33	48	8	18	19	11
High needs	433	30	27	19	24	17	28	30	28
Low income[a]	353	–	–	22	24	–	–	24	28
ELs and former ELs	10	33	–	10	20	25	–	20	34
Students w/disabilities	182	11	12	4	11	35	47	58	46

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

Table E2. Bourne 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	89	70	73	43	58	2	4	6	8
African American/Black	1	–	–	–	41	–	–	–	13
Asian	2	–	–	–	79	–	–	–	4
Hispanic/Latino	5	–	–	–	38	–	–	–	17
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	–	–	–	62	–	–	–	6
Native American	3	–	–	–	53	–	–	–	8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	–	45	–	–	–	16
White	74	72	75	43	65	1	4	5	4
High needs	35	52	65	29	38	3	10	9	15
Low income[a]	29	–	–	28	40	–	–	7	14
ELs and former ELs	2	–	–	–	21	–	–	–	30
Students w/disabilities	10	23	–	10	20	8	–	20	26

[a] 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. Bourne 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	813	41	27	29	39	11	20	17	17
African American/Black	13	6	17	8	19	38	25	23	31
Asian	18	53	23	33	69	7	23	17	6
Hispanic/Latino	38	26	20	16	18	9	22	16	32
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	39	46	18	28	44	5	26	15	16
Native American	7	50	–	–	27	10	–	–	23
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	–	39	–	–	–	19
White	698	42	29	31	47	11	19	16	11
High needs	433	23	12	15	22	22	34	28	28
Low income[a]	352	–	–	18	20	–	–	23	29
ELs and former ELs	10	33	–	30	21	25	–	20	32
Students w/disabilities	182	10	5	1	12	44	53	57	45

[a] 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. Bourne 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	92	48	44	33	50	6	5	15	10
African American/Black	1	–	–	–	26	–	–	–	20
Asian	2	–	–	–	78	–	–	–	4
Hispanic/Latino	5	–	–	–	26	–	–	–	21
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	–	–	–	53	–	–	–	10
Native American	3	–	–	–	37	–	–	–	16
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	–	48	–	–	–	19
White	77	48	46	34	59	4	5	13	6
High needs	38	26	24	16	28	14	14	26	19
Low income[a]	31	–	–	16	29	–	–	29	19
ELs and former ELs	2	–	–	–	17	–	–	–	32
Students w/disabilities	11	0	–	9	15	33	–	36	33

[a] 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. Bourne 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	269	45	35	38	42	7	14	17	18
African American/Black	4	–	–	–	21	–	–	–	31
Asian	8	–	–	–	65	–	–	–	8
Hispanic/Latino	9	–	18	–	20	–	18	–	33
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	58	46	25	48	0	23	17	15
Native American	3	–	–	–	28	–	–	–	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	–	41	–	–	–	20
White	233	46	35	41	52	7	14	17	10
High needs	126	27	26	21	24	16	24	31	29
Low income[a]	101	–	–	24	23	–	–	25	30
ELs and former ELs	2	–	–	–	18	–	–	–	37
Students w/disabilities	51	10	13	4	15	33	36	61	44

[a] 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. Bourne 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	86	–	–	28	47	–	–	21	14
African American/Black	1	–	–	–	25	–	–	–	25
Asian	2	–	–	–	70	–	–	–	6
Hispanic/Latino	4	–	–	–	23	–	–	–	28
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	–	–	–	51	–	–	–	12
Native American	3	–	–	–	38	–	–	–	14
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	–	45	–	–	–	23
White	72	–	–	29	56	–	–	17	8
High needs	34	–	–	12	26	–	–	32	24
Low income[a]	29	–	–	10	26	–	–	34	25
ELs and former ELs	2	–	–	–	13	–	–	–	43
Students w/disabilities	9	–	–	–	16	–	–	–	37

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 and 2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	627	49.5	45.3	49.8
African American/Black	9	–	–	48.8
Asian	13	–	–	58.5
Hispanic/Latino	28	48.1	39.0	46.5
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	33	52.0	49.6	51.5
Native American	5	–	–	46.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	–	–	–	51.7
White	539	49.5	45.7	50.0
High needs	307	47.3	42.5	46.7
Low income[a]	258	–	45.1	46.5
ELs and former ELs	6	–	–	47.7
Students w/disabilities	121	44.0	32.3	41.8

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 and 2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	78	57.6	40.7	50.0
African American/Black	1	—	—	49.8
Asian	2	—	—	56.0
Hispanic/Latino	4	—	—	47.6
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	—	—	50.6
Native American	1	—	—	54.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	49.5
White	66	58.8	40.1	50.1
High needs	29	54.3	43.2	47.7
Low income[a]	25	—	44.6	47.2
ELs and former ELs	2	—	—	50.5
Students w/disabilities	7	—	—	45.1

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 and 2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	628	49.8	45.6	49.9
African American/Black	9	—	—	47.0
Asian	13	—	—	59.8
Hispanic/Latino	30	49.1	44.9	46.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	32	52.3	45.6	51.0
Native American	5	—	—	49.5
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	49.9
White	539	49.4	45.6	50.4
High needs	310	48.2	43.3	47.1
Low income[a]	260	—	44.8	46.4
ELs and former ELs	6	—	—	48.6
Students w/disabilities	121	47.2	36.0	43.3

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 and 2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	79	39.0	43.7	50.0
African American/Black	1	—	—	45.6
Asian	2	—	—	57.3
Hispanic/Latino	3	—	—	44.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	—	—	50.0
Native American	1	—	—	46.6
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	41.2
White	68	38.5	43.3	51.6
High needs	30	30.2	41.5	46.7
Low income[a]	27	—	41.6	45.6
ELs and former ELs	2	—	—	48.9
Students w/disabilities	6	—	—	47.3

[a] 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. Bourne 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	111	52	44	28	44	8	12	17	15
4	137	42	40	18	38	5	13	18	16
5	122	57	54	41	41	4	9	13	13
6	152	48	39	32	41	14	25	24	22
7	143	45	32	38	41	9	23	17	19
8	149	51	25	29	42	7	26	20	18
3-8	814	49	39	31	41	8	18	19	17
10	89	70	73	43	58	2	4	6	8

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

Grade	*N* (2022)	Percentages meeting or exceeding expectations				Percentage not meeting expectations			
		2019	2021	2022	State (2022)	2019	2021	2022	State (2022)
3	111	40	37	30	41	15	24	29	20
4	137	42	28	28	42	8	20	17	17
5	122	40	26	32	36	10	19	16	16
6	150	47	18	25	42	12	21	15	15
7	144	33	26	30	37	12	20	15	19
8	149	46	29	32	36	8	14	13	17
3-8	813	41	27	29	39	11	20	17	17
10	92	48	44	33	50	6	5	15	10

Table E13. Bourne 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	121	44	36	34	43	6	15	19	18
8	148	46	34	42	42	8	13	16	18
5 and 8	269	45	35	38	42	7	14	17	18
10	86	–	–	28	47	–	–	21	14

Note. Grade 10 results for the 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 E14. Bourne Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019 and 2022

Grade	*N* (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	–	–	–	–
4	127	51.2	39.5	50.0
5	107	56.8	57.7	49.9
6	143	47.0	41.3	49.8
7	120	48.9	52.4	49.7
8	130	43.7	38.4	49.7
3-8	627	49.6	45.3	49.8
10	78	57.6	40.7	50.0

Table E15. Bourne Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2019 and 2022

Grade	*N* (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	—	—	—	—
4	127	50.2	35.9	50.0
5	108	48.9	47.8	50.0
6	141	55.0	34.1	49.8
7	123	44.4	55.6	49.9
8	129	51.1	56.2	49.8
3-8	628	49.8	45.6	49.9
10	79	39.0	43.7	50.0

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

Group	*N* (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	114	88.6	92.7	93.9	90.1
African American/Black	3	—	—	—	86.2
Asian	3	100	—	—	96.2
Hispanic/Latino	4	85.7	100	—	81.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	—	—	—	88.7
Native American	2	—	—	—	82.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	81.3
White	100	91.4	93.5	94.0	93.2
High needs	56	79.7	88.4	91.1	83.9
Low income[a]	50	78.0	82.4	92.0	83.2
ELs	2	—	—	—	73.1
Students w/disabilities	18	62.5	82.1	77.8	78.0

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

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

Group	*N* (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	123	90.0	88.6	93.5	91.8
African American/Black	2	—	—	—	88.1
Asian	2	—	100	—	97.0
Hispanic/Latino	6	57.1	85.7	100	84.0
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	5	—	—	—	91.2
Native American	—	—	—	—	84.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	87.7
White	108	92.5	91.4	94.4	94.4
High needs	69	85.5	79.7	89.9	85.8
Low income[a]	51	88.1	78.0	84.3	85.1
ELs	—	—	—	—	78.0
Students w/disabilities	39	78.1	62.5	82.1	80.6

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

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

Group	*N* (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,654	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.6
African American/Black	27	—	—	—	2.2
Asian	38	—	—	—	0.4
Hispanic/Latino	96	—	—	—	2.1
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	102	—	—	2.0	1.8
Native American	14	—	—	—	2.4
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	1.9
White	1,376	1.5	0.9	1.2	1.4
High needs	862	2.9	1.4	1.6	2.2
Low income[a]	695	—	—	1.9	2.3
ELs	24	—	—	—	1.4
Students w/disabilities	358	3.2	1.7	1.4	2.8

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,654	1.6	1.0	2.8	3.1
African American/Black	27	—	—	—	6.2
Asian	38	—	—	—	0.7
Hispanic/Latino	96	—	—	—	4.9
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	102	—	—	4.9	3.5
Native American	14	—	—	—	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	3.6
White	1,376	1.4	1.0	2.8	2.1
High needs	862	2.7	1.3	3.6	4.6
Low income[a]	695	—	—	3.5	5.2
ELs	24	—	—	—	3.5
Students w/disabilities	358	1.5	1.1	3.9	5.8

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	377	0.4	1.2	1.6	2.1
African American/Black	4	—	0.0	—	2.8
Asian	8	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.6
Hispanic/Latino	14	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	16	0.0	0.0	6.3	2.4
Native American	6	—	0.0	0.0	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	1.2
White	329	0.3	1.4	0.9	1.3
High needs	145	0.8	3.0	2.8	3.6
Low income[a]	120	1.1	4.1	3.3	3.8
ELs	2	—	—	—	7.8
Students w/disabilities	43	0.0	5.9	4.7	3.4

[a] 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. Bourne Public Schools: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	*N* (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	195	72.2	71.7	77.4	64.9
African American/Black	4	—	16.7	—	55.5
Asian	5	100.0	—	—	84.9
Hispanic/Latino	5	41.7	72.7	—	49.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	6	62.5	83.3	100	66.1
Native American	1	—	—	—	50.0
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—	65.4
White	174	73.0	73.7	77.6	69.5
High needs	75	50.7	44.3	65.3	49.1
Low income[a]	64	56.5	49.2	70.3	50.1
ELs	1	—	—	—	30.0
Students w/disabilities	21	5.3	25.0	33.3	34.3

[a] 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.