Oxford Public Schools

Targeted District Review Report

November 2022

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 May 2023

Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a comprehensive review of Oxford Public Schools (hereafter, Oxford) in November 2022. Data collection activities associated with the review focused on understanding how district systems, structures, and practices operate in support of district continuous improvement efforts. This review focused on three of the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness, specifically the three student-centered standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support.[1]

Curriculum and Instruction

Oxford ensures that most teachers have access to standards-aligned curricular materials by using a mix of locally created, standards-based curricula and externally created curricula that have been rated as meeting expectations on CURATE.[2] Staff at both the school and district levels mentioned pride in their locally created curricula. The current curriculum review process includes the use of CURATE and EdReports ratings, an equity review, and a review and survey of teachers for their input. The consistent review process is an area of strength; however, documentation of the process is an area for growth. Students have access to a reasonable variety of coursework, including upper level and enrichment courses.

Oxford has attempted to address multiple issues facing its schools through a variety of initiatives that influence classroom instruction, including student access to higher level coursework, student engagement, and cultural responsiveness. The district has provided professional development to address these issues, including trainings on social-emotional learning, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), student-centered instructional models, and culturally responsive teaching methods. These district-level supports are strengths. Still, consistency with these initiatives at the classroom-level is an area for growth, as implementation was described as inconsistent. However, administrators clearly noted that the district is in the early stages of implementation, having started on these initiatives approximately when the superintendent was hired in July 2021. Although social-emotional learning approaches have yet to be incorporated across all classrooms, this is an area of strength for district leadership because their support for social-emotional learning has included multiple types of initiatives. Support for the other three areas was adequate but appeared to be improving in most classrooms.

Two observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Oxford during the week of November 14, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[3] guided all classroom observations in

---

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

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

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

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, across all grade bands, instructional observations suggest mixed evidence of emotional support, instructional support, and student engagement, with generally strong evidence of classroom organization.

Assessment

Oxford uses a variety of data systems to monitor students' progress and provide data reports. These systems incorporate data from Istation, the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), in addition to a district social-emotional survey and locally created classroom assessments – together, these systems are a strength for Oxford. At the individual level, there are additional structures for identifying students who are struggling and examining data to provide the targeted support, often through student support teams (SSTs). However, several stakeholders expressed concern at the lack of a consistent diagnostic tool that uses standardized data, which was an area of growth for the district.

After identifying data use as a priority for the 2022-2023 school year, Oxford has carried out several related initiatives, including monthly data meetings facilitated by the district's curriculum director, professional development offered to all teachers, and a consultant for higher level mathematics courses. Strengths include district support for regular use of a variety of data – especially in Grades K-4 and high school mathematics – as well as systems for sharing data with school leaders. Areas for growth include staff capacity to use data to drive decision-making and some variation regarding how data are shared with families, which often depended on each teacher's level of comfort with technology.

Student Support

As reflected in the *3-Year District Improvement Plan,* Oxford has several priorities, including: addressing students' social-emotional and health needs, providing a multitiered system of support (MTSS), and partnering with families and community members for student success. Strengths related to these priorities include: a) implementation restorative practices, mindfulness, and other positive behavioral approaches, b) support for related initiatives, including Universal Design for Learning and Social-Emotional Learning, through professional development and frequent engagement with staff, students, and families, and c) attempts to increase engagement with families of EL students and students with disabilities. However, areas for growth include: a) concerns from both families and students about whether schools maintained safe and supportive environments, due to some issues with bullying, b) the lack of Tier 2 supports, and c) opportunities for families to contribute meaningfully to decision-making.

Oxford 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 Oxford review focused only on the three student-centered standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. In addition, the design of the comprehensive district review promotes district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data prior to conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including school committee members, teachers' association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students' families. Virtual interviews and focus groups 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 Oxford was conducted during the week of November 14, 2022. The site visit included approximately 12 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 55 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students' families, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted four teacher focus groups with five elementary school teachers, three middle school teachers, and four high school teachers. The team also conducted two student focus groups, one each with middle and high school students.

The site team also conducted 60 observations of classroom instruction in four schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

District Profile

Oxford is led by superintendent Michael Lucas, who was appointed in 2021, as well as a curriculum director, a director of student services and special education, and a director of technology. The district is governed by a school committee composed of five members who are elected for staggered 3-year terms.

In the 2022-2023 school year, there were 112 teachers in the district, with 1,437 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
Clara Barton Elementary School	Elementary	PK, 3-4	262
A. M. Chaffee Elementary School	Elementary	K-2	287
Oxford Middle School	Middle	5-8	504
Oxford High School	High	9-12	384
Total			**1,437**

Note. Enrollment data as of October 1, 2022.

Between 2020 and 2023, overall student enrollment decreased by 21 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 less than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for K-12 districts of similar size in fiscal year (FY) 2021—$15,702 for Oxford compared with $17,343 for similar districts—and less than average state spending per pupil ($18,519). Actual net school spending in FY 2022 was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D4 in Appendix D.

School and Student Performance

In ELA in grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 12 percentage points, from 44 percent in 2019 to 32 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 41 percent. In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 13 percentage points, from 60 percent in 2019 to 47 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 58 percent. (Tables E1 and E2)

- In grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022 was above the state rate by 1 and 2 percentage points for Low Income

students and English learners (EL) and former ELs respectively, equal to the state rate for High Needs students, and below the state rate by 9 and 13 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students and White students, and by 2 to 4 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022 was below the state rate by 13 and 14 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and White students respectively, and by 1 to 6 percentage points for High Needs students, Low Income students, and Students with Disabilities.

In math in grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined 8 percentage points, from 36 percent in 2019 to 28 percent in 2022, and was below the 2022 state rate of 39 percent. In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations declined by 10 percentage points from 48 percent in 2019 to 38 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 50 percent. (Tables E3 and E4)

- In grades 3-8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022 was equal to the state rate for Low Income students, below the state rate by 8 to 16 percentage points for African American/Black students, Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students, and below the state rate by 2 to 3 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022 was below the state rate by 17 and 18 percentage points for White students and Hispanic/Latino students, and below the state rate by 1 to 8 percentage points for all other student groups with reportable data.

In science in grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS declined by 9 percentage points, from 41 percent in 2019 to 32 percent in 2022, which is below the 2022 state rate of 42 percent. In grade 10, 24 percent of all students scored Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022, which is below the state rate of 47 percent. (Tables E5 and E6)

- In grades 5 and 8, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022 was above the state rate by 19 percentage points for Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, below the state rate by 11 to 19 percentage points for Students with Disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students, and below the state rate by 1 and 4 percentage points for Low Income students and High Needs students.

- In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations in 2022 was below the state rate by 23 and 27 percentage points for Hispanic/Latino students and White students, and by 14 to 16 percentage points for Low Income students, High Needs students, and Students with Disabilities.

The average student growth percentile (SGP) on the 2022 MCAS assessments in grades 3-8 was 45.8 in ELA and 44.9 in math, which represent typical growth. In grade 10, SGPs were typical in ELA (42.4) and low in math (34.4)[4]. (Tables E7-E10)

- SGPs in grades 3-8 in ELA and math were typical for each student group with reportable data, ranging from 40.1 to 54.6 in ELA and from 43.5 to 58.4 in math, except in ELA for Students with Disabilities which was low (39.8).
- In grade 10, ELA SGPs were typical, ranging from 42.1 to 44.0 for all student groups with reportable data. SGPs in math were low, ranging from 29.4 to 35.4 for all student groups with reportable data.

Oxford's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 4.4 percentage points, from 82.1 percent in 2020 to 86.5 percent in 2022. The five-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved 6.6 percentage points from 81.5 percent in 2019 to 88.1 percent in 2021. (Tables E16 and E17)

- The four-year-cohort graduation rate increased by 6.0 to 9.3 percentage points for each student group with reportable data between 2020 and 2022 but remained below the state rate for each student group, except for Hispanic/Latino students.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate increased between 2019 and 2021 by 4.2 to 10.5 for each student group with reportable data but remained below the state rate for each student group.

The district's annual dropout rate for all students increased from 3.0 percent in 2020 to 3.3 percent in 2022, which is above the 2022 state rate of 2.1 percent. (Table E20)

- The dropout rate in Oxford was almost three times the state rate for White students, and above the state rate for High Needs students and Students with Disabilities.

---

[4] Average student growth percentile (SGP) ranges: Very Low Growth = 1.0--29.9, Low Growth = 30.0--39.9, Typical Growth = 40.0--59.9, High Growth = 60.0 or higher.

Curriculum and Instruction

Oxford ensures that most teachers have access to standards-aligned curricular materials by using a mix of locally created, standards-based curricula (which are not reviewed or rated by CURATE) and externally created curricula that have been rated as meeting expectations on CURATE. Advanced Placement (AP) courses are the one exception, in that these curricula are externally created but not reviewed or rated on CURATE. In interviews, staff at both the school and district levels mentioned pride in their locally created curricula.

The district's process for reviewing curricula is not formally documented—an area that district administrators shared they are actively working on. The current curriculum review process includes the use of CURATE and EdReports ratings, an equity review, and a review and survey of teachers for their input. Teachers also have room to modify curricula to their own contexts.

Students have access to a reasonable variety of coursework, including upper-level and enrichment courses. The district also has developed several initiatives to guide classroom instruction, including social-emotional learning, UDL, and student-centered and culturally responsive approaches, which are currently being implemented. Although the degree of implementation varies by school, these have been areas of emphasis by the district, and interviews indicated district support for each initiative in the form of professional development and other resources.

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	- Most curricular materials are standards based or generally meet expectations on CURATE. - Oxford develops and uses consistent processes for reviewing curricula. - District provides support for UDL and social-emotional learning.	- Documentation of curricular review and selection processes - More consistency in the taught curriculum and supporting strategies at the middle and high school levels
Classroom instruction	- District leads several initiatives, including social-emotional learning, UDL, student-centered methods, and culturally responsive teaching. - District provides multiple forms of support for initiatives, including professional development, book clubs, and staff surveys.	- Documentation of development opportunities, surveys, and other information related to classroom implementation of these initiatives - Consistency at the classroom level with initiatives, particularly UDL in middle school classrooms
Student access to coursework	- Students have access to a wide array of courses, including advanced courses such as AP options and enrichment courses such as arts and music. - The district uses disaggregated student data to identify groups underrepresented in advanced courses and works to address the disparity.	Representation of students receiving special education services in advanced courses.

Curriculum Selection and Use

Oxford ensures that most teachers have access to standards-aligned curricular materials by using a mix of locally created curricula that follow understanding by design (UbD) frameworks and at least partially meet expectations on CURATE. For history, social studies, and science in all grades and ELA for Grades 6-12, Oxford used UbD frameworks to guide curriculum development, with ongoing district-level efforts to focus on student-centered, social-emotional learning approaches, such as workshop models that district leadership has encouraged staff to incorporate more in recent years. For ELA in Grades K-5, Oxford's current curriculum, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's Into Reading program, is rated as meets expectations in CURATE; the Into Writing program, used in Grades 6-8, also meets expectations. For mathematics, the district uses Envisions Math curriculum for Grades K-8, which also meets expectations on CURATE. District curricula not guided by UbD frameworks or rated on CURATE were primarily upper grade subjects, including physics and precalculus AP courses, which have their own rigorous criteria for evaluation. In addition, Oxford uses a Grades 5-8 science curriculum called Savvas, which has also not been rated. Still, staff at all three schools that use Savvas explained that they incorporate locally created lessons alongside the Savvas curriculum to ensure it is rigorous and aligned with the workshop model that district leadership emphasizes. Staff at both the school and district levels mentioned pride in their locally created curricula and said families and staff view this as a strength for the district.

The district currently does not have a documented curriculum selection and review process; however, district administrators described a detailed, consistent process for reviewing curricula, parts of which were supported across several interviews and limited documents. The administration uses CURATE and EdReports ratings to initially determine the strengths of a given curriculum. One administrator explained that they are "heavy into standards-based instruction," noting that curricula must draw on Massachusetts standards, and teachers need to adapt the curricula to their classrooms. Teaching staff are tasked with ensuring that the "right standards" are considered, but administrators recognized that, "of course, there is no perfect program. Every teacher is going to have to go in and make adjustments." Administrators also explained that the curricula are reviewed through an "equity lens" to have a "variety of stories" represented in the curriculum. The details of that equity lens were not clear from the interview data, but the district has developed a document entitled *Evaluating Instructional Materials for Cultural Responsiveness*, which provides a structure and guidelines for addressing this topic. As a final part of the selection process, administrators have teachers pilot curriculum programs and then fill out surveys to provide feedback and make recommendations. Teacher focus groups corroborated parts of this process, including the pilot and survey they were provided for reviewing new curricula. When prompted, most teachers agreed that their feedback was considered in the final decision. Teachers described the piloting processes as largely collaborative, especially at the elementary level. Most teachers interviewed expressed the collaboration itself and the resultant curricula as strong points. Also, teachers in every focus group stated that the program or texts selected were the top choice of most teachers. Despite this general reporting of teacher involvement in the process, several teachers questioned the importance of teacher input. One shared that they were unaware of the "criteria" used to select new curricula, and another claimed that "those [big money] decisions are made outside of here." Another claimed that "ultimately the district decided it wasn't up to the teachers." Still, most teachers expressed

satisfaction with the decision-making process and further agreed that teacher input seemed to be weighted in the final decisions.

Although the district relies in part on CURATE and EdReports to select curricula, documentation of the curriculum selection process was described in interviews as ongoing. Administrators and school committee members explained that the reason Oxford lacks documented systems for curriculum review came down to staffing. As one committee member stated, "[W]e've had a significant amount of turnover with administration and leadership from superintendents to curriculum coordinators. We didn't have a curriculum coordinator for an extensive period of time." Five of eight district administrators, including the superintendent, had been hired within one year of this review, and committee members further explained that one of the new hires, the curriculum director, was brought on to create curriculum review criteria and selection systems, including documentation processes. Documenting the curriculum selection and review process is an area for improvement that the district is aware of and explicitly planning to address.

Regarding the taught curriculum, district leaders confirmed that teachers are expected to teach the selected framework-based curricula. Middle and high school teachers explained that most teachers teach to the standards from the Massachusetts state frameworks, but consistency does not always exist between teachers. Some teachers worked together more often; others developed their own lessons and assessments. The district attempts to guide the taught curriculum by focusing on supporting strategies related to social-emotional learning, UDL, and the workshop model. Many teachers on all levels concurred that district administrators were invested in these initiatives; however, middle school teachers had less familiarity with some of the district efforts. For example, a teacher in the middle school focus group first expressed a lack of familiarity with UDL, but another explained that: "No, I don't think that they [administrators] are really focused on getting better at it [UDL] because they feel like it's what we're doing." This respondent stated that the while the district had once provided professional development for UDL, this approach was not a current focus within the middle school. This person did not elaborate on why school administrators felt that teachers were already using UDL. While there were some inconsistencies within this focus group about whether UDL was part of the taught curriculum, there was agreement that school and district leaders had not emphasized UDL since the start of the 2022-23 school year. The findings are generally consistent with what district and school leaders reported. Based on interviews of teachers and administrators, UDL implementation is under way, but the process appears further along in some schools than in others. More consistency in the taught curriculum and supporting strategies at the middle and high school levels is an area for improvement.

Classroom Instruction

Two observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited Oxford during the week of November 14, 2022. The observers conducted 60 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics. The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the district. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

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

include 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support, in addition to Student Engagement. The three domains observed at all levels broadly are defined as follows:

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

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

In Oxford, 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 Oxford is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in the same appendix.

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

- **Emotional Support.** Ratings were in the high middle range for the K-5 grade band (5.1) and the middle range for the 6-8 and 9-12 grade bands (4.1 and 4.5, respectively).
- **Classroom Organization.** Ratings were in the high range for all grade bands (6.1 for K-5, 6.6 for 6-8, and 6.9 for 9-12).
- **Instructional Support.** Ratings were in the low middle range for all grade bands (3.1 for K-5, 3.4 for 6-8, and 3.3 for 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 grade bands (4.3 for 4-5, 4.5 for 6-8, and 4.8 for 9-12).

Overall, instructional observations suggest strong classroom organization; moderate to moderately high emotional support and student engagement; and mixed evidence of consistent, rigorous instructional support. Each domain was generally consistent in terms of ratings, with the only exception being the high middle rating for emotional support in Grades K-5 versus ratings in the middle range for the Grades 6-12.

These ratings are generally supported by interview and document collection data. District and school leaders affirmed that social-emotional learning and emotional support in general have been priority areas for the district in recent years, particularly ongoing issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Discipline and behavioral issues, as well as student mental health, have become areas of concern

across the district. Some students and parents reported concerns that incidents of bullying were not always addressed properly. This report revisits bullying in greater detail in the Student Support section. In interviews, students reported feeling supported, with some very important exceptions related to bullying, which were corroborated by the parent and administrator focus groups. School staff described specific related efforts such as questionnaires, mindfulness exercises, professional development offerings, and social-emotional learning teams. Social-emotional learning is an area in which Oxford leadership is providing support for schools, and this process is at least partly aimed at improving behavior and discipline issues that district administrators and principles recognized as ongoing. These efforts are apparent across the district, as reported by teachers, support staff, and students.

In addition to emphasizing social-emotional learning, the district has embarked on multiple initiatives related to instruction, including UDL, student-centered instruction methods such as the workshop model, and culturally responsive teaching. District leaders, school leaders, support staff, and teachers generally agreed that these initiatives have become more prominent and are filtering down to the classroom level. Multiple stakeholders described various aspects of these initiatives, which indicates consistency in district-level messaging and implementation within schools, with some discrepancies regarding UDL.

According to the focus group participants, elementary and high school teachers were more consistent in their use of UDL compared with middle school teachers. A high school teacher explained using UDL in their grade band teams (Grades 9-10 and Grades 11-12) and, this year, teachers are incorporating vertical alignment across the teams. Some elementary teachers expressed similar use of the UDL model, whereas others explained that efforts to incorporate UDL were present but still nascent. School leaders acknowledged that the district has room to grow with UDL. Principals explained that implementation of UDL is an ongoing process. One suggested that UDL in each classroom is a long-term goal that is not happening yet. Another expressed some challenges along the way, stating, "I wish my teachers were a little bit more excited about UDL. I think that's something that they're going to enjoy once we get there, but we're in the first phases of it and I think there's a fear." This principal explained that a previous UDL initiative was not well implemented, so current efforts to improve implementation include walkthroughs, professional development, and support for teachers to improve consistency with implementation.

Regarding student-centered instructional methods, principals at multiple schools and several high school teachers described the workshop model. One defined it as follows:

> The workshop model idea is providing students with the independent learning as quickly as possible, from the lesson to learning and being able to flow amongst it. It has a lesson opener, it has a learning part of it, and then it includes independent practice. And then we can look at the exit slips for each individual period.

Elementary teachers did not explicitly mention workshop models but described an emphasis on other student-centered, gradual-release instruction methods, including some work with project-based learning. Middle school teachers did not explicitly describe most of their instructional practices but did discuss related efforts such as interdisciplinary instruction and collaboration on instruction, indicating that there was support from the district for that work.

Lastly, the district has started to introduce culturally responsive teaching methods. The district developed a document to formally review instructional materials for cultural responsiveness, and some elementary and high school teachers were familiar with this document and reported using it. Part of the professional development related to culturally responsive teaching was through the book *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* by Zaretta Hammond. This included distribution of the book, a voluntary book club for interested staff, and professional development for all levels of staff to learn how to incorporate these principles into their teaching, all of which began at the start of the 2022-2023 school year. Teachers from several focus groups described experiences with district-initiated culturally responsive teaching supports, such as professional development and the book club. The district provided documentation related to culturally responsive teaching, including the instructional materials review document and school improvement plans. However, there was limited documentation related to classroom implementation, and specifics from interviews and focus groups about how teachers integrated culturally responsive teaching into classroom instruction were minimal.

Student Access to Coursework

Student access to coursework was generally an area of strength for the district. Oxford ensures that students across multiple demographic groups have access to a range of rigorous coursework and a variety of content areas. The district also examines disaggregated student data about access to inform decisions about how to improve inclusion and address inequities. District administrators indicated that across most demographic groups—including race and gender—students generally had equitable access to a variety of coursework. One administrator explained: "When we looked into our numbers . . . [students from all groups] are well represented in those AP classes and are reflective of our total school enrollment." The data indicated that the main group underrepresented in advanced courses is students receiving special education services. For that reason, improving special education outcomes has become a point of emphasis for the district. Despite some promising data, the same administrator also acknowledged areas for improvement, specifically with regards to enrollment in advanced courses for students with disabilities. The district has an ongoing effort to make course enrollment more equitable, and Oxford has partnered with Mass Insight to improve equity and access to all courses for all students. Specifically, Mass Insight provides professional development for teachers to help all students succeed in advanced courses and also helps district leaders use data to develop strategies for improving student access and performance. According to students, enrollment in advanced courses was relatively straightforward. Concurring with the messaging from administrators, students stated that the main step for joining an AP class was to fill out a form online. One student claimed, to the general agreement of others, "It's easier to get into an AP [course] than it is to drop it."

Teachers, students, and families agreed that Oxford provides students with access to a variety of courses, including AP and honors level, arts, and other enrichment courses such as art, world languages, ecology, and environmental science. An administrator explained that at the middle school, these enrichment classes are automatically assigned for all students, but students can test into accelerated mathematics at this level. Schools also use What I Need blocks to provide enrichment and accelerated learning. Starting at the high school level, students have access to electives of their choosing. Administrators and school staff agreed that students can sign up for any elective, but enrollment in those courses depends on the students' schedules and completion of core courses. Noncore courses also continue to be added, most recently related to career readiness.

A high school staff member explained, "We've added three additional courses this year too, which are more career focused: the nursing program, the firefighter fire science, and the childcare [courses]." Students and families agreed that multiple electives and advanced courses are offered, and described the availability of extracurricular activities as well, such as band, chorus, student government, and clubs.

DESE Recommendations

- *The district should formalize its curriculum review and selection process and document its already-existing phases.*

- *In future curriculum decisions, the district should explicitly link final decisions to pre-established criteria and feedback from teachers – and then disseminate that rationale.*

- *The district should further its expansion of UDL across the district, with a particular eye towards improving implementation at the middle school level.*

- *The district should continue its expansion of supports for culturally responsive teaching with a direct connection to implementation and instruction in the classroom.*

- *The district should continue its efforts to expand students with disabilities' participation in AP classes. This process may include an investigation at lower grades to identify any barriers students may experience.*

Assessment

Oxford use a variety of data systems to monitor students' progress and provide data reports. These systems incorporate data from Istation, MCAS, and DIBELS, in addition to a district social-emotional survey and locally created classroom assessments. At the individual level, there are additional structures for identifying students who are struggling and examining data to provide targeted support, often through SSTs. However, several stakeholders expressed concern at the lack of a consistent diagnostic tool, indicating a desire to collect more standardized data.

After identifying data use as a priority for the 2022-2023 school year, Oxford has carried out several related initiatives, primarily targeting early elementary (K-4) teachers and high school mathematics teachers. These include monthly data meetings facilitated by the district's curriculum director, professional development offered to all teachers, and hiring a consultant for higher level mathematics. Both parents and students reported variability in how data was shared, which primarily depended on the teacher and their level of comfort with technology.

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 is improving consistency with the use of Istation data to monitor progress and determine next steps in instruction.	▪ Using diverse district data sources to ensure a more comprehensive picture of student, school, and district performance
Data use	▪ District leaders support the regular use of a variety of data, especially in Grades K-4 and high school mathematics.	▪ Comfort of all teachers and leaders with using data to drive decision-making
Sharing results	▪ Systems exist for sharing data with district and school leaders.	▪ Sharing data and assessment results with students and families consistently and effectively

Data and Assessment Systems

Oxford uses assessments and related data to ensure that all teachers provide effective instruction that challenges and supports all students. In addition to formative and summative assessments integrated in locally-created curricula, teachers administer Istation and DIBELS to monitor students' progress and determine support needs. To gain a districtwide vision of student progress, district leaders review student data across the district, including MCAS and beginning-, middle-, and end-of-year Istation data, along with attendance, pass/fail rates for 9th grade students, and graduation rates for high school students. The district also administers a wellness and social-emotional survey three times per year to measure students' mental health, according to a district administrator.

According to a district administrator, Oxford noted a need for a common, regularly administered assessment for Grades K-8 and selected Istation, which was implemented beginning in the 2021-22

school year. Teachers confirmed that this year they administer Istation assessments at least three times per year. The district uses the assessment as a diagnostic tool to help determine both whether students need interventions and the specific interventions that students receive.

Although Istation is in the process of implementation and is currently used by some teachers along with MCAS for diagnostics, district leaders reported limitations with diagnostic tools for examining student data, some noting that the development of such systems was in an early phase. For example, some teachers use common assessments between classes or grade levels. One district leader described feeling "stuck" on whether the MCAS was an appropriate diagnostic tool, even as staff reported using it as a diagnostic. Principals also said they felt limited by the selection of data sources available to them, with one individual describing their mathematics testing as "lacking." District leaders suggested that data use is an increasingly important area of focus for the district, but the use of data to inform decision-making is a relatively recent phenomenon, coinciding with major changes in district leadership after 2021. For these reasons, an area of growth for the district is clearer expectations and stronger systems for not only developing data sources but also using them to inform instruction.

At the high school level, teachers reported using common assessments as part of their classroom instruction. For example, one teacher reported using pre- and posttests for each unit to measure growth. Mathematics teachers at the high school also use daily exit tickets to measure mastery of content. These common assessments were part of a general trend toward more data use at the school level that district leaders have been encouraging in recent years.

Data Use

Oxford leaders support the regular use of data to inform decision-making at the classroom level and are actively providing professional development designed to improve the use of data and assessments to inform the practice of all educators. Various stakeholders reported that regular data use has been one of the district's major priorities for this year, which has led to several new initiatives. For example, a district administrator created monthly data meetings for K-4 teachers to review data during common planning time (CPT). They do so in a team consisting of school leaders, grade-level teachers, a special education teacher, and a district administrator. The purpose of these meetings is to teach educators how to use Istation data to identify and close student learning gaps. One principal explained that it has been a "bit of a learning curve," with some teachers grasping the concepts easier than others. Kindergarten teachers also explained that all kindergarten classes meet monthly to assign Title I interventions using Heggerty screener data, with one describing an additional "equity screener" she uses to determine how to assign groups fairly.

The district recently purchased PowerSchool Unified Insights, a software extension that enables the district to compile all student data into one reporting dashboard. This dashboard can share individual student data with parents and teachers. The district's curriculum director manages the district's data analysis and meets quarterly with a subcommittee on data accountability to present and discuss findings. These presentations include PowerPoint slides showing data from district assessment systems, including (1) annual MCAS results showing the percentage of students in the district who scored at each achievement level for each test, and (2) quarterly Istation reading and mathematics results showing the number of students at each grade level who are meeting

expectations by content area. The curriculum director also works with school staff to make sure they are aware of the latest data and are using it to guide instruction, primarily by reviewing Istation data with K-4 teachers and school leaders during monthly meetings.

The district has created structures for data use at the high school and the middle school; a mathematics coach facilitates weekly data conversations with faculty. This coach shares and discusses "a spreadsheet that shows us the strengths and weaknesses of the students and how they're learning and whether or not they're mastering." The district also encourages teachers at all grades to regularly review data during CPT and provides professional development opportunities for teachers to learn how to analyze data individually. The regular review of a variety of data and the active analysis of data for K-4 and high school mathematics teachers is a strength of the district.

When asked about data use and disparities, district leaders explained that data on course enrollment and student representation had few disparities by demographic, with one important exception: students with disabilities are underrepresented in advanced courses. MCAS data further indicated ongoing disparities between several groups, including racial groups as well as between students with disabilities and those without. Students with high needs generally had disparate outcomes compared to those without high needs. The disparities exhibited in Oxford were similar to those seen between these groups at the state level. A greater emphasis on these achievement disparities in addition to the current examination of differences in access and enrollment may prove helpful as the district continues to work on improvement strategies.

For the middle and high schools, the district hired a part-time mathematics coach to monitor data, meet regularly with mathematics teachers, and create common formative assessments. Several stakeholders, including a district leader, a principal, and a teacher described this initiative favorably. One teacher explained that the weekly meetings that the coach initiated with the mathematics teachers were beneficial, saying,

> It helps us to see where we're missing gaps and where we're well and where we might need to dig in a little bit more. She is a former math teacher from this building so that helps because she has an understanding of how we teach what we do.

Further, the district encourages teachers at all grade levels to use their CPT to review student data. However, effective use of CPT for reviewing data differs from school to school, with middle school teachers reporting that data collaboration has been "difficult" because teachers often are pulled from their CPT to substitute for absent teachers. Although the district offers additional professional development for teachers on how to use Istation data to inform instruction, several stakeholders indicated that this remains an area for growth because teachers may still be struggling to use data effectively. Several principals indicated that their teachers could use more training, with one explaining, "I think they use their data. I just think they could be using it more efficiently." These principals explained that more training could help improve data use.

Sharing Results

School and district staff share data in multiple formats, although the extent of data sharing varies by grade level. Aligned with the district's other data initiatives, a member of the school committee shared that a priority for this year is "trying to make sure that data gets in the hands" of all families

and educators. Likewise, the school improvement plans for the elementary and middle schools include a specific goal on working with families to increase their "understanding and access to important data that impacts student learning."

Part of the middle and high school mathematics coach's role is sharing data with teachers, in addition to coaching them on how to use the data. Despite not working with the mathematics coach, K-4 teachers also reported receiving sufficient data on their students. Although not all teachers reported the same access to student data, most did not claim a need for more data. Further, many reported satisfaction with data-sharing and with the supports to use the data effectively. In addition, the district uses the PowerSchool platform, described in the Data Use section, to share information, including report cards, with families. A district administrator explained that an additional goal for this platform is that both teachers and families will be able to "click on a child and get all of their data for the last five years."

A majority of teachers use Google Classroom to post work for students. However, the utility and availability of these systems vary based on how often and how fully individual teachers update the platform, as well as, to a lesser extent, how comfortable families are with the technology. For example, a member of the school committee mentioned that families have different experiences with communication depending on the extent to which their children's teachers know how to use the platforms, such as Google Classroom. Parents in the focus groups also expressed frustration with communication, with one sharing that she did not learn that her son was failing his classes until the quarter was about to end: "Well, if they've been failing this whole time, then why are we not doing something to fix this? Why are we waiting for the last minute?" A need for more consistent and effective communication from schools about students' progress—and any need for improvement—is an area for growth in the district.

The extent to which teachers regularly share data with both families and students also varies by grade level, with elementary school teachers reporting that they regularly share "all the benchmarks" with their students and families, including DIBELS and Istation, and the district shares MCAS results when they become available. Elementary school families also receive data during their annual parent-teacher conferences, including report cards and anecdotes about student conduct. On sharing with students, one kindergarten teacher described sharing Istation data with her students monthly, using it as an opportunity to both celebrate progress and foster a growth mindset: "And even the color change [representing a change in percentile], as simple as that for them, oh, you were in red, but now you get to try to get to yellow and green . . . so we celebrate growth."

However, teachers and school leaders at the middle and high schools indicated that direct data sharing occurred less frequently. In multiple instances, Oxford students and families had access to data, but it was not actively shared with them. For example, even though families have direct access to Istation data through the platform, one staff member stated that sharing Istation data with families would be "a daunting task." In a separate instance, students indicated that although they have access to their grades, the extent to which they were actively aware of their overall academic performance varied on a "teacher-by-teacher basis." Students also receive teacher feedback via notes on their assignments, which also varies by teacher.

Both students and high school support specialists reported that attendance and course completion data could be, at times, "unreliable," with both groups sometimes unsure whether a specific student had enough credits to pass their classes. Several students in a focus group referenced experiencing or hearing about students learning that they were missing credits very late into the year, causing said students to be unsure of whether "they were going to be able to pass" their classes. The support specialists also recognized this as an opportunity for growth and reported that they are "trying to improve" by sending letters home to students.

DESE Recommendations

- *The district should review, refine, and disseminate the list of assessments and other data sources that staff are expected to use to assess student progress.*

- *The district should provide all staff with ongoing opportunities to familiarize themselves with these tools and use them to meaningfully inform instruction.*

- *Where possible, the district should seek creative solutions to address staff absences, to ultimately protect staff Common Planning Time and improve data practices.*

- *The district should shift to a more proactive approach to sharing data with students and families, including establishing school-wide structures, staff expectations, and timelines for communicating student performance data, including attendance and credit-earning information.*

Student Support

As reflected in the *3-Year District Improvement Plan,* Oxford has several initiatives related to addressing students' social-emotional learning and health needs, providing MTSS, and partnering with families and community members for student success. The district supports these initiatives through professional development and frequent engagement with staff, students, and families. However, both families and students reported concerns about whether the schools maintained safe and supportive environments.

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	■ The district has implemented restorative practices, mindfulness, and other positive behavioral approaches.	■ Providing clear guidance and procedures on how to address bullying and ensuring that these procedures are implemented with fidelity ■ A consistent and vertically aligned social-emotional learning program districtwide
Tiered systems of support	■ District staff use data to identify student need for supports, particularly at the classroom level. ■ Professional development is aligned with district initiatives such as UDL and social-emotional learning.	■ Creating Tier 2 supports ■ Providing sufficient Tier 2 and Tier 3 supplemental supports, including the need for additional staff to carry out supports
Family, student, and community engagement and partnerships	■ The district has created specific initiatives to engage families and parents of students with special needs and ELs.	■ Meaningful opportunities for families and students to contribute to planning and decision making

Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

Although district leaders demonstrate a commitment to fostering a safe and supportive environment for all students, some stakeholders expressed mixed opinions on whether this commitment has yielded consistent results. The district improvement plan, which was put in place in 2019 prior to major changes in district leadership starting in 2021, reflects a commitment to addressing "social, emotional, and health needs" and to fostering a culturally responsive environment. Likewise, district and school staff reported progress toward creating a safe, positive, and welcoming learning environment for all students through a greater focus on positive behavioral approaches. However, teachers, students, and parents indicated that bullying and offensive language remain issues at the middle and high schools.

The *3-Year District Improvement Plan* includes an initiative focused on "social, emotional, and health well-being for students and staff." This district initiative is written into school improvement plans and was identified in interviews as a major priority for the district, although interview data indicated some issues persist with consistency in programming and with school climate, particularly related to bullying. Examples of actions that the district is taking to address these topics include (1) a districtwide social-emotional learning and mindfulness initiative; (2) professional learning about culturally responsive and antibias teaching; and (3) discussions of social-emotional learning and issues related to bullying in weekly advisory groups at the high school. These initiatives reflect the district's overall plan for ensuring that classroom environments are positive, healthy, and inclusive for all students.

All schools in the district have received training on and are currently implementing the "Breath for Change" initiative, which involves yoga, social-emotional learning, and mindfulness for educators, students, and families. Likewise, one district administrator described a "big push" in the district on antibias instruction, culminating in a mandated training and a "ten-step check system" to ensure that all curricula are culturally inclusive and not perpetuating harmful stereotypes. Multiple staff, including district leaders and teachers, also referenced professional learning related to the book *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* by Zaretta Hammond, which for some self-selected teachers included a voluntary book club. Teachers also explained that they were provided additional professional development on subjects such as race and gender identity.

However, district and school leaders mentioned that the district lacks a comprehensive social-emotional program that is implemented vertically across schools and grades. Both support specialists and principals described the district's current approach to social-emotional learning as "pockets of information and procedure" that have not yet been vertically integrated, such as the "Breathe for Change" initiative described previously. The superintendent acknowledged that the social-emotional learning program can be further integrated and implemented consistently districtwide, stating that his vision is for a comprehensive and vertically aligned social-emotional learning program, along with "a common language around PBIS [positive behavioral interventions and supports] for our kids." Hence, work in this area is an area of growth and one the district has named a priority as it creates a new strategic improvement plan starting in 2023.

Regarding approaches to discipline, district and school leaders described the need for a "cultural shift" away from suspension and toward more positive behavioral approaches. These leaders described the shift as in progress at the time of data collection. For example, the *Middle School School Improvement Plan* includes a goal centered on use of "restorative practices." Similarly, a district administrator reported that district leaders actively review referral data and suspension rates to determine whether discipline practices are enacted consistently, including which populations might be disproportionately affected by current policies. The district also has provided professional development to teachers to help identify underlying issues related to challenging behaviors, such as whether a student has a disability or experienced trauma. CLASS data included high marks for Behavior Management, with averages in the 6.5 to 6.9 range across all grade levels, but ratings of Positive Climate were middling, with averages ranging from 4.4 to 4.9 across grade levels. Supporting the district's assertion, middle and high school students reported that their teachers are

generally consistent in their behavioral expectations and apply consequences for misbehavior, with some key exceptions.

Although many behavior incidents are well handled within the schools, parents, students, and administrators reported bullying incidents at the high school that negatively affect school climate and culture. For example, one parent shared that her child experienced both bullying and homophobic slurs, and this parent felt that neither teachers nor school administrators adequately addressed the issues. This parent further expressed feeling that the school is "not a safe environment for these children." Similarly, one student reported being the target of racial slurs, and multiple students in the focus group agreed that they had witnessed similar behavior, adding that, "there [weren't] enough consequences" to the students who used these slurs. School staff similarly expressed concerns that school staff may not be adhering to behavioral procedures consistently, or that said procedures may remain undeveloped. One support specialist reported that, regarding "safety issues" related to behavior and discipline, some teachers are "feeling like they are the sole holder of that process versus it coming from an administrative guidance perspective." The specialist reported confusion about policies for reintegrating students after a bullying incident occurred: "If a child is truly just being unsafe in the district, who's doing those reintegration plans? If a kid's been sent home or something's happened, how do we reintegrate?" Other support specialists agreed with that statement, citing concerns that a lack of a safety plan may be making all students feel unsafe. This lack of administrative guidance on school safety is an area of growth for the district.

Similar to these reports of mixed responses to discipline issues, along with reported incidents of bullying from several stakeholders, results from the Views of Climate and Learning student survey indicate mixed perceptions of school climate. The overall score across all students surveyed in the district is a 45, which falls in the "Somewhat Favorable" range. These scores support the interview data suggesting that although the district has developed initiatives focused on social-emotional learning and positive behavioral approaches, students' experiences with discipline and climate across the district are inconsistent. Given reports about bullying incidents using racial slurs, the establishment of clearer antibullying procedures is an area of growth for the district.

Tiered Systems of Support

Oxford's MTSS has three tiers structured to meet the needs of all students. District staff described the MTSS use as data driven, with interviews and documents highlighting the importance of using "student data" to inform MTSS decision making. The only specific student data mentioned in interviews or documents was from Istation. Interview data and documents—including the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan, the 2022 *Tiered Focus Monitoring Report*, and interviews—confirm that the district has established a tiered system of both academic and social-emotional supports. Each school also has or is forming an MTSS social-emotional/behavior team and additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral supports, which include social-emotional learning components. Interviews did not mention such teams by name but did describe SSTs. In interviews, district and school leaders expressed the need for more such supports, particularly at the high school.

Teacher interviews and district documents indicate that Oxford uses a combination of assessment tools and screeners to assess student learning and behavioral needs. Teachers of kindergarten and first-grade students administer the BRIGANCE Early Childhood screening to identify developmental

and academic challenges. However, a district administrator with knowledge of this tool explained that BRIGANCE is less appropriate for identifying behavioral or social-emotional issues, and screening tools for such issues in young students (K-2) were not currently used in the district. Elementary and middle school teachers use a combination of DIBELS, Istation, and, starting in third grade, MCAS data to screen all students and identify those who need additional academic supports. At the high school, students are more often referred by teachers for additional supports based on their classroom performance.

Across all schools, the process for assigning students to interventions typically includes a teacher referral to an SST. Elementary school teachers stated that these teams typically include a guidance counselor and teachers who meet regularly to review student data and determine whether supports are working as intended. High school staff described the SSTs as consisting of support staff who communicate regularly with teachers after a student is referred for extra supports. The specific supports and interventions provided also vary by each school. Examples of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports include the Bridge for Resilient Youth in Transition program at the high school and "transition" classrooms at the middle school for students with behavioral and medical conditions. Both support programs are spaces for students who have been out of school to transition back into classroom life.

Retaining sufficient staff to provide supports has been a challenge; administrators and teachers across schools called for the hiring of additional staff to deliver social-emotional and behavioral supports. Principals also reported struggling to find staff to teach special education classes. Regarding the provision of Tier 2 supports, a district administrator identified this as an area of growth, particularly for the high school: "we really don't have any Tier 2 supports at all." This administrator further elaborated that the district has "great Tier 1 [supports]" and that "we kind of have everybody else at Tier 3 . . . but we don't really have that in-between space." Currently, Tier 2 supports do not exist. In addition, school staff reported a need for more staff to provide supports to students, but the district also recognized the need to create additional supports that staff can then provide.

Multiple stakeholders also reported the need to provide more supports, such as trained staff, for Oxford's ELs, a population that has grown quickly in recent years, according to several stakeholders. One support specialist claimed that "there's progress being made, but . . . not fast enough."

Finally, district- and school-sponsored professional development opportunities and trainings reflect a commitment to addressing a variety of student needs. Examples include a districtwide initiative on implementing UDL, optional professional development on a series of social-emotional topics, behavioral consultants in the elementary schools who observe classrooms and provide staff with strategies on how to implement trauma-informed behavioral supports, and an audit of the district's special education department that resulted in trainings on how to assess interventions.

Family, Student, and Community Engagement and Partnerships

Although Oxford provides some opportunities for family engagement and two-way communication, it is more limited in providing opportunities for student and family leadership. The district's *3-Year District Improvement Plan* includes a strategic objective specifically centered on parent and community engagement, which is reflected in documents, such as school improvement plans, and

interviews. For example, various stakeholders reported an "uptick" in the district actively requesting family input either through surveys, informal "coffee chats," or invitations for parents to attend general school committee meetings and serve on school committee subgroups. Families also can participate in decision making via their parent-teacher organizations and school councils.

However, parents indicated feeling more limited in their opportunities to meaningfully contribute to these decision-making bodies. Parents and other stakeholders agreed that there is "not a lot of visibility" about how to get involved in the parent-teacher organization or school council. Similarly, Oxford's school councils have historically not played a significant role in decision making, although schools are encouraged to use these councils for writing their school improvement plans. Ensuring that parents are aware of these opportunities and feel empowered to actively contribute to their school's decision making is an area of growth for the district.

Regarding day-to-day communication, interviewees across multiple stakeholder groups generally agreed that schools do a "good job" of keeping families informed of current events within the district. For example, principals at all schools send weekly messages to parents, and, according to the *Elementary School Improvement Plan*, teachers at the elementary schools are encouraged to engage with parents regularly and positively through "postcards, emails, and 'Good News Calls.'" Principals noted that connecting with "hard-to-reach families," including those speaking languages other than English at home, is difficult, but the district is currently trying to remedy this by translating all materials. In addition, the district is developing workshops on topics requested by parents, such as bullying, mental health, and technology. Finally, the district recently created a Special Education Parent Advisory Council for parents of children with disabilities. The purpose of the council is to create a network for these families and provide a forum to share information and discuss matters of concern. These initiatives to engage traditionally hard-to-reach families is a strength for the district.

Students can participate in leadership by serving on their school councils or as representatives on the school committee. School committee members also shared that students are invited to school committee meetings to provide school updates and "highlight something great they've done, or some things that they want to talk about." The district has previously surveyed students, although a school committee member reported that these surveys are not frequently administered and could be done more often. However, students in one focus group reported that very few students actually completed this survey when it was administered. Regarding student contributions to decision-making, one student shared that although they "don't really personally like talking about issues in the school," they felt that the school committee would be willing to listen. The district has attempted to include students, but opportunities for student leadership or voice in district decision making is an area in which the district can improve.

District and school leaders reported that prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Oxford had various partnerships with community counseling agencies and youth programs that have since discontinued. One support specialist explained that these partnerships disappeared because the organizations have either gone entirely virtual or "dissolved completely" because of funding issues and staff turnover. However, several programs remain. Currently, the district engages primarily with You Inc, a behavioral health organization that provides counseling to schools. District leaders also described partnerships with Massachusetts's Department of Children and Families, Youth Villages (an in-home

counseling service), local hospitals, and early childcare providers. Finally, the district hopes to connect with additional providers and community-based organizations as they continue to recover from the pandemic.

DESE Recommendations

- *The district should prioritize student safety and address bullying and offensive language issues at the secondary level, through strengthened administrative guidance, the implementation of a safety plan, and thoughtful planning around school reintegration after an incident.*
- *The district should vertically align its social-emotional learning program to create a consistent K-12 vocabulary and experience for its students and educators.*
- *The district should strengthen its model for supporting students identified as needing Tier 2 supports, with foci on supporting high school students and students who are English learners.*
- *The district should empower students and families to have greater influence on school and district decision-making, and identify creative ways to further engage them through already existing structures such as parent-teacher organizations or school councils.*

Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following activities as part of the district review activities in Oxford. The team conducted 60 classroom observations during the week of November 14, 2022, and held interviews and focus groups between November 14 and November 18, 2022. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

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

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
- Published educational reports on the district by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district's end-of-year financial reports
- All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations

Appendix B. Districtwide Instructional Observation Report

Oxford Public Schools

Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

November 2022

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.

Two observers visited Oxford Public Schools during the week of November 14, 2022. Observers conducted 60 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*: 4.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	60	4.7
Grades K-5	0	0	4	11	3	3	4	25	4.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	6	2	4	1	2	15	4.4
Grades 9-12	0	1	4	3	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 1] + [3 x 14] + [4 x 16] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 9]) ÷ 60 observations = 4.7

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

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K–12

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

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

Teacher Sensitivity District Average*: 5.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	60	5.1
Grades K-5	0	2	1	5	9	2	6	25	5.0
Grades 6-8	0	0	5	2	1	1	6	15	5.1
Grades 9-12	0	0	5	3	3	1	8	20	5.2

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 11] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 20]) ÷ 60 observations = 5.1

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*: 3.4

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	60	3.4
Grades K-5	1	7	4	5	6	1	1	25	3.6
Grades 6-8	3	4	4	2	0	2	0	15	2.9
Grades 9-12	4	4	1	4	5	1	1	20	3.5

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 8] + [2 x 15] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 11] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 60 observations = 3.4

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*: 7.0

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	60	7.0
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	25	6.9
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15	6.9
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	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 57]) ÷ 60 observations = 7.0

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*: 6.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**60**	**6.7**
Grades K-5	0	0	1	0	1	4	19	25	6.6
Grades 6-8	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	15	6.5
Grades 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	20	6.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 2] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 48]) ÷ 60 observations = 6.7

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*: 6.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**60**	**6.6**
Grades K-5	0	0	0	1	0	5	19	25	6.7
Grades 6-8	0	0	0	2	1	2	10	15	6.3
Grades 9-12	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	20	6.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 9] + [7 x 46]) ÷ 60 observations = 6.6

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*: 4.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	60	4.8
Grades K-5	0	0	3	5	8	5	4	25	5.1
Grades 6-8	0	0	3	3	4	5	0	15	4.7
Grades 9-12	0	1	6	3	7	1	2	20	4.4

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 12] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 19] + [6 x 11] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 60 observations = 4.8

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, whereas other students are not engaged. 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	5	6	2	1	1	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 5] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 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*: 3.8

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	45	3.8
Grades 4-5**	1	3	2	3	1	0	0	10	3.0
Grades 6-8	0	2	3	2	4	4	0	15	4.3
Grades 9-12	4	1	2	5	4	4	0	20	3.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 5] + [2 x 6] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 10] + [5 x 9] + [6 x 8]) ÷ 45 observations = 3.8

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

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

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Analysis and Inquiry District Average*: 2.7

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**45**	**2.7**
Grades 4-5**	4	3	1	0	2	0	0	10	2.3
Grades 6-8	2	7	1	3	2	0	0	15	2.7
Grades 9-12	5	6	2	2	3	2	0	20	2.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 11] + [2 x 16] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 45 observations = 2.7

**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*: 3.1

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	60	3.1
Grades K-5	1	5	9	4	4	2	0	25	3.4
Grades 6-8	1	7	4	1	2	0	0	15	2.7
Grades 9-12	7	2	6	1	2	0	2	20	2.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 9] + [2 x 14] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 60 observations = 3.1

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

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

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

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K – 3

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

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

Language Modeling District Average*: 3.9

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	15	3.9
Grades K-3**	0	3	4	2	4	2	0	15	3.9

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 3] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 15 observations = 3.9

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

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

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

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

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 – 12

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

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

Instructional Dialogue District Average*: 2.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**45**	**2.6**
Grades 4-5**	3	3	2	2	0	0	0	10	2.3
Grades 6-8	4	6	2	0	1	2	0	15	2.6
Grades 9-12	9	2	3	3	0	1	2	20	2.7

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as: ([1 x 16] + [2 x 11] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 45 observations = 2.6

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4−12

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

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

Student Engagement District Average*: 4.6

Grade Band	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	45	4.6
Grades 4-5**	0	0	3	3	2	2	0	10	4.3
Grades 6-8	0	0	6	2	1	5	1	15	4.5
Grades 9-12	0	1	5	3	5	1	5	20	4.8

*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 14] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 45 observations = 4.6

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

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

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

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**		
Emotional Support Domain	**1**	**9**	**9**	**21**	**18**	**8**	**34**	**100**	**5.1**
Positive Climate	0	0	4	11	3	3	4	25	4.7
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	25	6.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	2	1	5	9	2	6	25	5.0
Regard for Student Perspectives	1	7	4	5	6	1	1	25	3.6
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**4**	**6**	**9**	**14**	**42**	**75**	**6.1**
Behavior Management	0	0	1	0	1	4	19	25	6.6
Productivity	0	0	0	1	0	5	19	25	6.7
Instructional Learning Formats***	0	0	3	5	8	5	4	25	5.1
Instructional Support Domain	**9**	**22**	**24**	**13**	**12**	**5**	**0**	**85**	**3.1**
Concept Development (K-3 only)	0	5	6	2	1	1	0	15	3.1
Content Understanding (UE only)	1	3	2	3	1	0	0	10	3.0
Analysis and Inquiry (UE only)	4	3	1	0	2	0	0	10	2.3
Quality of Feedback	1	5	9	4	4	2	0	25	3.4
Language Modeling (K-3 only)	0	3	4	2	4	2	0	15	3.9
Instructional Dialogue (UE only)	3	3	2	2	0	0	0	10	2.3
Student Engagement (UE only)	**0**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**10**	**4.3**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 4] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 25 observations = 4.7

**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 2] + [7 x 23]) ÷ 25 observations = 6.9. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

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

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

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

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		n	Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Emotional Support Domain	**3**	**4**	**15**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**8**	**45**	**4.1**
Positive Climate	0	0	6	2	4	1	2	15	4.4
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	5	2	1	1	6	15	5.1
Regard for Student Perspectives	3	4	4	2	0	2	0	15	2.9
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**36**	**45**	**6.6**
Behavior Management	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	15	6.5
Productivity	0	0	0	2	1	2	10	15	6.3
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15	6.9
Instructional Support Domain	**7**	**22**	**13**	**9**	**13**	**11**	**0**	**75**	**3.4**
Instructional Learning Formats	0	0	3	3	4	5	0	15	4.7
Content Understanding	0	2	3	2	4	4	0	15	4.3
Analysis and Inquiry	2	7	1	3	2	0	0	15	2.7
Quality of Feedback	1	7	4	1	2	0	0	15	2.7
Instructional Dialogue	4	6	2	0	1	2	0	15	2.6
Student Engagement	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**15**	**4.5**

*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 4] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 15 observations = 4.4

**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 14]) ÷ 15 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	**4**	**5**	**10**	**10**	**12**	**7**	**12**	**60**	**4.5**
Positive Climate	0	1	4	3	4	5	3	20	4.9
Teacher Sensitivity	0	0	5	3	3	1	8	20	5.2
Regard for Student Perspectives	4	4	1	4	5	1	1	20	3.5
Classroom Organization Domain	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**54**	**60**	**6.9**
Behavior Management	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	20	6.9
Productivity	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	20	6.7
Negative Climate**	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	7.0
Instructional Support Domain	**25**	**12**	**19**	**14**	**16**	**8**	**6**	**100**	**3.3**
Instructional Learning Formats	0	1	6	3	7	1	2	20	4.4
Content Understanding	4	1	2	5	4	4	0	20	3.8
Analysis and Inquiry	5	6	2	2	3	2	0	20	2.9
Quality of Feedback	7	2	6	1	2	0	2	20	2.9
Instructional Dialogue	9	2	3	3	0	1	2	20	2.7
Student Engagement	**0**	**1**	**5**	**3**	**5**	**1**	**5**	**20**	**4.8**

*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 3] + [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: ([7 x 20]) ÷ 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
https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/	An MTSS is a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that all students receive a high-quality educational experience.

Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

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

Group	District	Percentage of total	State	Percentage of total
All	1437	100	913,735	100
African American	41	2.9	85,662	9.4
Asian	14	1	67,010	7.3
Hispanic	225	15.7	221,044	24.2
Native American	2	0.1	2,155	.2
White	1,084	75.4	496,800	54.4
Native Hawaiian	0	0.0	787	0.1
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	71	4.9	40,277	4.4

Note. As of October 1, 2022.

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

Student groups	District			State		
	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of district	N	Percentage of high needs	Percentage of state
Students w/disabilities	306	39.1%	21.0%	179,095	35.2%	19.4%
Low income[a]	636	81.2%	44.3%	386,060	75.9%	42.3%
ELs and former ELs	34	4.3%	2.4%	110,554	21.7%	12.1%
High needs	783	100.0%	53.7%	508,820	100.0%	55.1%

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 1,437; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 913,735.

[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 D3. Oxford Public Schools: Chronic Absence[a] Rates by Student Group, 2019-2022

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,525	12.7	15.2	31.8	27.7
African American/Black	39	24.1	29.7	38.5	32.0
Asian	17	5.9	5.9	17.6	15.4
Hispanic/Latino	242	23.3	28.0	44.6	42.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	72	21.3	18.2	40.3	28.4
Native American	2	—	—	—	37.8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	—	—	—	32.1
White	1,152	10.3	12.6	28.5	22.1
High needs	865	20.0	24.6	40.0	37.1
Low income[b]	742	—	—	43.4	40.6
ELs	32	11.1	30.0	37.5	39.9
Students w/disabilities	323	22.2	21.0	38.7	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. Oxford Public Schools: Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years, 2020-2022

	2020		Fiscal Year 2021		Fiscal Year 2022	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools						
By school committee	$18,066,975	$17,985,277	$18,066,975	$18,155,706	$18,775,975	$18,468,343
By municipality	$7,962,792	$7,950,040	$7,401,338	$7,165,250	$7,409,721	$7,306,490
Total from local appropriations	$26,029,767	$25,935,317	$25,468,313	$25,320,956	$26,185,696	$25,774,833
From revolving funds and grants	--	$2,177,417	--	$2,579,888	--	$5,743,835
Total expenditures	--	$28,112,734	--	$27,900,844	--	$31,518,668
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid	--	$10,566,894	--	$10,566,894	--	$10,613,784
Required local contribution	--	$9,622,553	--	$9,891,135	--	$10,080,418
Required net school spending	--	$20,189,447	--	$20,458,029	--	$20,694,202
Actual net school spending	--	$21,790,240	--	$21,948,133	--	$22,326,389
Over/under required ($)	--	$1,600,793	--	$1,490,104	--	$1,632,187
Over/under required (%)	--	7.9%	--	7.3%	--	7.9%

Note. Data as of June 1, 2022, 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. Oxford Public Schools: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2019-2021

Expenditure category	2019	2020	2021
Administration	$545	$638	$621
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$1,055	$1,069	$1,147
Teachers	$5,267	$5,432	$5,894
Other teaching services	$1,083	$1,097	$1,125
Professional development	$84	$94	$118
Instructional materials, equipment, and technology	$378	$373	$970
Guidance, counseling, and testing services	$513	$594	$597
Pupil services	$1,505	$1,420	$1,388
Operations and maintenance	$958	$1,124	$1,356
Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs	$2,548	$2,402	$2,487
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$13,937	$14,244	$15,702

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 2021-22 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. Oxford 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	733	44	39	32	41	10	16	18	17
African American/Black	17	31	11	24	26	19	21	12	27
Asian	1	--	--	--	63	--	--	--	8
Hispanic/Latino	106	29	24	18	22	17	27	30	31
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	31	57	31	39	48	5	19	10	14
Native American	1	--	--	--	29	--	--	--	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	43	--	--	--	17
White	577	46	43	35	48	9	14	17	11
High needs	400	28	24	24	24	20	27	28	28
Low income[a]	354	--	--	25	24	--	--	27	28
ELs and former ELs	32	18	23	22	20	23	31	34	34
Students w/disabilities	143	12	8	7	11	43	46	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. Oxford 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	60	42	47	58	6	11	3	8
African American/Black	1	--	--	--	41	--	--	--	13
Asian	3	--	--	--	79	--	--	--	4
Hispanic/Latino	12	30	25	25	38	20	25	0	17
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	--	--	--	62	--	--	--	6
Native American	--	--	--	--	53	--	--	--	8
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	45	--	--	--	16
White	71	60	43	51	65	5	8	4	4
High needs	50	47	30	34	38	11	19	6	15
Low income[a]	44	--	--	39	40	--	--	2	14
ELs and former ELs	1	--	--	--	21	--	--	--	30
Students w/disabilities	14	--	20	14	20	--	53	21	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. Oxford 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	734	36	25	28	39	16	23	15	17
African American/Black	18	19	15	11	19	44	30	17	31
Asian	1	--	--	--	69	--	--	--	6
Hispanic/Latino	105	17	11	15	18	24	32	29	32
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	33	43	32	33	44	8	45	15	16
Native American	1	--	--	--	27	--	--	--	23
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	39	--	--	--	19
White	576	38	27	31	47	14	20	13	11
High needs	400	19	13	19	22	29	37	23	28
Low income[a]	354	--	--	20	20	--	--	20	29
ELs and former ELs	31	14	12	19	21	23	38	19	32
Students w/disabilities	141	7	7	9	12	54	62	47	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. Oxford 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	88	48	30	38	50	3	18	11	10
African American/Black	1	--	--	--	26	--	--	--	20
Asian	3	--	--	--	78	--	--	--	4
Hispanic/Latino	12	0	15	8	26	10	38	8	21
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	1	--	--	--	53	--	--	--	10
Native American	--	--	--	--	37	--	--	--	16
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	48	--	--	--	19
White	71	53	33	42	59	3	15	13	6
High needs	49	23	11	24	28	5	31	16	19
Low income[a]	43	--	--	28	29	--	--	12	19
ELs and former ELs	1	--	--	--	17	--	--	--	32
Students w/disabilities	14	--	0	7	15	--	50	43	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. Oxford 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	266	41	30	32	42	12	18	20	18
African American/Black	7	--	--	--	21	--	--	--	31
Asian	1	--	--	--	65	--	--	--	8
Hispanic/Latino	28	8	16	4	20	19	37	29	33
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	12	--	18	67	48	--	18	8	15
Native American	--	--	--	--	28	--	--	--	25
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	41	--	--	--	20
White	218	44	33	33	52	11	14	20	10
High needs	142	27	18	20	24	23	30	29	29
Low income[a]	128	--	--	22	23	--	--	26	30
ELs and former ELs	9	--	20	--	18	--	20	--	37
Students w/disabilities	46	12	10	4	15	48	54	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. Oxford 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	85	--	--	24	47	--	--	15	14
African American/Black	--	--	--	--	25	--	--	--	25
Asian	3	--	--	--	70	--	--	--	6
Hispanic/Latino	12	--	--	0	23	--	--	8	28
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	1	--	--	--	51	--	--	--	12
Native American	--	--	--	--	38	--	--	--	14
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	45	--	--	--	23
White	69	--	--	29	56	--	--	17	8
High needs	47	--	--	11	26	--	--	23	24
Low income[a]	41	--	--	12	26	--	--	20	25
ELs and former ELs	1	--	--	--	13	--	--	--	43
Students w/disabilities	13	--	--	0	16	--	--	54	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. Oxford Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 & 2022

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	571	45.2	45.8	49.8
African American/Black	16	--	--	48.8
Asian	--	--	--	58.5
Hispanic/Latino	76	47.4	40.1	46.5
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	21	47.0	54.6	51.5
Native American	--	--	--	46.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	51.7
White	458	44.4	46.1	50.0
High needs	298	44.1	43.8	46.7
Low income[a]	265	--	43.7	46.5
ELs and former ELs	23	--	40.2	47.7
Students w/disabilities	101	45.3	39.8	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. Oxford Public Schools: ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 & 2022

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	85	42.6	42.4	50.0
African American/Black	1	--	--	49.8
Asian	3	--	--	56.0
Hispanic/Latino	11	--	--	47.6
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	--	--	50.6
Native American	--	--	--	54.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	49.5
White	68	44.2	42.7	50.1
High needs	47	41.2	42.1	47.7
Low income[a]	42	--	44.0	47.2
ELs and former ELs	1	--	--	50.5
Students w/disabilities	12	--	--	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. Oxford Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grades 3-8, 2019 & 2022

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	573	42.8	44.9	49.9
African American/Black	16	--	--	47.0
Asian	--	--	--	59.8
Hispanic/Latino	76	43.6	46.4	46.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	23	50.4	58.4	51.0
Native American	--	--	--	49.5
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	49.9
White	458	42.3	44.1	50.4
High needs	299	40.2	46.1	47.1
Low income[a]	266	--	46.2	46.4
ELs and former ELs	23	--	53.0	48.6
Students w/disabilities	101	35.3	43.5	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. Oxford Public Schools: Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile in Grade 10, 2019 & 2022

Group	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
All students	84	51.0	34.4	50.0
African American/Black	1	--	--	45.6
Asian	3	--	--	57.3
Hispanic/Latino	11	--	--	44.4
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	1	--	--	50.0
Native American	--	--	--	46.6
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	41.2
White	68	50.1	35.4	51.6
High needs	46	50.9	29.4	46.7
Low income[a]	41	--	30.4	45.6
ELs and former ELs	1	--	--	48.9
Students w/disabilities	12	--	--	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. Oxford 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	109	51	54	36	44	11	8	19	15
4	100	40	43	33	38	7	18	18	16
5	148	52	40	34	41	3	6	16	13
6	129	50	39	31	41	11	27	16	22
7	123	42	32	24	41	8	21	22	19
8	124	32	30	37	42	22	16	19	18
3-8	733	44	39	32	41	10	16	18	17
10	89	60	42	47	58	6	11	3	8

Table E12. Oxford 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	108	35	37	37	41	18	23	25	20
4	100	35	29	37	42	14	27	13	17
5	145	40	22	25	36	9	18	17	16
6	132	42	28	36	42	9	22	5	15
7	124	43	30	26	37	11	9	15	19
8	125	18	10	12	36	32	36	18	17
3-8	734	36	25	28	39	16	23	15	17
10	88	48	30	38	50	3	18	11	10

Table E13. Oxford 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	144	50	35	33	43	6	15	17	18
8	122	33	24	30	42	18	21	23	18
5 and 8	266	41	30	32	42	12	18	20	18
10	85	--	--	24	47	--	--	15	14

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

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

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	--	--	--	--
4	92	40.5	46.6	50.0
5	133	54.1	49.9	49.9
6	119	47.2	48.6	49.8
7	115	45.4	38.5	49.7
8	112	39.0	44.7	49.7
3-8	571	45.2	45.8	49.8
10	85	42.6	42.4	50.0

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

Grade	N (2022)	2019	2022	State (2022)
3	--	--	--	--
4	92	42.3	39.6	50.0
5	131	49.0	43.1	50.0
6	121	60.4	63.4	49.8
7	115	46.3	48.5	49.9
8	114	14.1	27.8	49.8
3-8	573	42.8	44.9	49.9
10	84	51.0	34.4	50.0

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

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	96	82.1	86.1	86.5	90.1
African American/Black	4	--	--	--	86.2
Asian	1	--	--	--	96.2
Hispanic/Latino	13	84.6	62.5	92.3	81.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	4	100	--	--	88.7
Native American	--	--	--	--	82.2
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	81.3
White	73	81.7	87.1	87.7	93.2
High needs	60	75.0	75.0	81.7	83.9
Low income[a]	54	75.0	78.7	81.5	83.2
ELs	1	--	--	--	73.1
Students w/disabilities	19	59.1	53.8	68.4	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. Oxford Public Schools: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2019-2021

Group	N (2021)	2019	2020	2021	State (2021)
All students	101	81.5	83.0	88.1	91.8
African American/Black	2	100	--	--	88.1
Asian	4	--	--	--	97.0
Hispanic/Latino	8	58.3	92.3	62.5	84.0
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	--	100	--	91.2
Native American	--	--	--	--	84.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	87.7
White	85	82.5	81.7	89.4	94.4
High needs	48	72.1	76.6	79.2	85.8
Low income[a]	47	70.4	76.7	80.9	85.1
ELs	--	--	--	--	78.0
Students w/disabilities	13	52.2	59.1	61.5	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. Oxford Public Schools: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,529	2.0	0.0	3.8	1.6
African American/Black	43	--	--	--	2.2
Asian	17	--	--	--	0.4
Hispanic/Latino	247	3.0	0.0	6.5	2.1
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	72	--	--	2.8	1.8
Native American	2	--	--	--	2.4
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	1.9
White	1,147	1.8	0.0	3.4	1.4
High needs	872	3.0	0.0	5.4	2.2
Low income[a]	751	--	--	5.5	2.3
ELs	32	--	--	--	1.4
Students w/disabilities	327	4.0	0.0	5.8	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. Oxford Public Schools: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	1,529	4.0	1.4	7.5	3.1
African American/Black	43	--	--	--	6.2
Asian	17	--	--	--	0.7
Hispanic/Latino	247	9.9	3.6	14.2	4.9
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	72	--	--	13.9	3.5
Native American	2	--	--	--	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	3.6
White	1,147	2.9	1.0	5.7	2.1
High needs	872	5.8	2.5	10.8	4.6
Low income[a]	751	--	--	11.6	5.2
ELs	32	--	--	--	3.5
Students w/disabilities	327	6.3	3.1	12.8	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. Oxford Public Schools: Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	395	3.0	1.8	3.3	2.1
African American/Black	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Asian	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Hispanic/Latino	64	0.0	2.2	3.1	4.3
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	17	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
Native American	1	--	--	--	4.3
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	1.2
White	293	3.9	1.9	3.8	1.3
High needs	217	4.8	1.7	4.1	3.6
Low income[a]	185	5.9	2.0	3.2	3.8
ELs	4	--	--	--	7.8
Students w/disabilities	68	1.8	1.8	5.9	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. Oxford Public Schools: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

Group	N (2022)	2020	2021	2022	State (2022)
All students	185	50.5	54.7	42.7	64.9
African American/Black	6	--	42.9	33.3	55.5
Asian	4	83.3	--	--	84.9
Hispanic/Latino	25	30.4	52.9	28.0	49.2
Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino	6	25.0	50.0	16.7	66.1
Native American	1	--	--	--	50.0
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--	65.4
White	142	53.8	54.2	46.5	69.5
High needs	102	29.4	40.0	29.4	49.1
Low income[a]	85	32.9	40.6	29.4	50.1
ELs	1	--	--	--	30.0
Students w/disabilities	33	0.0	22.7	18.2	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.