

REPORT OF TWO YEAR FOLLOW UP REVIEW

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

Henry Lord Middle School Fall River, Massachusetts

Executive Summary

The Henry Lord Middle School has made some significant positive changes since it was declared an “underperforming” school at the end of 2002. It still faces a number of important challenges.

The learning environment is now safer and calmer as the result of concerted effort from the new administration and the faculty as a whole. Additionally, the faculty is working together in house groups, in content area groups, and in school improvement teams in ways that are becoming strongly collegial. Data is being collected increasingly in formative and summative systems and is being discussed in these groups. The originally-approved school improvement plan has objectives that are strategically laid out and are the focus of group agendas according to an activity calendar. Staff development is being participated in by significantly larger percentages of professional teachers.

Three major challenges exist as the school moves forward. First, the school principal retires at the end of this school year and the district superintendent retires in the fall. While, individuals in leadership positions are changing, so are the dynamics of the change process. Responsive and distributed leadership has been developed within the school setting, but at the same time, the central office is becoming more proactive in deciding on initiatives. Sometimes the building level administration does not feel involved in these decisions.

Second, the faculty and leadership have not engaged actively in revising and rewriting the originally-approved plan, and the development of a new plan to replace it is just in the initial stages. Data has been collected and analyzed, and the PIM team and the Instructional Leadership Team have engaged in meaningful discussion. However, this has not been translated into substantial changes to the plan or in the rewriting of a new plan. The original plan is referred to and used in deliberations about instruction at school level, but it is too early to tell how this will translate into the next phase.

Third, scores have shown improvement in ELA; in Cycle III, AYP was met. Only limited improvement has been seen in math scores, however; AYP has not been met in six consecutive years. The special needs student population in particular has made little progress; in fact, MCAS results showed regression in all three of the grades tested in 2004. A Comparative Value Analysis, (prepared by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability), indicates that the school has not performed well against other demographically similar schools.

Priority Findings

- 1. The Henry Lord Middle School (HLMS) has shown improvement in grade 7 ELA and in grade 8 math in the aggregate. ELA has a Cycle III CPI of 73.8, up 10.9 points in the cycle, “above target” in improvement rating. HLMS is the only middle school of the four in Fall River to have that high an improvement rating, although its CPI is third out of the four schools. While math in grade 6 is stronger than at grade 8, as indicated by proficiency level percentages, the overall math improvement is minimal, rated “improved below target” for Cycle III and not achieving AYP.**

The improvements in English were among the strongest among the middle schools in Fall River and consistent across all subgroups. While a number of the racial subgroups were not large enough to register an AYP rating, the data indicates improvement and a closing of the achievement gap between the predominately white population and a variety of subgroups in the school.

In math, HLMS improved marginally in grade 6 and grade 8 math combined. The school has the poorest record of the four middle schools in percentages in Warning, percentages in Advanced and Proficient, and in the Cycle III CPI level. The school is “identified for restructuring” in terms of its math accountability status. As in ELA, HLMS closes the achievement gap among racial and ethnic groups in Cycle III math. While Whites gained 3.2 CPI points during the cycle, African American/Black students gained more than four times, at 13.8 points. Hispanic students were double that of the White gain at 7.8. Nevertheless, math improvement remains slow not only at HLMS but in three out of the four middle schools and in the City as a whole.

Special education students under perform significantly. The 2004 testing results show an increase in the percentage of students in the Warning category in grade 6 math, grade 7 ELA, and grade 8 math.

- 2. The school has worked diligently in the 2003-04 and the 2004-05 school years to implement the improvement plan approved by the state Board of Education. A number of the strategies in the original plan have become strongly embedded in the instructional processes. A new school administration was appointed on an interim basis during the 2002-03 school year and subsequently became permanently established. Initial efforts were focused not on the plan, which was approved in March 2003, but on changing the basic climate of the school relative to behavior expectations and student-adult relationships.**

Evidence of consistent use of graphic organizers, of the school-wide “Hamburger” writing model, and of a writing rubric and other forms of rubrics exist in the daily life of the school. In the math program, use of a problem of the day, smaller class sizes, and supplemental tutorial efforts have been put in place, the latter two in the 2004-05 school year. All these developments are consistent with the school improvement plan.

On the other hand, there is considerable work still to be done for effective implementation of the Connected Math Program, in the effective use of inclusion techniques, and in consistent use of differentiated instruction.

In general the plan that was approved by the Board of Education in March 2003 has a solid strategic structure, and has prompted the discussion of achievement results. It has enabled the new schedule and the team content area group meetings. The plan has a strong level of ownership by administrators and teachers. The PIM team and the meetings of the faculty in a variety of configurations (during common planning time within a seven-day schedule) discuss and plan the implementation of improved instruction.

3. Changes in the conditions under which the school has operated in the last two years have had largely positive influences. However, the governance processes, both at the building and at the district level, are in transition with results that are not clear at this time.

District decisions have assisted the school in reducing student population without losing teaching faculty. Furthermore, the district has added staff in a number of ways: 3 new math teachers, who the school has used to reduce math class size; increased time for special subject teachers to support the new schedule; math and literacy coaches funded by Title I; supplemental tutoring programs; and increased security staff.

At the same time, the district decision to use the Connected Math Program (CMP) has created a challenging instructional process, especially because in math at HLMS a high percentage of teachers are in their first two years in teaching.

The City has a transportation system outside the control of the school which impacts attendance rates adversely. The district also has a culture of using suspension as a sanction; high suspension rates are a pattern that applies at HLMS as in other Fall River schools.

One demographic change has impacted HLMS considerably more strongly than the other middle schools. The low-income population in the City has risen from 52% in 2002 to 60% in 2005, however that increase is at nearly double the rate at HLMS, moving from 53% in 2002 to 71% in 2005. The percentage of White students as compared to racial subgroups also has changed at double the rate of the City with a decline of 8 percentage points in the White population at HLMS but 4% points in the City as a whole.

- 4. The current plan has been an effective guide for improvement to date, but it is still largely the same plan approved two years ago. Only the initial steps have been taken in creating a new plan, so that there is not a sound plan in place to carry the school forward into the future.**

The deliberative processes, the staff commitment to the original plan, and the acknowledgement of the importance of the planning process are all solidly evident at HLMS. A number of priorities have been discussed by the PIM team and by administrators, but they have not been fashioned into a new plan.

The central administration has set in motion the implementation of important new programs at HLMS, and is committed to providing the associated training. However, there have been few efforts to engage staff in discussion of the need for these initiatives and the benefits in terms of addressing identified weaknesses.

- 5. The leadership in the school has been effective over the last two-and-a-half years and is credited with improvements in the climate, both in terms of safety and faculty engagement in school improvement. Although this leadership is changing with the retirement of the principal, the structures in place appear strong and sustainable.**

The school administration and the faculty are focused on priorities for improvement in teaching and learning. Concerns about the inclusion process and differentiated instruction are well founded and are being discussed actively.

Systems are currently being put in place that will provide more effective pre and post-test information and more client-useful analytical data. However, the faculty is still at the early stages of understanding how to apply data to changes both in the overall instructional objectives of a plan and in their individual planning processes for improved instruction.

Two Year Follow Up Review Process

Introduction

The Two Year Follow Up Review is the fourth and final stage in the process used to assess school performance under the Massachusetts School and District Accountability System. The first stage identifies schools in the lowest MCAS performance categories that are in need of improvement. Stage two, the Panel Review, involves the visitation of a review team to assist the Commissioner of Education in determining whether a school that has been identified as in need of improvement is underperforming and in need of state guidance to improve student performance. Schools declared to be underperforming are required to undergo the next stage of the process, the Fact Finding Review, to assist both the school and the Commissioner in determining the reasons for low student performance and in developing a factual basis from which to develop a plan to improve student performance. The **Henry Lord Middle School in Fall River, Massachusetts** developed such a plan, and the Commissioner and Board of Education accepted the plan on **October 17, 2003**. The district is required to direct the implementation of this plan, and within two years, the school must demonstrate significant improvement.

The underperforming Follow Up Review reports on progress at the end of this two year period of implementation. The Commissioner and Board of Education will use the Follow Up Review report to issue a judgment on the question of chronic underperformance at **Henry Lord Middle School**. The Follow Up Review was conducted on **APRIL 26-27, 2005**.

The panel's charge was to analyze data and written information on the school's performance and improvement efforts, visit the school, and meet with school and district officials in order to advise the Commissioner on the answers to the following five key questions:

1. Has the school shown improvement in student performance?
2. To what extent did the school implement the improvement plan which was approved by the State Board of Education?
3. Are there other factors (changes in conditions or circumstances, i.e., policies, practices) in the school or district which have contributed to or impeded the school's ability to implement their plan?
4. Is there currently a sound plan in place to guide continued improvement in student performance?
5. Are the conditions in place to sustain the gains achieved and support continued improvement in student performance?

The panel's responses to the above key questions that defined the scope of the review are included in this report. These findings and conclusions are the product of the panel's analysis, discussion, and observation, based on the evidence available to it. A list of panel members who participated in the review is provided in Appendix A. A detailed schedule of the panel's activities is provided in Appendix B.

The panel's findings and conclusions on the five key questions will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education for consideration, together with the school's status reports and student performance data, in determining whether **Henry Lord Middle School** is deemed to be chronically under-performing. The panel was not asked to formulate a sound plan for school improvement where such a plan does not presently exist or to recommend a course of action to create the conditions for successful implementation of sound improvement strategies where such conditions at present do not appear to exist.

Henry Lord Middle School Profile

Henry Lord Middle School (HLMS) is one of 26 schools in the City of Fall River. Twenty-one schools run from preK or K through grade 5, most are small, in the range of 145 to 330 students, with two others about 400 and one slightly over 600. There is also a 13-pupil alternative school in that grade range. Next in the sequence are four middle schools for grades 6-8, ranging in size from just over 600 to approximately 750. HLMS has 709 students, the second largest of these four middle schools. All students remaining in the Fall River public school system are then served by the BMC Durfee High School with close to 2,900 students in grades 9-12.

Three of the four middle schools in Fall River, including HLMS, have highly similar demographic statistics. All three have 28% (+/- 1%) students of color, have a percentage of low-income students in the low 70s and a percentage of students whose first language is not English (FLNE) in the mid to high 30s. At HLMS the percentage of special needs students is 13, while at the other two schools the percentage is 14 and 17. All three schools have school-wide Title I programs. The fourth middle school has no Title I program, 11% special needs, 19% FLNE students, 35% low income, and 18% students of color. All data is for the 2004-05 school year.

HLMS in 2004 had an attendance rate of 91.7%, a retention rate of 2.8%, in-school suspension rate at 29.1, and out-of-school suspension rate at 24.5. The Henry P. Talbot Middle School has very similar statistics. One of the other three that is demographically similar, the Matthew J. Kuss Middle School, has been declared chronically under performing; in 2004 it had attendance 2% lower than HLMS, a retention rate more than double, an in-school suspension rate 6 percentage points higher, and an out-of school suspension rate 8 percentage points higher. The Morton Middle School, with a significantly different demographic population, had an attendance rate 1 percentage point higher than HLMS, a retention rate well below, at 1.2 and in-school and out-of-school rates that were somewhat lower but within 3-6 percentage points. An interesting comparison to the Fall River out-of-school suspension rates, which range from 20.2 to 32.6% across the four schools, is approximately 15 middle schools in the City of Boston with low income rates as high or higher and other demographic diversity at a higher level. Only 4 of the 15 have out-of-school suspension rates over 20%. The Boston schools do not have in-school suspension systems whereas the rates in Fall River are from 23.4% to 35.3%. Similar differences exist between suspension rates at the high school level in Fall River (35.4%), double the rate in Boston. The phenomenon of high suspension rates is city-wide in Fall River.

The visiting team found some significant changes in demographics for HLMS that exceeded similar trends for the City. In 2002, HLMS was 21% students of color and 79% who were White. The city as whole had the same statistics. By 2005, HLMS students of color made up 29% of the student body and white students 71%. Those numbers for the City were 25% and 75% respectively. The primary growth among subgroups was among African American/Black and Hispanic students from 14% of the student body at HLMS to 21%. (see table below) The limited income population at HLMS saw a greater increase from 53% in 2002 to 71% in 2005, a growth of 18 percentage points, while the City as whole grew from 52% to 60%, less than half the rate of change.

Grade 6-8 Population by Subgroups

	HLMS		City	
	2002	2005	2002	2005
Asian	5	7	5	5
Black	5	8	7	9
Hispanic	9	13	8	11
Native American	1	1	1	1
White	79	71	79	75
Low Income	53	71	52	60
FLNE	29	33	29	30
SPED	(2001)18	13	NA	15

The significant change in the percentage of population is a result of two factors. The first is that the low income population increased from about 440 students in 2002 to 500 students in 2005; secondly, the population of the school decreased from 836 students in 2002 to 709 in 2005. Similarly, the FLNE student population at HLMS was 29% in 2002, the same percentage as for the City as a whole. But in 2005 that percentage had risen to 33% while the City grew by only 1 percentage point.

(The only comments by administration or teachers relative to the nature of the demographic change was that HLMS serves five different low income housing projects in the City, whereas no other middle school serves more than two. However, comment about the disadvantaged backgrounds of students was strikingly absent in conversations with faculty and administrators during the course of the two-day visit.)

The percentage of special needs students at HLMS has declined 5 percentage points from the 18% reported for 2001 in the Panel Report to 13% in 2005. Nevertheless, the school houses a city-wide substantially separate program for special needs students. The city-wide SPED population has stayed about 15%.

As noted earlier, HLMS has an attendance rate of 91.7, the same as Talbot, 1 point lower than Morton and 2 points higher than Kuss. Attendance rates at HLMS in 2004 had increased by more than 1% over 2003 and 2002 levels. This had a significant impact because attendance rates had been the cause of failing to meet AYP in English language arts in 2003, and the improvement allowed meeting AYP in 2004. By comparison, however, two-thirds of the 15 middle schools in Boston have attendance rates that are equal to or greater than HLMS.

Staffing

The Department of Education Accountability and Targeted Assistance staffing data for the 2004-05 school year provides the information about the current staffing of HLMS with 709 students enrolled. In the right hand column is the number of faculty listed in the 2002 Panel Report for the 793 students enrolled at that time.

Position	2004-05	2002
Principal	1	1
Assistant Principal	2	2
Counselors	4	4
Full-Time Staff	63	61
Teacher Assistants	13	14
Teachers Not Certified	5	4
Teachers with Masters	25	15
Teachers with more than 15 yrs. at HLMS	15	22

In addition to the staff listed in the table above, there is an additional position listed as SIP facilitator. This position did not exist when the Panel Report was published; it is a school-wide position to provide teacher leadership and development of programs.

There are also two long-term substitute positions listed for the building.

With about 90 fewer students, the school has maintained teaching staff. The staff in the school currently, including teachers and teacher assistants, shows approximately 20 people in their first 3 years in the building, 26 with 4-9 years in the building, 19 with 10-15 years in the building, and 15 with 16 years or more. However, focusing on the total teaching years of the current staff shows higher years of experience; there are 30 people with 16 or more years of total teaching.

In looking at total years of teaching among math teachers and English language arts teachers there is a striking difference. Six of 10 math teachers have 2 years or less of teaching experience with the average for the 10 teachers at 6.3 years. Of the English language arts teachers, one has 2 years or fewer, 6 have 20-40 years, and the average teaching experience is 20.3 years. The Fall River School District added 3 math teachers this year. The three teachers have been employed at HLMS to reduce class size at each grade, and the math classes observed by the team were considerably smaller than other subjects. This was also reported by faculty. Each math teacher has a group of students divided into five classes for one period per day. Each English teacher with a similar total load of students has them divided into three groups. Two of the groups have separate ELA and reading classes and a third group is taught one of the two components. This

latter group of students is split between two teachers and lacks the continuity of the double classes because the two teachers must find time to do common planning.

The principal moved to HLMS three years ago to replace a principal who resigned at mid-year, following the state declaration of under performance. At the same time that the new principal came to the building, one faculty member, who had been teaching in the building for slightly more than 10 years, became an assistant principal. A second assistant principal had been in that role for about 10 years at the time of the review.

MCAS Results

Overview

Students at HLMS are tested by MCAS in grades 6 and 8 in mathematics and at grade 7 in English language arts (ELA). Performance in math is not nearly as strong as ELA. While math is stronger at grade 6 than in grade 8, judging by proficiency level percentages, the overall math improvement is very small, rated “improved below target”, whereas the Cycle III improvement rating in ELA is “above target”. In the Cycle III performance rating, mathematics results are “critically low” and the Cycle III improvement totaled 3.5 CPI points compared to a target of 10.8. In math, with two grade levels combined for AYP, four subgroups are large enough to receive AYP ratings. But HLMS failed to meet math AYP in the aggregate or in any of the four subgroups: special education, low income, Hispanic or White.

In Cycle III in ELA, HLMS performance was rated “moderate” and the CPI gain was 10.9 compared to a target of 6.2. AYP was met in the aggregate and in both the low income and White subgroups, the only two which had enough students to report AYP. The improvement levels in other smaller subgroups indicate that they also would have met AYP had there been a large enough number to be eligible for an AYP rating.

In the 2003 mid-cycle report in ELA, before the threshold enrollment number for AYP rating had been raised, SPED, low-income, Hispanic, and White had all met the improvement target. In the 2003 mid-cycle report for math, six subgroups warranted AYP ratings. Special education and African American/Black students met the improvement target; Hispanic comfortably met the CPI change target; low-income, Asian, and White subgroups failed to meet the math CPI change target.

The City of Fall River, as a whole, similarly has stronger results in ELA than in mathematics in Cycle III. ELA rates “moderate” and mathematics “very low” in the overall rating and ELA is “on target” in terms of improvement whereas mathematics is “improved below target”. The Cycle III CPI in ELA is 74.6, and in mathematics it is 52. Similarly to HLMS, the City met its improvement challenges in ELA in all subgroups, but only limited English and Asian students had high enough attendance to achieve AYP. In mathematics, only limited English proficient (LEP) students in the City met the improvement target.

Looking at the proficiency level percentages at HLMS for all students, only grade 8 math shows a progression of improvement that runs to 2004, with 77% in Warning in 2002, 76% in 2003, and 69% in 2004. In grade 7 English there is a strong reduction in percent in Warning from 41 in 2001 to 20 in 2002 and to 14 in 2003; that remains unchanged in 2004. In grade 6 math the percentage in Warning drops from 66 in 2001 to 54 in 2002 but increases to 58 in 2003 and 2004.

Those patterns are less positive in special education where the 2004 percentage in Warning increases in all three grades tested. The general pattern is of major improvement from 2001 to 2002 but significantly unchanged or even regressive results in mathematics each year since. Grade 7 ELA shows solid improvement from 2001 to 2003 but loses almost all that gain in 2004.

Compared to the other middle schools in Fall River, the CPI in English at HLMS is very similar to Talbot and both are at the mid-point between Morton at the high end and Kuss at the low end. In mathematics, however, the Cycle III CPI at HLMS is the lowest of the four at 38.8 with Kuss at 41, Talbot at 44.4, and Morton at 54.2.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

As stated above, the Cycle III performance rating was “moderate” for HLMS and the Cycle III improvement rating was “above target” with CPI change of 10.9 against a gain target of 6.2. The 2003 mid-cycle AYP report shows a gain of 11.5, so the 2004 testing resulted in a 0.6 decline in the aggregate CPI.

In English language arts, unlike the math areas, HLMS made significant positive progress not only from 2001 to 2002 but from 2002 to 2003. Judging by proficiency levels the percentages in Warning went down by 5% in special needs and 8% in regular education for an aggregate decline of 6%. The percentages in proficient also went up each year of those two, but from the 2003 mid-cycle report to the 2004 AYP data report, all of the subgroups that can be compared declined in CPI except the Hispanic population. This subgroup had made a relatively small 3.7 CPI change in the 2003 mid-cycle report but reflected a strong 12.8% cumulative change in the 2004 end-of-cycle report. African American students made a sizeable CPI change of 37.2 points in the cycle, but they were not a large enough group to have a CPI gain report at the mid-cycle.

The special education population had made a 24.7 point CPI change at the mid-cycle which regressed to a 20.9 full-cycle change although they were too small a group for a formal AYP designation. The 3.8 point decline in CPI, however, translates into a big shift for special education in the proficiency level percentages. The percentage in warning moves from 47 in 2003 to 69 in 2004, but the relatively small number of SPED students (28) contributes to this large percentage shift.

Across the City as a whole the same pattern existed in English language arts with improvements from 2001 to 2002 and 2002 to 2003 with a step backward in the testing in 2004 for grade 7 ELA. CPI data is not available for the grade 7 alone for the City of Fall River, only for the aggregate for all English language arts in the City.

Comparing HLMS with the three other middle schools in terms of the percentages in Proficient or above and in Warning in 2004 and in 2002 provides the data in the table below.

**Grade 7 ELA
2004 Percentages in Proficiency Levels
Compared to 2002 in ()**

	Advanced and Proficient	Change	Warning	Change
Lord	37 (31)	+6	14 (20)	+6
Kuss	24 (23)	+1	26 (25)	-1
Morton	57 (52)	+5	7 (7)	--
Talbot	48 (45)	+3	12 (15)	+3

This data shows that HLMS is behind Morton and Talbot in the general percentages and ahead of Kuss. In terms of the improvement in percentage points, HLMS leads all four of the middle schools in the positive changes toward lowering those in Warning and increasing those in Proficient or above. As has been noted, the major step forward was in the 2003 testing.

The AYP report shows that HLMS began with the lowest baseline CPI in ELA but was the only one of the four schools that was “above target” in improvement rating in grade 7 English language arts. For HLMS the CPI gain in Cycle III was 10.9 points, for Talbot it was 7.8, for Morton 2.2, and for Kuss - 0.2. Similarly as a percentage of gain target, HLMS had the strongest improvement. AYP information is summarized in the table below for grade 7 ELA for the four middle schools.

Grade 7 ELA, AYP Information

	Baseline	Gain Target	Gain	Cycle III CPI	Improvement Rating
Lord	62.9	6.2	10.9	73.8	Above Target
Kuss	65.6	5.7	-0.2	65.4	No Change
Morton	80.8	3.2	2.2	83.0	On Target
Talbot	67.0	5.5	7.8	74.8	On Target

Student Performance in Mathematics

HLMS in math started at the lowest baseline CPI of any of the four schools going into Cycle III. The school gained in CPI points at a faster rate than two out of the four, but it still holds the lowest Cycle III CPI at 38.8. As the table below shows, compared to 2002, HLMS made stronger progress in grade 8 math but was unchanged to negative in terms of its 2004 grade 6 math. Looking at the other three middle schools, only Talbot made progress in improving percentages in Proficient and Advanced and reducing percentages in Warning. The other two middle schools, like Lord, remained unchanged or declined in these percentages. Middle schools across the City did better in grade 8 math between 2002 and 2004 than they did in grade 6. All four schools improved. It is noteworthy that Kuss School made the strongest improvements in grade 8 math but had the most serious decline from 2002 to 2004 in grade 6 math.

Grade 6 Math 2004 Percent of Students in Proficient Levels Compared to 2002 in ()

	Advanced and Proficient	Change	Warning	Change
Lord	12 (12)	--	58 (54)	-4
Kuss	5 (13)	-8	70 (61)	-9
Morton	26 (29)	-3	35 (35)	--
Talbot	16 (11)	-5	48 (58)	+10

Grade 8 Math 2004 Percent of Students in Proficient Levels Compared to 2002 in ()

	Advanced and Proficient	Change	Warning	Change
Lord	4 (1)	+3	69 (77)	+8
Kuss	8 (5)	+3	53 (67)	+14
Morton	21 (19)	+2	42 (47)	+5
Talbot	6 (4)	+2	63 (69)	+6

**Math (Grade 6 and 8 Combined)
2004 AYP Information**

	Baseline	Gain Target	Gain	Cycle III CPI	Improvement Rating
Lord	35.3	10.8	3.5	38.8	Improved Below
Kuss	38.6	10.2	2.4	41.0	No Change
Morton	52.2	8.0	2.0	54.2	No Change
Talbot	36.0	10.7	8.4	44.4	On Target

Contrary to the subgroup data in English language arts at HLMS, in which 2004 testing took a regressive step, in math the Cycle III combined data for 2003/04 shows continued small improvements across the aggregate and the subgroups. In the aggregate the CPI change was positive: 1.7 in 2003 and 1.8 in 2004 giving a combination of 3.5. Special education gained 5.1 points in 2003 and 3 points in 2004. The African American/Black population showed gains: 5.2 in 2003 and 8.5 in 2004 giving a combined 13.7 positive CPI points in the cycle. Only the Hispanic group, which had made such strong gains in the ELA 2004 testing actually regressed in math in the 2004 testing combining grades 6 and 8. They moved from a positive 9.3 CPI points in 2003 to a negative (-) 1.5 in 2004 giving a combined positive 7.8 CPI gain.

The City of Fall River as a whole across math in all grades has a Cycle III CPI gain of 6.3 as compared to a gain target of 9.1 and “improved below target”, but its math performance still lags far behind its English performance, as is the case for the four middle schools. Only Talbot Middle School had a math CPI gain greater than the City as whole, whereas the other three middle schools had gains of one-third to one-half that of the City as a whole.

In math, HLMS, while improving marginally in grade 8 performance and while improving in very small steps in both 2003 and 2004 in CPI across both grades, still has the poorest record of the four middle schools in percentages in Warning, percentages in Advanced and Proficient, and Cycle III CPI level. Because of its inability to make AYP in six consecutive years for the aggregate, HLMS has a DOE accountability status of “Identified for Restructuring”, which charges the district with responsibility for intervention.

Comparative Value Added (CVA) data

Since the visit, the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA) has provided additional analytical data that indicates a significant underperformance of HLMS students in comparison to similar students across the state. The Comparable Value Analysis (CVA) compares student performance at HLMS to student performance in similar demographic subgroup across the state. The report also provides an income adjustment factor.

The analysis of ELA, math and SPED student performance confirms the relative strengths and weaknesses of the MCAS data presented earlier. ELA is the stronger area of the two content areas, but both are well into negative values for comparable performance:

There are some factors that may ameliorate this negative interpretation of CVA data for HLMS:

- CVA does not take into account any of the national origins of Portuguese and these groups are a significant part of the HLMS population
- CVA shows 48% with free and 9% with reduced lunch, while the low income statistic on the school shows 62% in 2004. The increasing percent of low income population is a significant factor at HLMS in the last 5 years
- CVA considers the LEP population, of which HLMS has few because the city offers SEI programs at a different site; but CVA does not consider FLNE students as a factor, and HLMS has 32% FLNE students
- Income for schools are per capita medians for the whole community; but the HLMS population is of lower income than the Fall River as a whole

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

KEY QUESTION 1: Has the school shown improvement in student performance?

HLMS has shown improvement in grade 7 ELA and in grade 8 math in the aggregate, although the starting point for English language arts was stronger. In grade 6 math the improvements have not been substantial, although the percentages of students in the Warning category are lower than grade 8 math.

A phenomenon that is common across grade 6 math and grade 7 English is that 2004 results do not show continued improvement. Grade 8 math for all students in 2004 does show a decline in the percentage of students in Warning of 11 percentage points, and a 2 percent growth of students in Proficient.

Compared to other middle schools in Fall River, HLMS performance in math is lowest in grade 8 math among the four, third among the four in grade 6 math and third among the four in grade 7 ELA based on percentages of students in various proficiency levels.

Special Needs subgroup: Special needs students at HLMS are underperforming. Performance in grade 7 ELA is considerably higher than in grade 6 math which is better than grade 8 math. Only in ELA is there a three-year progression of improvement from 2001 through 2003, but in English as in the math areas, the 2004 testing produced a regression to a higher level of students in the Warning category. This step back was by 22 percentage points in English language arts, 6 percentage points in grade 6 math, and 1 percentage point in grade 8 math, but that one point was from 95% to 96% in Warning.

The significant increase in special needs students in the Warning category in ELA in 2004 only reduced the CPI change by 3.8 points. In the 2003 ELA testing, SPED students had jumped 24.7 CPI points and would have met AYP except for attendance problems. In 2004 with a small decline, special education students still would have met the CPI improvement change, and the attendance improvement was met, but there were insufficient students to report AYP results.

Other subgroups: In ELA, HLMS low-income students met AYP in Cycle III with a 15.5 point CPI improvement. African American/Black and Hispanic subgroups also had CPI changes that were strong enough to meet AYP. The Black student attendance improvement would have made them eligible to make AYP if there had been a large enough number to qualify. The relatively poor attendance of Hispanic students would have denied them AYP. The White low-income subgroup, with a 10.2 CPI gain in ELA and appropriate attendance, met AYP in Cycle III.

The 2004 AYP data for HLMS indicates that among racial and ethnic groups the school has taken steps to close the achievement gap in ELA. Although the numbers are relatively small and do not result in AYP findings, the African American/Black population made nearly four times the CPI gain that the White population did (37.2 compared to 10.2). The 18 Asian or Pacific Island students made more than double the CPI progress of White students (24.6 vs.10.2). The Hispanic population saw a less dramatic change, but those 31 students gained 12.8 points compared to 10.2 for the White population. The Hispanic subgroup made the majority of its gains in the 2004 testing, whereas all of the other groups took small steps back from large gains in the 2003 testing. HLMS has virtually no limited English proficient (LEP) population because the specialized programs for LEP students are housed at the Talbot School.

The HLMS subgroups did not make enough CPI change in math in grade 6 and grade 8 to achieve AYP, although attendance levels had improved enough in all but the Hispanic subgroup. Nevertheless, HLMS closed the achievement gap among racial and ethnic groups in Cycle III math. While Whites gained 3.2 CPI points during the cycle, African American/Black students gained more than four times at 13.8 points. The gain for Hispanics was double at 7.8. The Asian or Pacific Islanders declined by 5.1 but maintained the highest CPI among these groups at 40.5, relatively high at HLMS, but not close to the state target of 60.8.

The School Two-Year Status Report states that the student long composition scores at HLMS were the highest in the City. Also stated as signs of improvement were that the Number Sense strand in math increased 7% in grade 6 and 3% in grade 8. Also, by content strand, the grade 6 MCAS math scores showed increases in four out of five strands from 2003 to 2004 and in three out of five in grade eight.

At HLMS, the data suggests that the same relatively able class (year of graduation group) that created a higher level in 2002 in grade 6 math moved into grade 8 in 2004 and their performance was reflected in positive math results. The ELA improvement in the 2003 mid-cycle report also supports this. While no one at HLMS volunteered comment on this phenomenon, the SIP facilitator, when questioned about it, acknowledged that there had been a relatively able cohort that he felt had contributed to these results.

Another factors that complicate interpreting progress is the increasing number of students from low-income families.

The school is setting goals for student performance overall and by subgroups that are dictated by AYP targets. Because of the very low baseline CPI levels in math and the very high gain target in order to achieve No Child Left Behind goals, the annual improvement poses an extreme challenge, particularly for special needs students.

KEY QUESTION 2: To what extent did the school implement the improvement plan, which was approved by the State Board of Education?

Aspects of the board-approved plan have been implemented through the efforts of the current administration, the SIP facilitator, and the PIM team. This plan has a strategic basis with instructional objectives and learning objectives. It has been monitored; evidence has been collected and discussed. The development of a seven-day cycle with rotating periods has provided common planning time that is used in a number of different settings to provide collegial exchange of information about the objectives and activities in the plan.

While the PIM team has met consistently and has discussed issues that have arisen from the plan, significant revision of the planning document based on these discussions has not taken place. On the one hand this has left the plan stable and a known quantity to administrators and to teachers. On the other hand, while weaknesses have been identified and discussed, the plan has not been altered with an effort to assess results of changes.

A number of strategies in the original plan have become strongly embedded. The introduction of graphic organizers, for example, was a deliberate change for which there was training. Evidence of consistent use of graphic organizers was found in observations and in reports by focus groups. Chief among these was the “hamburger” writing graphic organizer that is in active use not only in ELA classrooms but in many other subjects as well. A school-wide writing rubric is in strong evidence, and other use of rubrics was observed. In the math program, a strategy to develop a problem of the day to make improvements in identified areas of weakness was a part of the lessons observed. Paired student work was also an element of the improvement planning frequently observed and discussed.

One of the strategies referred to in the plan that shows the least evidence of impact is the math curriculum (Connected Math Program, CMP), which was selected by the district before the plan and continues to be employed at HLMS and at other schools. The instructional techniques in the program are complex and difficult, especially for inexperienced math teachers. Math rates of improvement and basic levels of achievement are limited and don't show significant improvement as the result of a program that has been in place for four years.

Another poorly implemented strategy to which HLMS is committed is the inclusion of SPED students. A high percentage of SPED students (66%) are in full inclusion classrooms; the City of Fall river lists 49.6% of SPED students in full inclusion. The City of Boston lists 29.6% of students in full inclusion classrooms. This grouping strategy is not showing results in math at HLMS. For the last three years in grade 6 math the percentage of SPED students in Failing is 82 (2002), 82 (2003), 88 (2004); for grade 8 math those percentages are 92, 95, and 96. Also, a significant decline of special needs students in Warning in grade 7 ELA was reversed by 8 percentage points in the 2004 testing.

The team did not see consistent effective use of differentiated instruction which is a focus of the plan. In several cases there was a failure to differentiate appropriately. This is an area in which training is still underway, but there is not evidence that differentiated strategies are being consciously practiced except through some student group work patterns.

Of the twelve classroom observed by the team during the Two-Year Review, five were considered to be at a high level that exemplifies good practice, five were considered to meet an acceptable standard, and two were considered not to meet an acceptable standard.

In general, the classroom student behavior was considered to be average, and the processes used to address challenging behavior were considered to exemplify good practice. The classroom culture was often one of high expectations. The team saw good use of group work as an instructional strategy. There was evidence of school improvement planning objectives in the classrooms observed, including the use of graphic organizers and rubrics. The use of technology, other than overhead projectors, was not evident in the classroom instruction observed.

A major support for improvements at HLMS came in the appointment of a new administrative team with the resignation of the principal during the 2002 school year. The Panel Report is clear about the inadequacies of leadership and refers to the “interim” appointment of a new principal, which has since become a permanent appointment. During the same period, a new assistant principal, a faculty member at HLMS, was appointed. A school improvement facilitator, the first in the City, was also appointed to the building.

As will be discussed in more detail in Question 3, this new leadership team created a greatly improved climate in terms of both administration/teacher and also adult/student relationships. One way of monitoring of climate has been through targets for reducing the numbers of referrals from classrooms to the office. Student and parent focus groups remarked especially on the much greater level of safety and calmness in the building. In general, the conditions at HLMS are markedly improved from the conditions described in the Panel Review Fact Finding reports.

The school adopted a 7-day cycle with rotating periods, which the City supported by increasing the allocation of special subject teachers. This schedule has permitted extensive common planning time for house faculty, teams within houses, and content area groups across houses. Through these structures the new leadership has been able to create considerably greater buy-in to the objectives of the plan and has increased the culture of collegiality. Both a PIM Team and an Instructional Leadership Team monitor these discussions. Agendas and minutes of meetings were readily available showing attention to the calendar of activities and pacing charts as topics of discussion.

Improving low attendance is an objective of the plan. Small improvements have been made, but attendance problems still impact improvement in achievement. A number of factors contribute to the challenges to attendance. At HLMS, one of these is the previously noted high suspension rate. Second is that the school has twelve early-release days for staff development. The principal noted that attendance is always lower on half-days and is especially lower on these days in the winter and in other bad weather. The transportation system is the third contributing factor. The school draws from an area with a radius of approximately 3 miles, and there is a large pond west of the school around which students must walk. There is no direct busing for HLMS and the for public transport students must ride the City bus system. Unfortunately, the routing of the buses is directed toward the center of the City. HLMS students must therefore ride one bus into the center of the City and then change to another bus that brings them out to an area close to the school. A security guard and administrators noted that many students prefer to walk, even in inclement weather, or stay home, rather than ride the inconvenient bus system.

The PIM team and focus groups interviews offered mixed evidence in understanding about the causes for lack of improvement. The school is proud of improvement in writing scores and explains those increases through the introduction of the Hamburger Model and other graphic organizers and the use of a school-wide rubric. By contrast, is the lack of strategy around three extra math teachers assigned to HLMS, last year. The school chose to assign one teacher per grade level to reduce class sizes in math. This decision was not the result of analyzing need but based on the assumption that reducing class sizes would assist in overcoming the lack of time allocated to teaching the CMP program. Another example of incomplete analysis is the assignment of students to additional tutoring help. Teachers and others referred to tutors being allocated the “218s” or the “214s” demonstrating how the school had grouped students by their MCAS scaled score rather than by any more detailed analysis of student need.

The school is moving towards more effective assessment techniques to monitor student performance and to measure effectiveness of teaching. Because of significant delays between testing and receiving analytical results, the district gave up the Terra Nova tests and moved to the Northwest Evaluation Association testing system (NWEA). This is a new initiative that has only been used with grade 7 students to date. There was considerable evidence of data by individual student, by content sub areas in math and English language arts, and by item analysis. While the school is feeling positive about some initial results that show larger than expected gains, the system and use of the data is still very new. The goal is to have a turnaround time of two days between testing and analytical information, but at this point it is in the region of 1-2 weeks.

In general, the plan that was approved by the Board of Education in 2003 has a solid strategic structure. However, although the PIM team and ILT have had discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of the plan, there has not been any specific revision of the objectives and subsequent development of new strategies. New initiatives have been put in place, partly through school and partly through district effort, but they have not been tied into revisions in the plan. While the stable condition of the plan over time has allowed the faculty to become familiar with its implementation, the lack of specific revision shows a need for increased responsiveness to changing conditions.

KEY QUESTION 3: Are there other factors (changes in conditions or circumstances, i.e., policies, practices) in the school or district which have contributed to or impeded the school's ability to implement their plan?

Changes in the conditions under which the school has operated in the last two years have had largely positive influences, but the governance processes that have impacted practices and policies are in transition.

As mentioned in Question 2, a culture is developing within the school that is positive, both in identifying areas needing further work and also in discussion of the learning objectives of the plan. There has been a significant improvement in the commitment to change and a collective sense of responsibility. One area of school practice that has changed to provide the building teams with a sense of collegiality and ownership has been that interviews and recommendations on hiring of new staff have been conducted by members of each team.

Within the last year, several conditions have changed that impact district decision-making relative to HLMS. The Kuss School has been declared "chronically underperforming", and the central administration acknowledged that they in part bore responsibility because of deficiencies in monitoring and lack of strong enough intervention. HLMS under the Cycle III Accountability Report has been "identified for restructuring" in math as a result of failing to make AYP for the last three cycles. This status places greater responsibility on the district to intervene. Additionally, there is a new assistant superintendent in charge of programs. As a result, while the school is growing to be more proactive, with a more responsive faculty, the district is playing a much more assertive role in restructuring and instituting new programs.

The district has reduced the student population at HLMS without any reduction in faculty size, which has reduced some class sizes and enabled closer supervision of students by existing numbers of administrators and counselors.

A district decision to move an alternative program from the school to a city-wide central administration deprived the school of an in-building alternative. The city-wide program currently has a waiting list and HLMS students must take turn with students from other schools.

The district has also centralized other specialized programs. The centralization of LEP students at the Talbot School removes the pressures from classes at HLMS to create sheltered English immersion training and programming. HLMS houses the district-wide substantially separate program for more profoundly disabled special needs students, but this does not have a major impact on regular classroom life because the mainstreaming of those students is limited.

The district adoption of CMP as the math program has put in place a program that emphasizes a relatively complex constructivist approach to teaching math, with emphasis on broad understandings rather than computational facility. Such programs, while supported by research, are difficult with students for whom English is not their first language and for whom literacy skills are weak. The district has moved to bolster the program recently through increased staffing, improved training of teachers, math coaches in the schools, and support for supplemental tutoring with Title I and 21st Century grant funds.

Turnover in the math department, as well as the addition of the three new math teachers, has confronted HLMS with finding well-trained teaching candidates. The math department of 10 teachers has 6 who are in their first or second year at the school. Two of the math department members are teaching under a waiver from the State. While the school was able to fill two of its three new positions effectively, the third took considerable time. It involved the hiring of four different teachers – each of whom started but did not continue - and the use of substitutes. One student reported having 17 math teachers last year for varying lengths of time.

No changes in specific policies relative to retention, suspension, attendance or other areas were evident that were significant factors in contributing to or impeding the school's ability to implement its plan. As noted earlier, the level of suspension throughout the system is considerably higher than Boston and very much higher than the statewide levels, and the transport options available to students at HLMS do not encourage regular attendance.

In terms of resource allocation, the conditions at HLMS have improved. As noted earlier, as the student population has declined, the staff has stayed the same. The district increased the time for special subject teachers in order to help implement the new schedule. As well as a math coach, a literacy coach has been funded by Title I, as has additional supplemental tutoring from Title I and 21st Century funds. The security staffing has been increased in 2004-05 with the addition of a second school district security officer and a school resource officer from the Fall River Police Department. Along with consistent effort by the three-year old administrative team, this has markedly reduced the level of disruptive student behavior in areas around the school, in corridors, and in the cafeteria.

A major positive change in collective bargaining has been that provisional level teachers are now required, as a condition of employment, to take part in summer and other professional development. Such summer work was provided for new math teachers, for example. Other professional development, rather than being voluntary, is mandatory for provisional level teachers.

The increase in the percentage of students of low-income status is more marked at HLMS than at other middle schools in Fall River. An increasing population of Latino or Hispanic families, has increased the percentage of FLNE students. (There has been a continuing Portuguese population, some with limited English at home.) New housing projects were identified by the school resource officer and the administration as sources of gang activity that has led to challenging student behavior in school. The superintendent and school leaders spoke of the increased Hispanic population as a new and significant cultural group with which the City and the school were failing to communicate effectively about the value of education. The Hispanic subgroup has the lowest attendance in the school and in the City. Nevertheless, as noted in MCAS results, HLMS saw reasonably strong gains in the Hispanic student CPI in English and math.

The development of an expanded Breakfast Club program has been initiated in response to both the increase in low income students and to encourage good attendance.

KEY QUESTION 4: Is there currently a sound plan in place to guide continued improvement in student performance?

At this time, HLMS has a plan in place, (dated October 2003), which is in most ways is the same as that approved by the Board in March 2003. A very strong, negative critique of another plan was read by the team, dated January, 2003. It appears that the initial plan was rejected and rewritten with approval at the March Board of Education meeting. No one at HLMS had a clear recollection of the early implementation of the plan, and it is unlikely that concerted effort took place until fall, 2003.

The October 2003 plan has been used by planning groups and for lesson planning by individuals. The weekly discussion by teams and by content areas actively uses the learning objectives of the plan.

As noted earlier, while there have been changes in services and programs to support the plan, these have not resulted from careful causal analysis nor resulted in specific revisions of the original plan. The PIM team and ILT have discussed strengths, weaknesses, and areas for new development.

To date only initial steps have been taken to create a new plan. During the two-day visit of the team, there was a meeting of district and school administrators to list "SIP Revision Priorities". This included seven areas, with about a dozen bulleted subsections in total, as a focus of revision. There is a timeline in place to complete a new plan by the end of the school year, which is an ambitious target if all stakeholders are to be involved. An imminent district decision to adopt America's Choice as a strategic partner in school improvement system-wide was not at the time of the visit being factored into new planning.

KEY QUESTION 5: Are the conditions in place to sustain the gains achieved and support continued improvement in student performance?

Leadership in the school has been effective and is credited with the improvement in the climate both in terms of safety and staff morale. It is a concern that the principal who has led this culture change will retire early in the next school year. Fortunately, leadership has been effectively distributed through the development of the house structure and teams within the houses and through the weekly meeting structures for teams, houses, and content areas. Special focus committees that were designed to look at criticisms in the Fact Finding Report have been at work and “all content area” (ACA) objectives are in the school improvement plan developed through an application of PIM processes. The school improvement facilitator is an energetic and positive force and the district school support specialist, although newly appointed, collaborates well with the faculty team.

The school will benefit from having a new leader who is attuned to using data to assess and revise plans and to set achievement objectives. The superintendent indicates a readiness to commit money to an attractive salary and rigorous screening to make this selection process successful. In order to assure the best appointment he said that he would use an interim principal rather than select a person less qualified than he felt the school needed. This is a sound strategy in the circumstances, but the use of an interim principal has dangers relative to maintaining momentum. Furthermore, the superintendent himself is retiring early in the fall. This complex transition of leadership on two levels adds further uncertainty to the future success of HLMS.

Faculty members at HLMS value the implementation of a well-structured set of instructional and learning objectives, and time has been set aside in the schedule for the faculty planning associated with this.

Systems are currently being put in place that will provide more effective pre and post-test information and more client-useful analytical data. However, the faculty is still at early stages of understanding how to apply data on an ongoing basis to changes both in the overall instructional objectives of a plan and also in their individual planning processes for improved instruction in response to student need. The District Two-Year Report cites supporting the school in becoming more data literate, as a key action on its part.

Faculty expressed a respect for the accountability processes that are part of their underperforming status. Several faculty members specifically mentioned the positive changes from the increased accountability. However, school and district monitoring of a rigorous nature with effective feedback from daily supervision and formal evaluation, was not clearly in evidence.

Improvements in the school climate have been discussed and represent a very positive condition to sustain growth. Students and faculty feel that the school is calm and safe. The parent focus group also represented a strong positive support for continued work at the school. The group of parents all realized that the underperforming status of the school allowed them to transfer their children. Most had investigated HLMS and the other middle schools in the City and had consciously and proudly decided to keep their children at HLMS. They cited the safety and the positive faculty/student relationships. They credited the new administrative team with this progress, and regretted the imminent change as the principal retires.

The current school administration and faculty are focused on priorities for improvements in teaching and learning. The team had concerns about the inclusion strategies and these were shared by administrators and teachers and documented in the school's status report. The absence of data in use to influence classroom instruction was also noted in the school and district Two-Year Report and in discussions with faculty. Professional development for differentiated learning has begun but the level of expertise at HLMS is currently limited. At the current time there is not a revised plan in place that specifically spells out the steps to be taken to set up these objectives and to measure success in meeting them.

The district level leadership has become more proactive in the past year with a number of interventions, particularly in the area of math improvement. The America's Choice initiative is a significant district decision that was being brought to the school without any broad collaboration at the time of the visit. At issue is not the adequacy of support and guidance from the district but how the initiatives will gain ownership and support from staff and be effectively implemented next year, given the impending changes in leadership at school and district levels.

Conclusion

Students at HLMS continue to under perform and improvements have generally not been sustained. In some subgroups students have regressed. The climate and culture of the Henry Lord Middle School has improved since the visit of the Fact Finding team in 2002. Leadership is increasingly shared by school administrators and faculty members, but the improvements have been in large measure due to the efforts of the new school principal, who is retiring this year (2005). The district has provided support for HLMS in a number of ways and in particular in the reduction of school size while maintaining staffing levels. At the time of the review, however, district strategies were not being factored into school planning, and the district was in the process of appointing a new superintendent. The existing school improvement plan is actively used and the staff is committed to fulfilling its objectives and to resolving issues that arise. However, the team could not find sufficient evidence of a sound strategy for developing a comprehensive new plan to carry the school forward. This is of particular concern given the continuing under performance and the transition of leadership at district and school levels.

APPENDIX A
Team Members

Mr. Peter Davies, Chair, Senior Consultant, Leadership and Accountability, Class Measures

Dr. Ethan Cancell, Deputy Director, Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

Dr. Peter Clark, Leadership Consultant and Reporting Examiner, Class Measures

Mr. Charles Valera, Examiner, Office of Education Quality and Accountability

Team Schedule

APPENDIX B

TWO YEAR FOLLOW-UP REVIEW SCHEDULE

Detailed Schedule for School Site Visit

Day 1 on site schedule

All activities take place in the school

- 8:00—9:00 Team members meet with the principal...
- 9:00—10:00. Team members meet with the district superintendent (and Assistant Superintendent, if appropriate).
- 10:00—11:00. Team members meet with the school’s curriculum and instruction leadership team and members of the school site council.
- 11:00—1:00. Team members meet to discuss findings so far and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch). Panelists use time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information; panelists may conduct an informal walk through with a focus on school culture and climate for learning.
- 1:00—3:00. Team members meet with teachers in focus groups.

	REVIEWER A and REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C and REVIEWER D
<i>1:00-1:30</i>	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #1	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #2
<i>1:30-2:00</i>	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #3	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #4

2:00- 2:30	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #5	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #6
---------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

2:30-3:00 Panelists meet with parents and students in focus groups.

	REVIEWER A	REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C	REVIEWER D
2:30 - 3:00	PARENT FOCUS GROUP #1	PARENT FOCUS GROUP #2	STUDENT FOCUS GROUP #1	STUDENT FOCUS GROUP #2

3:00—5:00 Panelists synthesize information, further define findings, prepare questions, and develop a team strategy for second day of the on-site visit.

Day 2 on-site schedule
All activities take place in the school

7:30—8:00 a.m. Team members meet with the principal for follow-up questions

8:00—8:30 a.m. Team members visit classrooms and interview teachers.*

	REVIEWER A	REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C	REVIEWER D
8:00-8:30	Observe teacher 1	Observe teacher 2	Observe teacher 3	Observe teacher 4
8:30-9:00	Interview teacher 1	Interview teacher 2	Interview teacher 3	Interview teacher 4
9:00-9:30	Observe teacher 5	Observe teacher 6	Observe teacher 7	Observe teacher 8
9:30-10:00	Interview teacher 5	Interview teacher 6	Interview teacher 7	Interview teacher 8
10:00-10:30	Observe teacher 9	Observe teacher 10	Observe teacher 11	Observe teacher 12

10:30 - 11:00	Interview teacher 9	Interview teacher 10	Interview teacher 11	Interview teacher 12
-----------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

11:00—1:00. Team members meet to discuss findings so far and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch). Members use time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information.

1:00—2:00. Team structured time. Members will identify any gaps in the evidence collected and may request additional information from the principal in the form of documents, meetings with classroom teachers, curriculum facilitators, content-area specialists, grade-level instructors, or other specific individuals or groups who can respond to questions relevant to the panel review protocol.

	REVIEWER A	REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C	REVIEWER D
1:00 - 2:00				

2:00—2:30 p.m. Closing meeting with the principal to discuss next steps (all members are present)

2:30—5:00 p.m. Members deliberate and form conclusions.