

REPORT OF TWO YEAR FOLLOW UP REVIEW

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

E.J. Harrington School

Lynn Public Schools

Executive Summary

Harrington has shown improvement in student performance since the initial Panel Review. The Composite Performance Index (CPI) has improved every year since the Panel Review, and the school has achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA and math, for the aggregate and all subgroups, in 2003 and 2004. In 2005, the school made Adequate Yearly Progress in ELA, but did not make AYP in math. Performance level data show proficiency levels increased in Grade 4 ELA, but decreased in Grade 3 reading and Grade 4 math. Composite Performance Index comparisons demonstrate that Harrington has the second highest percentage increase in CPI and third highest CPI point gains among the other 18 district elementary schools from 2002 to 2005. Harrington also had a higher CPI in ELA than five of six selected schools with similar subgroup populations in 2005, and it was the only school in this peer group that made AYP for the aggregate and for subgroups from 2003 to 2005. Harrington's CPI in math was slightly lower than its selected peers, but was still among the schools with 'No Status' in math, because the school made AYP in math in 2003 and 2004.

In the 2003-2004 school year, a new principal with expertise in curriculum and instruction was appointed to Harrington. The principal has established effective systems, structures, and a collegial work culture to implement and monitor improvement plan initiatives. The School Improvement Planning (SIP) process has engaged the entire staff, and has led to the adoption of effective instructional strategies and classroom practices. The adoption of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model has improved instruction, and the Curriculum and Instruction Teachers (CITs) and the reading specialist support the use of student achievement data in differentiating instruction. Data analysis, collaboration, and commitment to the SIP Instructional Change Objectives and the Student Learning Objectives (ICOs and SLOs) are entrenched in the school culture. Teachers participate in voluntary professional development opportunities and take on additional duties to support the implementation of the SIP.

The Harrington has a skilled and dedicated staff, and their efforts have been organized in a collegial work environment to improve instructional quality and student achievement. Parents and teachers note an improvement in the learning environment, and students understand and buy-in to the school's expectations for their behavior and performance. However, the Harrington School has limited planning time, technology, and staffing for after-school academic support. Further, staff report that additional stress is created by the extra time involved in their planning efforts, although they articulate commitment to the work. Teachers have been taking professional development courses beyond the school day and year (the district accepts the PDPs earned for salary increment or pay staff for their extra time). Also, staff interviewed by the team report that

constant oversight by the DOE creates stressful working conditions for staff working to improve student achievement. An increase in funding has supported professional development, salaries for additional curriculum and instruction teachers (CITs), a building substitute, school improvement planning, and additional technology (Dana boards), but most of the funding is from grant sources. Thus, funding for the continued level of professional development, CIT support, planning, and acquiring additional technology is limited and unreliable. However, the Superintendent has promised continued support for the Harrington school improvement initiatives, in spite of limited district funds, as he has committed in the past two years.

Because of whole-school engagement in the SIP process and district support, conditions are currently in place to sustain the gains achieved and to support continued improvement in student performance. As the school and district faces additional challenges, long-range planning and readjustment are keys to sustaining the improvement. The school's distributive management, staff buy-in, and professional capacity currently support the sustainability of the Harrington's school improvement systems.

Priority Findings

I. Student performance has improved overall at the Harrington.

- The school's aggregate Composite Performance Index (CPI) in ELA and math increased in 2004 and 2005. The CPI gain in ELA was 7.8 in 2004 and 7.5 in 2005. The CPI gain in math was 18.3 in 2004 and 0.8 in 2005.
- In 2005, the school made AYP in ELA; in 2003 and 2004, the school made AYP in ELA and math.
- CPI scores for all subgroups improved in 2004 and 2005. In 2005, Hispanics had a 10.7 gain in ELA. In 2004, LEP students made a 20 point gain in ELA and a 29.5 point gain in math. Other 2004 math gains in CPI included 30.4 points for SPED students, 19.9 points for low-income students, and 19.4 points for Hispanic students.
- On the Grade 4 ELA test, the percentage of students scoring at or above the level of 'Proficient' level increased steadily from 2001-2005.
- Between 2004 and 2005, the percentage of students scoring at or above the 'Proficient' level decreased on the Grade 3 reading and the Grade 4 math MCAS tests; however,
 - Proficiency on the Grade 4 math MCAS test steadily increased from 2002-2004 and the percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category decreased from 2002-2005, and
 - Proficiency on the Grade 3 reading test increased for regular education students from 2001 to 2004, and decreased by only three percentile points in 2005 (from 39 to 36 percent 'Proficient').
- Harrington had a higher CPI gain and CPI percentage increase from 2002 to 2005 than most of its district peers, with the second highest percentage increase in CPI and third highest CPI point gain in ELA and in math.
- Harrington performed higher in ELA than five of six selected elementary schools with similar subgroup populations, and was the only school in the peer group that made AYP for the aggregate and for subgroups from 2003 to 2005.

II. The principal has established effective systems and structures to implement and sustain improvement initiatives.

- The principal has received district support to implement change initiatives at the Harrington.
 - The district intentionally selected a principal with extensive experience in curriculum development and instruction.
 - The school support specialist provides active and direct district support to the school.
 - The district has increased financial support, staffing, and autonomy to support school-based implementation of improvement initiatives.
- The principal has effectively engaged the staff to develop the School Improvement Plan.
 - The principal involves staff in developing and refining the SIP.
 - The principal effectively monitors SIP implementation through ongoing supervision and evaluation processes.
 - The principal empowers staff to own, manage, and refine the SIP strategies and action steps.
 - Teachers describe an improvement in the SIP process since the arrival of the new school leadership.
- The SIP is focused on improving instruction.
 - The SIP contains standards-based Instructional Change Objectives (ICOs) and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).
 - The team found in classroom observations that teachers used SIP instructional strategies across the school, and the team rated teaching at the “above average” level.
 - School leadership and staff report that the SIP is effective in improving instruction.
 - The current SIP is based on the diagnostic root cause analysis in the original SIP approved by the Board of Education.
 - Through a review of documents, classroom observations, and interviews, the team found that the school continues to implement, refine, and develop SIP strategies to improve instruction.
- The principal is an instructional leader who effectively monitors the SIP implementation.
 - The principal is present in classrooms on a daily basis.
 - The principal gives instructional feedback through structured “SIOP Walkthroughs.”
 - The principal monitors teacher use of “Evidence boxes” in which teachers file student work demonstrating SLO goals.
 - The principal monitors math and writing assessment folders to ensure ongoing progress towards SLO goals.
 - The principal checks plan books for alignment with the SIP.
 - The principal provides informative and prescriptive feedback through the formal process.
- The principal has empowered staff to own, manage, and refine SIP elements.
 - The principal has encouraged staff ownership of the SIP
 - Teachers collaborate to implement change objectives in classrooms.

- Staff has initiated ways to make the SIP more effective.
- The leadership and faculty plan with an awareness of the connections between instruction and student improvement and are working to improve the SIP.
 - School leadership described subgroup analysis as a next step.
 - The leadership and faculty plan with an awareness of the links between student needs; instructional content, method, and strategies; and student achievement.
 - The instructional change objectives in the SIP are based on a root cause analysis, and have been implemented in the school.
 - Although SIP goals do not specify targets or benchmark performance on all assessments, the school has benchmarks for ELA and teachers use student achievement data to make decisions.
 - Further, staff report that the district is working on benchmarks for mathematics.

III. School improvement efforts are supported by a skilled, committed group of staff, and an increase in funding to support improvement initiatives. Although challenges remain, the school has effectively deployed staff to implement the SIP and improve instructional quality.

- The staff is skilled, committed, and deployed to promote student learning.
 - The district has built staff capacity at Harrington.
 - The Harrington staff is highly trained.
 - The district and school have deployed staff to provide targeted instruction by maintaining a small class size, implementing an SEI program at each grade level, and implementing a Newcomers class for students needing school and culture adjustment support in addition to English language instruction.
 - The staff demonstrates high levels of personal commitment through voluntary and uncompensated efforts.
 - Teachers, parents, and students report an improvement in the learning environment and the collective efforts to improve student achievement.
- District and school staffs are working to overcome current limits of the instructional program.
 - Classrooms have no computers for teacher use in planning, data analysis, and instruction. However,
 - Teachers continue to plan and use assessment data without the benefit of adequate technology, and
 - The district is planning to use the Risograph equipment purchased in spring 2005 to aid in assessment.
 - The district applied for and received a settlement of \$950,000 as a result of a class action law suit against Microsoft. School and district staff report that a portion of this money will be spent to upgrade technology at Harrington.
- The district and the school are working to increase student attendance and time on learning.
 - Recognizing the impact on student attendance of the half-day program for Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten, district leadership applied for a DOE grant to support a district-wide all day kindergarten. In March 2006, after the site visit, the school was notified that the district received the grant in the amount of \$735,000.

- The district has purchased Connect Ed to improve student attendance.
- District and school staffs plan with an awareness of the causes for poor attendance and chronic absenteeism, especially for lower grades, on student progress.
- District staff plans with an awareness of the impact of the mobile transient population, heightened by the proximity of homeless shelters, on instruction.
- Planning time is limited to 90 minutes personal planning time per week and 30 minutes common planning time per week.
 - However, staff reports an attempt to maximize planning time through focused and purposeful meetings.
- Teachers actively seek formal and informal professional growth opportunities in spite of limits to the district professional development program.
 - Teachers actively seek and obtain professional development beyond the district. There is no set limit to the number of hours of compensated professional development in which teachers may participate.
 - Teachers seek collegial support to implement the academic program to compensate for some perceived inadequacies in professional development to support implementation of the program materials.
 - The district has employed two retired teachers who manage the mentoring program so that all first year teachers are assigned a mentor.
- Teachers seek collegial support to implement the academic program and identify strategies to improve the implementation of existing programs.
 - Teachers articulate awareness that the English Language Arts program needs more scaffolding for the current student population.
 - Teachers articulate awareness that the Growing with Math Program provides insufficient coverage, and the school has implemented Calendar Math to improve coverage of math content.
- In the face of budget limitations, the district has secured external funding for key improvement initiatives.
 - The district has secured a Read First grant to fund the reading coach.
 - Title I has funded CITs.
 - Health and wellness has funded a school adjustment counselor.
 - The district has acquired support from local business partners and General Electric to augment professional development efforts.
 - In March 2006, after the site visit, the district presented confirmation of a \$950,000 voucher award from Microsoft for hardware and software purchases. School and district staff report that a portion of this money will be spent to upgrade technology at Harrington.
 - In March 2006, after the site visit, the school was notified that the district received a DOE grant to support a district-wide all day kindergarten.

IV. The school has put in place the leadership, staff, structures, and professional development to sustain the gains achieved and to support continued improvement in student performance. Leadership continues to prepare the school and district for further challenges.

- The school has put in place the leadership, staff, structures, and professional development to sustain the gains achieved and to support continued improvement in student performance.
 - Leadership, with support from district and staff, consistently monitors SIP implementation.
 - The school is focused on priority improvements to teaching and learning and using formative student achievement data.
 - The school makes effective use of distributive management.
 - The school has a skilled staff with key responsibility areas.
 - Staff has a high level of involvement, collaboration, and support
 - Stakeholders report an increased level of student buy-in and parent involvement.
 - Teachers continue to improve the implementation of curricular program and the use of data.
- Leadership continues to prepare the school and district for further challenges.
 - The district plans to develop an individual pupil profile to organize assessment data of all students.
 - The math CIT is aware of the need to implement diagnostic math assessments for progress monitoring, as the school has in place for reading.
 - Although funding is limited, staff has articulated the need for increased support for students in after-school programs and tutoring.
- The district is creating new opportunities to promote student achievement.
 - The district has implemented quarterly assessments to monitor student growth.
 - The district is planning to implement a new math program.
 - The district plans to enable teachers to use Risograph equipment to assist them in correcting assessments.
- The district is working to overcome current threats to the school's continued improvement.
 - Funding is unavailable for all identified needs, such as a comprehensive after-school program, a district data analyst, a grant writer, and adequate technology.
 - Funding was reduced because of the decline in student population.
 - Reductions in grants affected available resources for the school.
 - District and school leadership have worked to overcome threats to problematic staff turnover.
 - The superintendent supports the school leadership in maintaining an effective staff, for a decline in student population may result in staff reductions and "bumping" of Harrington staff.
 - Staff articulated a concern for teacher burnout due to high work levels. However, staff articulated a continued commitment to school goals, the students, and each other.
 - School leadership is currently stable.

- There is currently no document connecting all school structures, roles, and assessments, creating the threat that current connections could weaken without this explicitness in the event of leadership or staff changes. However, school leadership is aware of the needs, and continues to focus on priorities to build capacity and systems for longevity.
- Staff articulates confidence that the school's staff buy-in and the staff professional capacity will support the sustainability of the Harrington's school improvement systems.

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 Harrington developed such a plan, and the Commissioner and Board of Education accepted the plan in December 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 the Harrington. The Follow up Review was conducted on January 24 and 25, 2006.

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 four key questions:

1. Has the school shown improvement in student performance?
2. Is the school effective in using an improvement plan that results in the continuous improvement of student performance?
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. 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 four 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 Harrington is deemed to be chronically underperforming. 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.

HARRINGTON PROFILE

Harrington is one of nineteen elementary schools in Lynn Public Schools and enrolls students in Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 5. Harrington has the third largest student population of the elementary schools in the district with a population of 537 in 2005.

Compared to the district, Harrington has a significantly higher population of low-income students (91 percent versus 74 percent), first language not English (FLNE) students (66 percent versus 44 percent), limited English proficient (LEP) students (41 percent versus 19 percent), and Hispanic students (61 percent versus 36 percent). The school has a significantly lower percentage of White students (17 percent versus 36 percent). Further, according to data provided to the team from the district, 28.6 percent of the White students are FLNE students from Bosnia, Russia, and other countries.

The Harrington School is similar to the district in the percentage of Asians (eight percent versus 11 percent), Black students (14 percent versus 16 percent), and Native Americans (one percent versus zero percent). See Table 1. The school's special education (SPED) population is similar to the district's (16 percent versus 15 percent), but DOE Educational Environment data in School Year (SY) 2005 shows that the school has a higher percentage of SPED students whose primary language is Spanish (38.63 percent) than the district (26.42 percent).

**Table 1. Harrington School
In Comparison to the District and the State
Demographic Factors
2005**

School	N	Low-income	FLNE	LEP	Spec. Ed.	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Native Amer.	White
Harrington	537	91	66	41	16	8	14	61	1	17
Lynn	14,067	74	44	19	15	11	16	36	0	36
State	975,911	28	14	5	16	5	9	12	0.3	74

Data Source: Massachusetts Department of Education data

Among the other 18 district elementary schools, Harrington has the third highest percentage of low-income students, the second highest percentage of minority students, the third highest percentage of FLNE students, and the second highest percentage of LEP students.

Attendance, Suspensions, and Retentions

According to school leadership, some of the programs offered at Harrington typically have a lower attendance rate than other elementary schools in the district. The Harrington has a Pre-Kindergarten (PK) program; only 5 out of 19 elementary schools in the district enroll PK students. Non-mandatory classes significantly impact Harrington's attendance rate. According to school leadership, Harrington school has 38 percent of all the non-mandatory, half-day, SPED

integrated PK classes (6 out of 16) in the district and 38 percent of the students in all of these 16 district classes.

The 2005 attendance rate at the Harrington School was 92.8 percent overall, the second lowest attendance rate of all the district's nineteen elementary schools. The school has a lower attendance rate and a higher average number of days absent than the district at all grade levels. The gap between the school and the district's percentage of chronically absent students is much higher in the lower grades. The school has approximately twice the percentage of chronically absent students in Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten (46.6 percent versus 21.2 percent, and 50 percent versus 25.2 percent respectively). Again, the PK program consists of six half-day non-mandatory classes of special education inclusion pre-school students, with a typically higher rate of student absence. For grades 1-5, Grade 3 shows the widest gap, 13.3 points between Harrington (22.8) and the district (9.5). In Grade 2, the gap is 7.4 points between Harrington (17.1) and the district (9.7) In Grade 1, the gap is 4.8 points between Harrington (22.2) and the district (9.5). In grades 4 and 5, the gap is 0.9 points between the school (9.3) and the district (8.4). See Table 2.

**Table 2. Harrington School
In Comparison to District Elementary Schools
Attendance Statistics
2005**

2005 Attendance	Average Days Absent		Attendance Rate		% Chronically Absent	
	School	District	School	District	School	District
Grades						
PK	16.0	8.9	89.6	93.5	46.6	21.2
K	16.5	11.2	89.6	93.0	50.0	25.2
1	11.1	9.5	93.0	94.3	22.2	17.4
2	10.1	8.1	93.5	95.2	17.1	9.7
3	10.9	7.8	93.5	95.4	22.8	9.5
4	8.0	7.4	95.2	95.6	9.3	8.4
5	8.0	7.4	95.2	95.6	9.3	8.4

Data Source: Department of Education data

Note: The attendance rate equals the average number of students present each day divided by the average number enrolled each day; these attendance rates are calculated differently than AYP attendance determinations. Chronically absent students are students absent more than 10% of school days.

The school's suspension rate was higher than the district's average for each grade from 2003-2005. See Table 3. The overall rate of suspension (4.3 percent) ties for fourth with another elementary school in the district with its rate of out-of-school suspensions. No in-school suspensions are recorded for the Harrington.

**Table 3. Harrington School
In Comparison to District Elementary Schools
Out of School Suspensions
2003-2005**

Suspensions 2003-2005	2003		2004		2005	
	School	District	School	District	School	District
Grades						
PK-3	3.5	1.8	3.4	2.0	3.3	2.2
4	3.8	4.6	3.8	4.0	8.1	5.6
5	7.9	8.7	10.1	7.5	4.4	5.5

Data Source: Department of Education data

Staffing

The school has a principal in her third year at Harrington and an assistant principal in his ninth year at Harrington. Harrington has 47 teachers. Nine are special education teachers and six are bilingual teachers. Forty-three teachers have over four years' teaching experience, up to 37 years in the classroom. Only one teacher is a first-year teacher and two are in their second year. The average (mean) years of teaching experience is 13 years. The average number of years at Harrington is seven years; six teachers are in their first year at the school. Forty-three (96 percent) of the teachers are licensed in their instructional areas, and the remaining two are on waivers. Harrington has ten teacher aides, and nine (90 percent) are certified.

MCAS Results

The aggregate and sub-groups all met *improvement* targets and made AYP in ELA for 2003, 2004, and 2005 and in math for 2003 and 2004. See Tables 4-6. For both years, the aggregate and sub-groups also met all participation and attendance targets, although they failed to meet the performance targets for ELA and for math in 2004 and 2005. (Participation, attendance, and performance data is not included in the tables below.)

**Table 4. Harrington School
Cycle Data
2003-2005**

Aggregate AYP		ELA (change)	CPI	AYP? ELA Agg	AYP? All Subs	Math (change)	CPI	AYP? Math Agg	AYP? All Subs
2003	Mid-cycle III	56.0 (+5.4)		Yes	Yes	48.6 (+15.6)		Yes	Yes
2004	Cycle III (03-04)	58.4 (+7.8)		Yes	Yes	51.3 (+18.3)		Yes	Yes
2005	Mid-cycle IV	66.2 (+7.8)		Yes	Yes	52.1 (+0.8)		No	No

Data Source: Department of Education data

No sub-groups met the performance targets for ELA in 2004 or 2005. The aggregate and all reported sub-groups met CPI improvement targets in 2004 and 2005 for ELA. The CPI in ELA has increased from Mid-cycle III to Mid-cycle IV, from 56.0 to 58.4 to 66.2. See Table 5.

**Table 5. Harrington School
ELA Scaled Scores
2004-2005**

Group	2004 (Cycle III Results)				2005 (Mid-cycle IV Results)				
	N	CPI	Change	Met Imp Target?	N	CPI	Change	Met Target?	Imp
Aggregate	199	58.4	+7.8	Yes	170	66.2	+7.8		Yes
LEP	114	47.4	+20.0	Yes	60	54.2	+6.8		Yes
SPED	35	56.1	+9.2	-	40	68.6	-		-
Low-inc.	189	57.5	+9.5	Yes	163	65.9	+8.4		Yes
Af-Am	22	64.0	+9.2	-	21	70.2	-		-
Asian	15	78.8	-	-	15	-	-		-
Hispanic	135	50.6	+7.2	Yes	109	61.3	+10.7		Yes
N. Amer.	0	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
White	26	77.9	+5.2	-	25	81.3	-		-

Data Source: Department of Education MCAS Data. Note: N=the number assessed, not the number enrolled. A dash (-) represents that the figure was not reported in the DOE data.

The CPI in math in 2005 was 52.1 points, with a small gain of 0.8 points that fell short of the improvement target. In 2004, the school met math CPI improvement targets for the aggregate and for all sub-groups, with an overall CPI gain of 18.3. See Table 6.

**Table 6. Harrington School
Math Scaled Scores
2004-2005**

Group	2004 (Cycle III Results)				2005 (Mid-cycle IV Results)				
	N	CPI	Change	Met Imp Target?	N	CPI	Change	Met Target?	Imp
Aggregate	106	51.3	+18.3	Yes	90	52.1	+0.8		No
LEP	67	47.8	+29.5	-	33	52.7	-		-
SPED	13	42.9	+30.4	-	19	-	-		-
Low-inc.	99	50.6	+19.9	Yes	85	52.2	+1.6		No
Af-Am	-	-	-	-	13	-	-		-
Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Hispanic	77	48.1	+19.4	Yes	60	52.8	+4.7		Yes
N. Amer.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
White	12	60.6	+9.1	-	12	-	-		-

Data Source: Department of Education MCAS Data. Note: N=the number assessed, not the number enrolled. A dash (-) represents that the figure was not reported in the DOE data.

ELA Performance

In ELA, the school has improved at a far greater rate than the district, as is explained later under Key Question 1, although the school has yet to attain the same level of student achievement as other elementary schools in the district as measured by performance on the MCAS tests.

In Grade 3 reading, the school significantly underperformed the district and the state. Improvement gains in Grade 3 reading have not been sustained. The percentage of students performing at the 'Proficiency' level on the Grade 3 MCAS reading test improved from 2003 to 2004, from 22 to 30 percent; but in 2005 proficiency was 24 percent, falling back to 2003 levels. The trends for students in the 'Warning/Failing' category also improved from 31 to 14 percent from 2003 to 2004, then fell back to 30 percent in 2005. The school has not regained levels of proficiency that are comparable to the districts, as it did in 2002, when 41 percent were 'Proficient.' See Table 7

District and school staff reported that the decrease in proficiency on the Grade 3 reading test was due to two factors. One was an increase in newcomers due to district zoning changes. The second factor was the scoring of alternative assessments. School administration reports that during the 2005 MCAS administration, for the very first time, Grade 3 had eleven students with special needs who submitted Alternate Assessments. Each of these students, through their assessments, contributed 100 points toward the calculation of the school's AYP. They received the highest possible scores. However, alternately assessed students are considered by the Department of Education as automatic failures and are included in the statistics of the 'Warning/Failing' category because they are not capable of doing grade level work. Excluding these eleven students from the 'Warning/Failing' percentages would change the rate from 30 percent to 17 percent, according to school and district administrators.

**Table 7. Harrington School
In Comparison to the District and State
Grade 3 MCAS Reading Results
2001-2005**

Year		<i>N</i>	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning/Failing
2005	Harrington	82	24	45	30*
	Lynn	1037	49	40	11
	State	71,463	62	31	7
2004	Harrington	90	30	56	14
	Lynn	1076	51	40	9
	State	73,332	63	30	7
2003	Harrington	108	22	46	31
	Lynn	1141	46	43	11
	State	74,049	63	30	7
2002	Harrington	89	41	52	7
	Lynn	1166	49	43	8
	State	74,423	67	27	6
2001	Harrington	116	14	61	25
	Lynn	1245	44	44	12
	State	75,112	62	31	7

Data Source: Department of Education MCAS Data.
Note: Because of the DOE format for reporting the data, for 2003-2005, n=number tested. For 2001-2002, n=number enrolled.

In Grade 4 ELA, the school has made incremental shifts of students from the ‘Warning/Failing’ to the ‘Needs Improvement’ category and from ‘Needs Improvement’ to ‘Proficient.’ From 2001-2005, the percentage of students in the ‘Warning/Failing’ category has declined from 53 percent to 44, to 42, to 40, to 30 respectively. The percent of students in the ‘Proficient’ category and above climbed from eight percent to 12, to 14, to 14, to 20 percent over the same period. However, the school significantly underperformed the district and the state. See Table 8.

**Table 8. Harrington School
In Comparison to the District and State
Grade 4 MCAS ELA Results
2001-2005**

Year		N				
		Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning/ Failing	
2005	Harrington	90	1	19	50	30
	Lynn	1023	4	32	47	17
	State	72,780	10	40	40	10
2004	Harrington	96	0	14	47	40
	Lynn	1073	3	36	47	13
	State	73,111	11	45	35	9
2003	Harrington	95	1	13	44	42
	Lynn	1119	3	35	45	17
	State	74,852	10	45	34	10
2002	Harrington	129	1	11	44	44
	Lynn	1177	1	33	49	17
	State	74,291	8	46	37	10
2001	Harrington	100	0	8	39	53
	Lynn	1227	1	26	52	21
	State	78849	7	44	38	11

Data Source: Department of Education MCAS Data.

Note: Because of the DOE format for reporting the data, for 2003-2005, n=number tested.

For 2001-2002, n=number enrolled for the district and for 2001 for the state.

Math Performance

MCAS test data indicates that the school consistently has underperformed the district and the state in Grade 4 math, and student improvement gains have not been sufficient or sustained over time.

From 2002-2005, Harrington steadily shifted students from the ‘Warning/Failing’ to the ‘Needs Improvement’ category in Grade 4 math. The percentage of students in the ‘Warning/Failing’ category fell from 64 percent to 42, to 36, to 36 percent respectively. The number of students in the ‘Needs Improvement’ category grew correspondingly, from 31 to 57 percent over that period. However, the school did not sustain previous gains in the percentage of students performing at or above the ‘Proficient’ level in 2005. Proficiency rates grew from 2001-2004, from four to 13 to 14 percent, but fell to eight percent in 2005.

**Table 9. Harrington School
In Comparison to the District and State
Grade 4 MCAS Math Results
2001-2005**

Year		<i>N</i>	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning/ Failing
2005	Harrington	90	1	7	57	36
	Lynn	1022	7	19	52	21
	State	72,737	14	27	44	15
2004	Harrington	96	4	10	49	36
	Lynn	1077	6	22	54	18
	State	73,323	14	28	44	14
2003	Harrington	101	1	12	46	42
	Lynn	1133	5	20	50	25
	State	75,202	12	28	43	16
2002	Harrington	129	1	3	31	64
	Lynn	1177	4	19	46	31
	State	75,649	12	27	42	19
2001	Harrington	100	2	7	33	58
	Lynn	1227	4	19	49	27
	State	78,849	10	24	46	19

*Data Source: Department of Education MCAS Data.
Note: Because of the DOE format for reporting the data, for 2003-2005, n=number tested.
For 2001-2002, n=number enrolled for the district, and for 2005 for the state*

School and district leadership note that improvement has been impacted by changes in the student population of the school. The population is still changing. For the 2005-2006 school year, the school has acquired an SEI classroom of newcomers and a classroom of severely cognitively and physically challenged students.

Further analysis of MCAS test performance is provided in Key Question 1.

PANEL REPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

Yes. The Composite Performance Index has improved every year since the Panel Review, and the school has made AYP for the aggregate and all subgroups in ELA and math for 2003 and 2004 and for ELA in 2005.

The school has improved student achievement from 2002 to 2005 at a higher rate than its district peers, although the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in math in 2005. The school made AYP in math and ELA in 2003 and in 2004. Performance level data show proficiency levels increased in Grade 4 ELA, but decreased in Grade 3 reading and Grade 4 math. Compared to six selected schools having similar subgroup populations in 2005 (see Tables 13-15 below),

Harrington also had a higher Performance Index (CPI) in ELA than five of the schools, but a lower CPI in math than four of the schools.

The following is a subgroup trend analysis and a peer comparison analysis with Lynn elementary schools and demographically similar schools.

Subgroup Trends

In 2005, Harrington's student population was 91 percent low-income, 66 percent first language not English, 41 percent limited English proficient, 16 percent special education, eight percent Asian, 14 percent Black, 61 percent Hispanic, 1 percent Native American, and 17 percent White. See Table 1 in the profile section. Significant trends in subgroup performance in ELA and in math are described below.

ELA Subgroup trends

As shown in Table 5 above, CPI scores in ELA improved significantly for all sub-groups in 2004 and 2005. The largest gains were in the LEP subgroup, with 20 and 6.8 point gains, and in the Hispanic subgroup, with 7.2 and 10.7 point gains.

While DOE does not provide 2001-2005 performance level results for the Hispanic sub-group (nor for other ethnic subgroups or low-income students), performance level results are provided for the LEP and SPED subgroups. These results reveal further trends in ELA performance for LEP students, whose CPI gain in ELA was larger than the aggregate gain and the gain for other subgroups.

Like aggregate performance levels, LEP performance levels improved for Grade 4 ELA, but declined in Grade 3 reading. In Grade 3 reading, the rate of proficiency for LEP students declined from 2002-2005, from 42 percent to 0, to 27, to 14 percent respectively. The percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category vacillated greatly from 58 percent in 2001, to 76, to 23, and to 48 percent in 2005. LEP students underperformed their district peers in 2005, with 27 percent 'Proficient' (compared to 14 percent at Harrington) and 22 percent 'Warning/Failing' (compared to 48 percent at Harrington). For Grade 4 ELA, LEP students at the Harrington gained from 2003-2005, and almost performed at the level of their district peers in 2005. Eight percent of the SPED students scored at or above the 'Proficient' level at Harrington, compared to 12 percent of their district peers in 2005. LEP students had increased rates of proficiency for 2003 to 2005 from 0 to three to eight percent in the 'Proficient' category, and none in the 'Advanced' category. In 2005, the school was only one percentage point higher than the district's rate of 37 percent in 'Warning/Failing.' The school successfully shifted LEP students from the 'Warning/Failing' category to 'Needs Improvement' from 2003-2005, when LEP students in 'Warning/Failing' declined from 80 to 64 to 38 percent.

For SPED students, only 2004 and 2005 results are analyzed because DOE only publicly releases results for student populations greater than ten, and the school had fewer special education students in grades 3 and 4 between 2001 and 2003. In those two years, proficiency in Grade 3 reading for the special education sub-group declined from 21 to 14 percent and the rates of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category increased from 21 to 59 percent. In Grade 4 ELA,

results for SPED students were similar, with a decline in proficiency from eight to ten percent, and an increase of the percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category from 38 to 62 percent. SPED students at the Harrington underperformed their district peers on the Grade 3 reading and the Grade 4 ELA tests. In Grade 3 reading in 2005, 14 percent of Harrington SPED students scored in the 'Proficient' category, versus 27 percent of their district peers. The school also exceeded the district in the percentage of students in 'Warning/Failing,' with 59 percent versus 28 percent. For Grade 4 ELA in 2005, eight percent of special education students were 'Proficient,' while 12 percent of their district peers scored at or above the 'Proficient' level. Harrington SPED students fell in the 'Warning/Failing' category at a rate of 62 percent, versus the district rate of 46 percent.

Math Subgroup Trends

As discussed in the MCAS analysis section, and as shown in Table 6 above, the school did not make AYP for math in 2005. CPI gains in math for the two reported sub-groups were larger in 2004, when Harrington and all five reported subgroups met AYP. In 2005, the aggregate CPI gain of +0.8 and the low-income subgroup gain of +1.6 were too small to meet improvement targets. The only other subgroup reported in 2005 was the Hispanic sub-group, which met improvement targets with a 4.7 point CPI gain. Other subgroups were not reported in 2005 because of an insufficient population. (Cycle III data is reported in 2004, combining 2003 and 2004 results, while Mid-cycle IV data is reported in 2005, containing results only for one test period.) In 2004, all subgroups made significant gains in CPI and met AYP. The low-income, Hispanic, and White sub-groups improved with respective gains of 19.9, 19.4, and 9.1. The largest gains were for the SPED subgroup, with a 30.4 point gain, followed by the LEP subgroup with a 29.5 point gain.

Although SPED and LEP CPI changes are not provided for the purpose of AYP determination because of an insufficient population in 2005, SPED and LEP performance level results show trends up to 2005.

In 2005, Harrington SPED students underperformed their district peers, increasing rates of proficiency, but also increasing the rate of failure from the previous year. In 2004 and 2005, the percentage of SPED students performing at the level of 'Proficient' (none were 'Advanced') increased from zero to ten percent in Grade 4 math. However, the number of students in 'Warning/Failing' also increased, from 54 to 62 percent. SPED students at Harrington underperformed the district on the Grade 4 math test with lower rates of proficiency and higher rates of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category in both years. In 2005, the percentage of SPED students in the 'Warning/Failing' category (62 percent) exceeded the district percentage of SPED students in the 'Warning/Failing' category (53 percent) by nine percentage points. In Grade 4 math, the percentage of students who scored at or above the proficiency level was ten percent, slightly higher than the district's proficiency rate of nine percent. Because the school had fewer than ten special education students in Grade 4 between 2001 and 2003, DOE only publicly released SPED performance level performance for 2004 and 2005.

For LEP students at Harrington, proficiency rates, the percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category on the Grade 4 math test decreased from 2003-2005, although the

percentage of students achieving proficiency did not improve and the school continued to underperform the district. The percentage of proficient LEP students was three percent in 2003, eight percent in 2004, and zero percent in 2005. LEP students shifted steadily from the 'Warning/Failing' to the 'Needs Improvement' category as the percentage of students in 'Warning/Failing' decreased from 53 to 46 to 38 percent. LEP students at Harrington consistently underperformed the district on the Grade 4 math test from 2003 to 2005. In 2005, the district was eight percentage points higher in the rate of students performing at or above the 'Proficient' level (eight versus zero percent) and was three percentage points lower in the rate of students performing in the 'Warning/Failing' category (35 versus 38 percent).

In summary, student performance has improved overall at the Harrington. The school has increased the aggregate Composite Performance Index in ELA and math for the past two years. CPI gain in ELA was 7.5 in 2004 and 7.8 in 2005. CPI gain in math was 18.3 in 2004 and 0.8 in 2005. The school has made AYP in ELA and math for 2003 and 2004 and for ELA in 2005. The school has improved CPI scores for all subgroups. For example, in 2004, LEP made a 20 point gain in ELA and a 29.5 point gain in math. Other subgroups with significant gains in math in 2004 were SPED (30.4), low-income (19.9) and Hispanic (19.4). In 2005, Hispanics had a 10.7 gain in ELA. The percentage of students scoring at or above the 'Proficient' level increased on the Grade 4 ELA test. Although the percentage of students scoring at or above the 'Proficient' level decreased on the Grade 3 reading and the Grade 4 math MCAS tests, proficiency on the Grade 4 math MCAS test steadily increased from 2002-2004, and the percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category decreased from 2002-2005. Further, proficiency on the Grade 3 reading test has increased for regular education students from 2001 to 2004, and decreased by only three percentage points in 2005 (from 39 to 36 percent 'Proficient'). Again, district and school staff reported that the decrease in proficiency on the Grade 3 reading test was due to an increase in newcomers due to zoning changes and the scoring of alternative assessments.

School and district administrators reported that Harrington's proficiency levels on the MCAS test scores were negatively affected by the MCAS test performance of the special education students and the LEP students in the Newcomers class. The school did not provide the team with data to verify this claim, and the DOE has no provisions for a separate subgroup for this population. The school support specialist reported that the percentage of Grade 3 students in the 'Warning/Failing' category was 17 percent before the 11 alternative assessments were included as part of the failure rate. This inclusion increased the percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category to 30 percent. The school support specialist and the principal reported that the newly arrived Somalian population was likely to be the lowest performing subgroup. Like other limited English proficient students, Somalian students in the Newcomers class took the MCAS test, along with the MEPA and MELA-O. The administrators reported that this sub-group was believed to have the lowest performing students, since they arrive from refugee camps with little background knowledge, social skills, academic exposure, or preparation for a structured school environment.

Peer Comparisons

A peer comparison analysis provides a more complete picture of student achievement at the Harrington School. Harrington has a unique demographic compared to the 1,873 schools in the

Commonwealth. According to Department of Education Selected Student Population data, Harrington has the 25th highest percentage of low-income students, 27th highest percentage of LEP students, and the 44th highest percentage of FLNE students. In other words, the school is in the top three percent of all the schools in the percentages of low-income, LEP, and FLNE students.

The peer comparison analysis is in two sections. The first section compares ELA and math MCAS test performance of all the Lynn public elementary schools in terms of the 2005 CPI scores and the CPI change from 2002 to 2005. The second section compares ELA and math MCAS test performance between Harrington and selected schools with comparable student subgroup populations in terms of CPI and AYP status.

Peer Analysis: Lynn Public Elementary Schools

Interpretation of Lynn elementary school comparison data should account for demographic differences among the schools. According to administrators interviewed by the team, Harrington's demographic differences are partially due to the school's location and its programs. Harrington offers Sheltered English Immersion classes at each grade level and also houses the Newcomers class for LEP students lacking school experience. Note that subgroup data reveals differences in LEP populations, but does not reveal differences within LEP populations such as educational background from the country of origin. Of the 19 Lynn elementary schools, Harrington was the second largest school with the second highest low-income and LEP populations and the third highest FLNE populations. See Table 10.

Table 10.
Harrington School Demographics
In Comparison to Lynn Elementary Schools
2005

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	ENROLLMENT	% LOW INCOME	% SPED	% FLNE	% LEP
Aborn	256	55	9	23	13
Brickett	268	85	11	40	22
Callahan	513	74	10	45	25
Cobbet	725	90	11	67	31
Connery	456	81	20	68	43
Drewicz	392	85	18	55	29
Fallon	151	76	21	31	16
Ford	859	92	12	51	23
Harrington	537	91	16	66	41
Hood	379	71	21	32	13
Ingalls	518	90	14	62	40
Lincoln	252	64	4	19	5
Lynn Woods*	142	33	17	6	1
Sewell	257	42	13	21	14
Shoemaker*	374	36	20	14	7
Sisson	454	51	11	25	9
Tracy	223	89	14	51	24
Washington	330	90	7	63	36
District Average	394	72	14	41	22
State Total	975,911	28	16	14	5

* Non Title I schools. Data Source: Department of Education data and Lynn Public School data.

With a composite performance index score of 66.2 in ELA in 2005, Harrington had the second lowest performance in the district, and lagged 24.1 index points behind Lynn Woods, the district's highest performing school in ELA. Lynn Woods School is the smallest school with the lowest percentage of low-income students in the district, with 33 percent low-income students versus 91 percent at the Harrington. However, the trend data indicates that Harrington had the third highest CPI change in ELA from 2002 to 2005, with a 15.6 index point gain over the period. Harrington also had the second highest percentage growth over the period, with a 31 percent increase from 2002 to 2005. See Table 11.

Table 11.
Harrington School ELA CPI
In Comparison to Lynn Elementary Schools
2002-2005

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	02 CPI BASELINE	03 CPI YR 1	CHANGE 02-03	04 CPI YR 2	CHANGE 03-04	05 CPI YR 3	CHANGE 04-05	CHANGE 02-05	% INCREASE 02-05
Aborn	84.0	79.5	-4.5	81.9	2.4	82.8	0.9	-1.2	-1%
Brickett	84.9	82.8	-2.1	82.1	-0.7	82.6	0.5	-2.3	-3%
Callahan	80.0	81.1	1.1	79.8	-1.3	77.2	-2.6	-2.8	-4%
Cobbet	59.3	72.1	12.8	77.1	5.0	77.0	-0.1	17.7	30%
Connery	58.2	65.0	6.8	70.3	5.3	71.2	0.9	13	22%
Drewicz	68.5	74.0	5.5	75.5	1.5	73.6	-1.9	5.1	7%
Fallon	78.3	80.1	1.8	80.4	0.3	80.6	0.2	2.3	3%
Ford	81.9	85.8	3.9	85.0	-0.8	81.4	-3.6	-0.5	-1%
Harrington	50.6	53.4	2.8	58.4	5.0	66.2	7.8	15.6	31%
Hood	71.4	80.8	9.4	79.8	-1.0	78.6	-1.2	7.2	10%
Ingalls	62.9	70.2	7.3	66.7	-3.5	62.4	-4.3	-0.5	-1%
Lincoln	84.7	86.6	1.9	85.7	-0.9	75.0	-10.7	-9.7	-11%
Lynn Woods	80.1	76.8	-3.3	83.2	6.4	90.3	7.1	10.2	13%
Sewell	72.0	66.6	-5.4	70.1	3.5	83.7	13.6	11.7	16%
Shoemaker	81.5	87.0	5.5	88.9	1.9	85.8	-3.1	4.3	5%
Sisson	80.8	86.3	5.5	84.9	-1.4	78.3	-6.6	-2.5	-3%
Tracy	60.7	72.3	11.6	75.3	3.0	80.0	4.7	19.3	32%
Washington	65.0	68.1	3.1	71.7	3.6	71.4	-0.3	6.4	10%
District Average	72.5	76.0	3.5	77.6	1.6	77.7	0.1	5.2	7%
State Total	81.2	83.2	2.0	84.2	1.0	83.7	-0.5	2.5	3%

Data Source: Department of Education data and Lynn Public School data

With a composite performance index score of 52.1 in math in 2005, Harrington had the lowest performance in the district, and lagged 32 index points behind Sewell-Anderson, the district's highest performing school in math. However, trend data indicates that Harrington had the third highest CPI change in math from 2002 to 2005, with a 19.1 index point gain over the period. Harrington also had the second highest percentage growth over the period, with a 58 percent increase from 2002 to 2005. See Table 12.

Table 12.
Harrington School Math CPI
In Comparison to Lynn Elementary Schools
2002-2005

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	02 CPI BASELINE	03 CPI YR 1	CHANGE 02-03	04 CPI YR 2	CHANGE 03-04	05 CPI YR 3	CHANGE 04-05	CHANGE 02-05	% INCREASE 02-05
Aborn	79.1	68.8	-10.3	76.1	7.3	73.4	-2.7	-5.7	-7%
Brickett	82.1	70.8	-11.3	69.9	-0.9	70.6	0.7	-11.5	-14%
Callahan	65.4	59.2	-6.2	67.0	7.8	75.0	8.0	9.6	15%
Cobbet	47.0	61.0	14.0	60.5	-0.5	58.4	-2.1	11.4	24%
Connery	45.2	55.6	10.4	61.8	6.2	68.3	6.5	23.1	51%
Drewicz	65.9	60.1	-5.8	64.7	4.6	54.2	-10.5	-11.7	-18%
Fallon	NA	65.1	NA	61.4	-3.7	65.0	3.6	-0.1	0%
Ford	57.8	61.9	4.1	63.5	1.6	64.6	1.1	6.8	12%
Harrington	33.0	48.6	15.6	51.3	2.7	52.1	0.8	19.1	58%
Hood	55.1	66.1	11.0	61.9	-4.2	60.7	-1.2	5.6	10%
Ingalls	48.6	63.3	14.7	59.7	-3.6	55.4	-4.3	6.8	14%
Lincoln	79.0	70.5	-8.5	73.2	2.7	68.2	-5.0	-10.8	-14%
Lynn Woods	62.0	66.3	4.3	75.0	8.7	73.8	-1.2	11.8	19%
Sewell	56.1	50.7	-5.4	59.3	8.6	84.1	24.8	28	5%
Shoemaker	72.4	77.2	4.8	76.1	-1.1	70.0	-6.1	-2.4	-3%
Sisson	70.2	77.6	7.4	75.6	-2.0	75.0	-0.6	4.8	7%
Tracy	42.2	72.0	29.8	72.3	0.3	75.0	2.7	32.8	78%
Washington	50.4	55.5	5.1	57.1	1.6	57.7	0.6	7.3	14%
District Average	59.5	63.9	4.3	65.9	2.0	66.8	0.8	7.3	12%
State Total	65.4	69.4	5.0	71.4	2.0	72.4	1.0	7	11%

Data Source: Department of Education data and Lynn Public School data

Peer Analysis: Schools with Comparable Subgroup Populations

The team used DOE Selected Student Population data to identify elementary schools in other districts with comparable subgroup populations. Although no schools were comparable to Harrington for each subgroup population, six schools were identified with high percentages of low-income students (90 to 91 percent), FLNE students (49 to 80 percent), and LEP students (36 to 50 percent). The percentages of SPED students ranged from 14 to 27 percent in the peer schools selected. Four schools from Boston were selected: the Blackstone, Harvard-Kent, Paul A. Dever, and Sarah Greenwood Elementary Schools. The other two schools selected were Morgan Elementary School in Holyoke and the Ingalls in Lynn. See Table 13.

Table 13.
Harrington School Subgroup Populations
In Comparison to Demographically Similar Schools
2005

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	% LOW INCOME	% SPED	% FLNE	% LEP
Harrington	Lynn	537	91	16	66	41
Blackstone	Boston	626	91	27	60	50
Harvard-Kent	Boston	460	90	20	57	44
Ingalls	Lynn	518	90	14	62	40
Morgan Elementary	Holyoke	512	90	25	80	38
Paul A. Dever	Boston	500	90	16	49	36
Sarah Greenwood	Boston	392	92	16	57	40

Data Source: Department of Education data

Harrington's ELA CPI of 66.2 was the second highest compared to the other schools. The median CPI in ELA of the seven schools was 61.4 and the median was 62.4 in 2005. Only Harrington and two other schools had no status for AYP performance. Three of the peer schools were 'Identified for improvement,' and one was in 'Restructuring' for math in 2005. Harrington was also the only of the seven schools to make AYP in ELA for three consecutive years between 2003 and 2005 for the aggregate and all subgroups. See Table 14.

Table 14.
Harrington School ELA CPI
In Comparison to Demographically Similar Schools
2002-2005

ELA CPI RANK 2005	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	MET AYP? AGGREGATE/SUBS				AYP STATUS FOR ELA	AGG CPI 2005
		2002	2003	2004	2005		
1	Sarah Greenwood	Y/NA	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/N	No Status	77.0
2	Harrington	N/NA	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	No Status	66.2
3	Harvard-Kent	Y/NA	N/N	N/N	N/N	Identified for improvement	64.7
4	Ingalls	Y/NA	Y/N	Y/Y	N/N	No Status	62.4
5	Paul A. Dever	N/NA	N/N	N/N	N/N	Restructuring	57.8
6	Morgan Elementary	Y/NA	N/N	N/N	N/N	Identified for improvement	51.7
7	Blackstone	Y/NA	N/N	N/N	Y/N	Identified for improvement	49.9

Data Source: Department of Education data

Harrington's math CPI of 52.1 ranked fifth of the seven peer schools. The mean math CPI was 55.6 and the median was 55.4 in 2005. However, Harrington was among the five schools in the peer group to have 'No Status;' the lowest two comparison schools were 'Identified for improvement' in 2005. See Table 15.

Table 15.
Harrington School Math CPI
In Comparison to Demographically Similar Schools
2002-2005

MATH CPI RANK 2005	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MET AYP? AGGREGATE/SUBS				AYP STATUS FOR MATH	AGG CPI 2005
		2002	2003	2004	2005		
1	Sarah Greenwood	Y/NA	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	No Status	66.6
2	Harvard-Kent	Y/NA	N/N	Y/Y	Y/Y	No Status	64.9
3	Paul A. Dever	N/NA	N/N	Y/Y	Y/Y	No Status	60.8
4	Ingalls	N/NA	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/N	No Status	55.4
5	Harrington	N/NA	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/N	No Status	52.1
6	Blackstone	Y/NA	N/N	N/N	Y/Y	Identified for Improvement	50.5
7	Morgan Elementary	Y/NA	Y/Y	N/Y	N/N	Identified for improvement	38.8

The comparative peer analysis demonstrated that the Harrington has performed and improved at a rate comparable to or higher than schools with similar subgroup populations, especially in ELA. The district peer analysis also demonstrated that Harrington has improved student performance at a higher rate than over 80 percent of their district peers in ELA and in math from 2002-2005.

Key Question 1 described Harrington's success in improving student performance. Key Question 2 describes the effectiveness of district and school actions in implementing a plan to result in continuous improvement.

KEY QUESTION 2: Is the school effective in using an improvement plan that results in the continuous improvement of student performance?

Yes. The principal has established effective systems, structures, and a collegial work culture to implement and monitor improvement plan initiatives, resulting in the continuous improvement of student performance.

After a Panel Review led to the school's designation as underperforming in 2003, the district replaced the principal of Harrington. The current principal started the summer of 2003 and was present at the time of the Fact Finding Review. The principal attended the PIM training along with the vice-principal, who had been at Harrington for six years, and a leadership team of teachers. The team developed the School Improvement Plan, and the principal immediately involved staff in understanding school performance data, the instructional change objectives (ICOs) in the SIP, and identifying ways that they could work toward those objectives in the classroom. Staff reported an immediate change in the school culture and expectations for communication, work, participation, and collaboration. Fewer than five teachers left the school, and staff reported that the change from top-down leadership and classroom isolation was welcomed.

In 2004-2005, the school implemented major program changes. The district chose Harrington as school one of recipients of the Reading First Grant. The district implemented Harcourt Trophies program across all grades PK-5; previously, Harcourt Trophies was used only for grades 4 and 5. The Rigby program was instituted for the SEI classes. The Early Reading Intervention (ERI) was also incorporated for use with at-risk students. The school implemented Calendar Math to supplement the existing Growing with Math curriculum in the areas of geometry and measurement.

At the time of the review, in the middle of the 2005-2006 school year, faculty reported plans developed from their summer attendance at the Raising Achievement Institute, which was attended by 90 percent of the faculty. The Institute was funded mostly by the Department of Education, with some supplemental funding from a district business partner and the Lynn Teachers Union. A new code of conduct and a parent participation program are two examples of teacher-led initiatives. The school is continuing the above-mentioned initiatives instituted the previous two years and other practices staff has found effective. All teachers participate in grade-level team meetings in their weekly 30-minute common planning time block to discuss student performance data and instructional strategies. Monthly two-hour faculty meetings are used for professional development and school improvement purposes. The leadership team meets for an additional hour per month after-school. New teachers meet once a month with the principal. Most teachers participate in (unpaid) after-school professional development sessions for PDPs, and one (paid) Saturday session was held in the current school year, with a reported 80 percent participation rate.

The principal has established effective systems and structures to implement and sustain improvement initiatives, with district support. The district selected the principal because of her extensive experience in curriculum development, and assigned the School Support Specialist to work closely with the school, along with other Lynn schools, to support SIP implementation. Each school's SIP contributes to the district's development of the DIP, according to district staff in interviews. District staff also reported that the district also considers data analysis conducted on the district level to create the DIP. To increase school capacity in the implementation of improvement initiatives, the district has provided increased financial support, staffing, and autonomy to Harrington.

School leadership reports that the district has been very supportive of the school's improvement efforts. According to the superintendent, the Harrington principal was chosen as the school leader because of her work in the district office as a curriculum and instruction administrator, and her efficacy in her prior role as a teacher. The superintendent reported he chose the new principal based on the school's need for an instructional leader who "understood that all children can learn, and had a solid understanding of teacher and learning and would change the school culture."

District staff reports that the principal has brought a sense of urgency to Harrington, and provided evidence that the school has posted more improvement gains in CPI than any other Lynn school from 2002-2005. Teachers interviewed by the team said that the current school leadership and her instructional initiatives, particularly SIOP, were key in improving the school.

Teachers indicate that the school has made many improvements since the initial Panel Review. Student behavior is now addressed proactively with a code of conduct and the support of the administration. Students with special needs and in need of extra support receive differentiated instruction. Inclusion and integrated classrooms are improving student achievement. Teachers are using data analysis to improve instruction with the support of CITs. The SIP process has improved since the Panel Review, and the process has been a vehicle for change. The principal involves staff in developing and refining the SIP, and empowers staff to own, manage, and refine the SIP strategies and action steps.

Improvements to the SIP Process since the Panel Review

School staff members report that the principal has effectively engaged the staff to develop and implement the instructional initiative in the School Improvement Plan. In 2003-2004, the leadership focused on implementing the Sheltered English Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and the ICOs to improve teaching. School staff describes the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) as the model for instruction. Recognizing SIOP as a “best practice,” this model was identified and adopted by Harrington, leading the district in deciding to disseminate the model throughout the Lynn school district.

The principal has encouraged staff ownership of the SIP by protecting the use of common planning time on an ongoing basis, promoting SIP implementation through professional development, and creating a culture of collegial refinement, commitment, and improvement. Teachers collaborate to implement change objectives in classrooms on their own as well as during common planning time, according to staff interviewed by the team. Further, staff has initiated ways to make the SIP more effective. Teachers have closed identified gaps in curriculum and assessment. As a result, the school has adopted the Calendar Math Every Day Counts program, and QAR and GWM assessments. The principal reported that a team of math educators in the district, chaired by a member of the Harrington faculty, is currently realigning the elementary math curriculum to further identify gaps and coordinate assessments. Through the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) grant, a math consultant is specifically addressing formative assessments as a backward design to developing and realigning the curriculum.

The SIP is Focused on Improving Instruction

Implementation of the SIP is evident throughout the school. The SIP contains standards-based Instructional Change Objectives (ICO) and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). School leadership and staff report that the SIP is effective in improving instruction. A Reading First teacher and six CITs model lessons, provide small group interventions, perform specialized assessments, perform data analyses with grade level teams, and help teachers with content issues. They have identified links between the instructional programs and the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, gaps in curriculum, and measures to fill gaps in instruction. They have also developed rubrics and created assessments to support the effective use of formative assessment data to adjust instruction.

The SIP is tied to the school’s adoption of the Sheltered SIOP as a vehicle for improving instruction, and SIOP implementation is supported by sustained professional development and

supervision. Teachers credit SIP strategies with improving their own instruction. For example, the SIP has increased teachers consciousness of pacing issues to ensure alignment with the MCAS tests. The SIP process resulted in an increase of time on learning to 120 minutes in ELA and 90 minutes in math. In classroom observations, the team found that teachers used SIP instructional strategies across the school. Teaching was rated by team at the “above average” level.

SIOP is consulted in lesson planning and during the administrator’s walk-through visits. School staff attributes SIOP with the increase in the performance of all students, because “it is a better way of teaching,” especially for LEP students. Initially, eighty percent of the teachers received SIOP training. Currently, over 90 percent of the school’s teachers have received SIOP training, and most have completed “SIOP II” training. To document teacher efforts to implement the ICOs, the leadership instituted “evidence boxes.” The evidence box is a portable black file with a separate folder for each ICO in the SIP. Teachers continue to date to file lessons or student work with an attached cover sheet that documents the connection between the evidence and the ICO and describe the SIOP strategy incorporated in the lesson. The leadership team was restructured to provide curriculum and instruction support with six curriculum and instruction teachers (CITs) specializing in lower or upper elementary math, ELA, or ESL.

Curriculum and instruction support teachers provide the backbone of support for data-based instructional improvement and intervention. Prior to instituting the Curriculum and Instruction Teacher (CIT) roles, the school had a “facilitator” providing a similar function. However, the facilitator was under an administrator’s contract, unlike the CITs, whom teachers welcome as peer supports. The group of instructional support teachers consist of five CIT teachers and a Reading First coach who model lessons, provide small group interventions, perform specialized assessments, provide data analyses to grade level teams, and help teachers with content issues. The CITs have also identified gaps in curriculum and supportive measures. CITs have matched curriculum standards with the instructional programs, developed rubrics, created assessments, and identified supplementary materials an instructional methods. One CIT is also chairperson of the Student Study Team, a referral process in which teachers can discuss student issues and potential modifications. It may also serve as a pre-referral process for students that need 504 plans and evaluation for IEP services.

The team observed a common planning time meeting led by a reading coach. The meeting was a very structured 30 minute session in which teachers reviewed DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) data on printouts. Teachers received an item analysis of scores of the students in their classes, and comparison data of student scores across the grade. Grade performance was charted on a graph and compared to student performance in the first test session. Teachers grouped students by the number of items correct on a stem and leaf chart to summarize performance on an interval scale with three student groupings. Students identified as members of the *core* group receive no specific specialized services. Students identified as members of the *supplemental* group receive support in oral reading fluency by their classroom teachers, and students identified as members of the *at-risk* group receive interventions in reading.

Ongoing SIP Development

The new SIP is still in draft form and lacks some elements. The SIP contains no subgroup analysis. Goals aren't specific enough and goals do not specify targets or benchmark performance on all assessments.

However, the leadership and faculty plan with an awareness of the next steps to school improvement. School leadership described subgroup analysis as a next step for the SIP development.

Further, although SIP goals do not specify targets or benchmark performance on all assessments, teachers use student achievement data to make decisions. For example, teachers use a Quick Phonics Screener to identify the specific reasons for a student's low levels of oral reading fluency progress. On an ongoing basis, teachers report that they monitor at-risk students to determine their progress on a real-time basis.

Additionally, faculty recognizes a need for increased instruction using various sources of data, including a staff-initiated Home Survey. This need was reflected in the SIP, which proposes a Problem Solver After-School program, in addition to school's pre-existing partnership with Tower and Gordon to fill in the need in part. The staff continues to refine strategies based on existing ICOs and SLOs. The staff has created new committees to support the SIP as a direct result of a professional development session on the "Results of Raising Student Achievement." For example, one committee established the "Family Meeting Day," reported as a success by parents and staff. School leadership and teachers articulate that there is more work to be done, and that the staff is willing and capable to make further improvements.

Finally, the leadership and faculty articulated to the team awareness of the connections between the SIP and instructional improvement, and that the SIP and instructional improvement process is ongoing. The Raising Student Achievement Institute has promise, according to the leadership team and teachers in focus groups, some of whom described the experience as "excellent," and "unbelievable." 98 percent of the staff participated in this training, including teachers new to the building and paraprofessionals. The school worked on team-building and data applications and use. The superintendent described this institute as "cutting edge." After the conference, teachers set up committees and identified goals. Products of these committees are already evident in the school. The family meeting day, the code of conduct, positive rewards for students, the reading roundtable professional development, the developing consensus meeting, and the home language survey were cited as examples.

Teachers in interviews expressed confidence in and commitment to the school's improvement efforts. Teachers stated that the instructional approach of SIOP is effective; their work expectations and standards are high and continuously refined; they have a high level of collegial collaboration; and the leadership is effective in driving improvement.

Supervision and Evaluation

The principal effectively monitors SIP implementation through ongoing supervision and evaluation processes. The principal and vice-principal provide informal and formal evaluations and ensure teacher accountability. The principal is present in classrooms on a daily basis. Informal accountability measures include a range of spot-checking methods: the SIOP walk-through tool, Growing With Mathematics (GWM) observation tools, checking of the students' writing and math folders, checking the teacher's evidence boxes, and reviewing teacher plan books. The review team found sufficient evidence that informal accountability promoted instructional improvement at Harrington. Teachers and administrators noted that the administrators are highly visible, that brief classroom visits occur on a daily basis, that feedback is often oral rather than recorded in writing, and that their plan books and folders may be checked at any time. The review team also found evidence of implementation of the SIP elements in classrooms. A review of teacher folders found that formal observations were informative, instructive, and timely. In both the formal and informal feedback tools, the team found instances of critical feedback offered by the evaluating administrator. The district has an improvement plan for struggling teachers, but the principal reports that no teacher at Harrington is currently on a plan.

Interviewees indicate that the current formal evaluation system has been restrictive. Formal observations must always be announced with one day's notice, and the evaluation tool needed improvement. A revised teacher evaluation tool with Research for Better Teaching standards was approved in 2004-2005 and fully implemented in 2005-2006. Interviewees report that the new tool is informative. Further, the collective bargaining unit has not hindered the school's efforts to implement changes to the evaluation process or other school improvement efforts.

In summary, the team found that the school is effective in using an improvement plan resulting in continuous improvement. The team's rationale for an affirmative finding is that Harrington uses the SIP effectively, with the principal monitoring SIP implementation across the school, a staff that has taken ownership of the SIP, and whole-school planning with an awareness of the connections between instruction and student improvement. The leadership team attributed overall student improvement to elements related to the SIP implementation process: the adoption of the SIOP model, the change in the teacher culture away from isolation and towards collaboration, and the following of the pacing guides in GWM and Harcourt Trophies to ensure adequate coverage.

This section describes the school's growth since the Panel Review, concerning the quality of implementation and monitoring of improvement plan initiatives at Harrington. Improved school systems, structures, and staff engagement have been the basis for SIP development of the continuous achievement gains described under Key Question 2. Key Question 3 describes key factors contributing to the success of the SIP and key factors limiting the success of the SIP.

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?

Yes, some factors in the school and in the district have contributed to the school's ability to implement their plan, and some factors have been impediments to the school. The team found two major factors affecting the school's ability to implement their plan. An improvement in staff efficacy has contributed to the school's ability to implement the improvement plan. The Harrington has a skilled, committed group of staff whose skills have been organized in a collegial work environment to improve instructional quality and student achievement. However, there are obstacles to the staff doing their work. The team also found that an increase in funding has supported improvement initiatives, mostly from grant sources. However, grant funding is limited and unreliable, so grant-funded improvement initiatives may not be sustainable.

Overview of changes at the Harrington from Initial Panel Review

School improvement efforts are supported by a skilled, committed group of staff, and an increase in funding to support improvement initiatives. Although challenges remain, the school has effectively deployed staff to implement the SIP and improve instructional quality. The school culture is positive and improving. The Harrington was once a school that veteran staff described as a place where teachers were isolated within their classrooms. Teachers report that they now seek support and recommendations from each other and work collegially on teams. Teachers articulate that they are vested in improving student performance and in the well-being of the students. Staff commitment to the school's culture of improvement is evidenced by the percentage of overall participation in professional development sessions. The leadership and teachers have created a culture of caring in the school and in the classroom. A new Harrington pledge is posted throughout the school and recited daily. In classroom observations, the team found that students participate in class, cooperate with their peers, and take care of their materials. Parent participation and involvement has increased in the last three years, according to teachers and parents.

The district and staff credit the school's turnaround initiative to the current principal's leadership. The principal reports that she has put the systems and structures in place and created effective roles for staff that she expects to outlive her leadership. District and staff indicated that Harrington's progress would continue in the absence of the principal because the school's systems are in place and the teachers have ownership of these systems because of their involvement in the turnaround process. Staff also report that the expectations for teaching, learning, collaboration, preparation, and the use of data have been embedded in the school culture. Several teachers noted that they would continue to use SIOP strategies, for example, because now they understand the methods as "just good teaching." The team observed that staff members clearly understood their roles and carried them out in an organized way to promote the school's improvement objectives. Although all staff is able to articulate the school's methods and goals, the school has not yet developed a process chart, organizational chart, or comprehensive role descriptions to document the connections between the programs and assessments to provide seamless continuation in the event of new leadership.

Staff Capacity

The district has provided human resource support that has resulted in a well-qualified instructional staff at Harrington. The school support specialist noted that the district is proactive in its recruitment efforts and judicious in releasing teachers on waivers who fail to make adequate progress toward licensure. Further, although the bargaining agreement allows teachers with seniority to “bump” district teachers in their area of licensure, should a senior teacher be excised, the Superintendent reserves the right to refuse a placement in a particular building. The school principal voiced confidence in the district’s openness to her feedback about prospective teachers.

The district has built staff capacity at the Harrington. As described above, the district built staff capacity by choosing a principal to serve as an instructional leader, implementing a more effective teacher evaluation tool for 2005-2006, and maintaining effective recruiting and staff management practices, including the releasing of teachers on waivers not making adequate progress towards certification. The provision of CITs was also a means to build staff capacity through peer coaching. Because they are not administrators, teachers can seek assistance from CITs without fear of evaluation. The district has maintained a small class size at the Harrington despite a decreasing budget, according to district staff. The district promoted continuity of learning in the event of teacher absence by providing a permanent substitute to the school. Additionally, the district provided special expertise to support language learners by placing at Harrington an SEI program at each level and a Newcomers class to provide instruction to students needing school and culture adjustment support as well as English language instruction.

The school has worked to provide support for a population of students with diverse backgrounds and needs. Sixty-six percent of the students are FLNE (first language not English), representing twenty-three languages. Forty-one percent are also limited English proficient. The majority language is Spanish, representing 54 percent of the families, according to data provided by the principal. The school has one Newcomer’s class for the first-year LEP students of all grades who need a school adjustment class, and Sheltered English Instruction class at each grade level to provide instruction to limited English proficient students during their first year of instruction. The principal reports that “many” teachers speak Spanish, and a Spanish translator attends meetings for families. The school-based Somali teacher in the Newcomer’s class also provides translation for the Somalian population.

The staff is skilled, committed, and deployed to promote student learning. 96 percent of Harrington teachers are certified and staff skills have been bolstered with sustained professional development, and teachers report that participation in voluntary professional development programs is high.

Teachers in interviews stated that the work expectations and standards are high, but planning time, staffing for after school instruction and tutoring, and technology are inadequate. Teachers stated that one 90-minute personal planning time and one 30-minute common planning time per week was inadequate, and teachers had to work extra hours to meet expectations. They stated that students needed more after school homework, support, and tutoring. No computers are

available in classrooms for teacher and student use, so that teachers and CITs had to spend more time for instruction and for data analysis than if technology was adequate. Because the math program is not comprehensive enough, and the English program not scaffolded enough, teachers have to work to cover gaps. While teachers are equipped with training, resources, strategies, and CIT support, time to meet all the expectations is limited. One teacher exclaimed, “What’s next? We can’t work any harder!”

Professional Development

Most teachers at the school reported that the district provided adequate professional development opportunities. Seventy percent of the Harrington teachers reported on the instructional staff survey that the professional development provided by the district is “available and adequate,” while 26 percent responded that it was “available but not adequate.” The teacher’s contract only allows for two days dedicated to professional development. District and school staff reported that in addition to the two professional development days, teachers may enroll in a variety of workshops in the district and at local colleges. Teachers either receive PDPs for salary increment, PDPs, or stipends. For courses mandated by the district teachers receive PDPs for salary or stipends. Accumulated PDPs for salary increments result in pay increases. Teachers may also take a number of workshops strictly for recertification PDPs.

Teachers actively seek and obtain professional development beyond the district limit of four hours a month of compensated professional development activity. Teachers also seek collegial support to implement the academic program to compensate some perceived inadequacies in professional development to support implementation of the program materials. The district has not provided mentors for new teachers, so new teachers also rely on collegial support. Although new teachers have no mentors, the principal recommends that new teachers work closely with CITs, in addition to her monthly meetings with them.

Content-specific training was selected as the top choice for professional development that would provide the most benefit in the instructional staff survey. According to interviewees, no GWM training has been offered for two years. Fifty-two percent of the teachers selected content-specific training as one of their top three choices for professional development.

One of the professional needs that teachers in interviews identified was improved training in the use of their core instructional programs. Harcourt-Trophies training was provided a year after the program was implemented and was only a preview of the materials, lacking support on how to use the program successfully in the classroom. No GWM training has been offered for two years, according to a member of the leadership team.

A review of Individual Professional Development Plans found that the records are current and include a wide range of trainings. Professional development on IPDPs included training in Mass Insights in math, SIOP I and II, PIM planning, MELA-O, literature circles, Mimosa/Growing with Math, graphing interpretation and construction, ELL strategies, rubrics creation, raising student achievement, and Write-On Rethinking Reading and Writing.

Learning Environment

Staff, parents, and teachers report that the school's learning environment has improved. School leadership takes responsibility for problematic behavior. The school has implemented a code of conduct cited often by teachers and students in interviews as clear, fair, and effective. Interviewees reported that Harrington has a positive peer climate that facilitates learning and student collaboration.

Students interviewed by the team indicated that teachers make the learning objectives clear, have common expectations, model expectations, circulate the room to provide individual support, care about students, provide appropriate levels of challenge, and prompt students to explain their thinking.

Parents interviewed by the team indicated that a warmer school environment, family programs, and visibility of the principal have encouraged parent participation, and the school's PTO has grown as a result. A few parents noted that the school had no active PTO a few years ago, but "a TO" instead. Parents report that the school now has approximately 50 parents on the PTO roster, with 15-30 attending every meeting. The school provides a Spanish translator for meetings. The PTO is active in fundraising, running the school store, and hosting parties and pizza nights. Some parents indicated that the SIC is involved in the SIP, looked at ICOs and SLOs, and is aware of district initiatives such as professional development programs.

Parents indicated that family meeting day, implemented this year, encouraged a positive home-school connection. Every Friday, one grade level hosts a family meeting during which parents are invited into the classroom. Parents also expressed that the school provides a supportive learning environment for their children. They stated that the code of conduct is clear and that the "principal is strict, but children aren't afraid of her." Parents indicated they were "impressed by the way teachers discuss students' needs" and that school staff did all possible to support the students, although there is a need for more after-school programs.

Academic Program Overall

District and school staff has worked to overcome current limits of the instructional program. Teachers seek collegial support to implement the academic program and identify strategies to improve the implementation of existing programs. Teachers had mixed reviews of the effectiveness of the Harcourt-Trophies series as the core English Language Arts program, particularly because the program needs more scaffolding for the current student population and that more professional development is needed to deliver the curriculum more effectively to the school's population. Interviewees also reported that the Growing with Math Program is not comprehensive enough, and the team found that instructional interventions are more targeted for skill areas in reading than for math. The school has implemented Calendar Math to improve coverage of math content, and the school support specialist reported that the district is revamping the math program.

ELA Program

Teachers had mixed reviews of the effectiveness of the Harcourt-Trophies series as the core English Language Arts program. The program is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks, and is accompanied by a reference guide matching units to ELA strands. Interviewees reported that the district selected the Harcourt Trophies series because it was one of the research based highly recommended reading series supported by the Department of Education. However, a teacher noted that a careful inspection found some of the program components to be weak in particular strands, and in need of supplemental lessons. The program has pre- and post-assessments for each unit. Teachers report that the pre-tests are helpful for making decisions about areas in need of more scaffolding prior to each unit, and some teachers reported use of this information to form student groups. Post-tests are helpful to assess student learning of each unit.

Teachers report that the program does not provide adequate materials and support for scaffolding instruction. They stated that the text assumes too much prior knowledge and that the reading level is too advanced for the majority of the students without providing the adequate support. Teachers report that they use supplemental materials and sheltered English Instruction strategies to provide additional support and to fill in gaps in prior knowledge. The listening component of the program, audiocassettes of the literature in the text, is used by teachers to help their students with reading comprehension and fluency, and to provide review of the material. This component is especially helpful in a school with a high LEP population. Teachers are unable to use the computer-based materials in the Harcourt-Trophies series because they lack access to the necessary technology, which would offer an additional layer of support appropriate for their student population.

The district purchased the Harcourt Trophies program in 2002, but professional development was provided by the publisher in 2003, a year after the school had been using the program. The content of the training was not only delayed, but was limited to explaining the program's components. The training session did not provide enough support to show teachers how to use the program to increase student mastery. At the time of the site visit, a Harrington teacher had been scheduled to provide a new Harcourt Trophies training for the district this year. Since the on-site visit, the principal reported to the team that the Harcourt Trophies training has been provided to Harrington teachers at every grade level. Some teachers opined that perhaps no one program could sufficiently meet the unique requirements of Harrington and that the school is learning how to best accommodate the program to reach student needs.

Additional elements of the ELA program include the Rigby reading program to supplement Harcourt Trophies for the SEI class, the Collins Writing program, and a few ELA skill rubrics developed by teachers. Each student has a Collins writing folder in which they place pieces of work. On the inside of the folder, they list the item and the Focus Correction Area (FCA) indicating the writing skill the student is working to improve by developing the piece of writing. The school has developed two rubrics to support writing development, one each for poetry and non-fiction. As an additional evaluative support, the school has also developed other ELA rubrics for reading poetry and for participating in literature discussions. The rubrics identify four performance categories: emerging, developing, proficient, and exemplary.

The Math Program

Having already identified the areas of math weaknesses in the School Improvement Plan, the school started developing math vocabulary lists for word walls in 2003 and supplemented GWM with the Calendar Math program in school year 2004. Calendar Math was selected to provide more adequate coverage of geometry, measurement, data analysis, and statistics. Teachers also identified formative performance assessment as a weak area in the GWM program, so the math CITs developed tests for each program topic.

Additionally, the math program is largely language-based, which helps students with language development, but provides a challenge to math instruction. The need to work through language issues can slow the pace of the math instruction, and the team found no evidence of differentiated instruction in math so that students who mastered the lesson could move to a more advanced lesson. Further, no item analysis is performed for all individual students, so teachers cannot easily identify differences in achievement levels for particular mathematical skill areas and provide differentiated support. However, individual students' MCAS item analysis is done through TestWiz and is used to inform the students' Individual Student Success Plans (ISSPs). Teachers receive an overview of student performance in the Calendar Math areas by math CITs, who perform an item analysis of Calendar Math assessments by class and by grade. The CITs highlight the strong areas and the weak areas (defined as 50 percent or fewer students answering an item correctly) so that teachers can easily identify areas in need of re-teaching. Assessment of student performance on GWM skills is more informal. To evaluate student performance in GWM skill areas, teachers use observation, the school-developed tests, and the GWM math folders in which students place evidence of their work for each unit. Identification of weak areas for each student, class, and grade level is less systematic for GWM program areas than for Calendar Math.

Instructional interventions are more targeted for skill areas in reading than for math. For reading, teachers receive an analysis of each student's performance on the DIBELS on a regular basis, and intervention support is provided for at-risk students. For math, teachers receive no item analysis of student performance on an on-going basis. The discrepancy is due to several factors. First of all, the school uses no comprehensive standardized math assessment on a regular basis. The school has not found a tool comparable to DIBELS for item analysis. The results of the school-created GWM assessments are recorded in folders in which the skill area is marked as "fully, partially, or not achieved." The Calendar Math assessments only cover the areas in the program. In the 2005-06 school year, the district has just started to implement quarterly formative assessments in math (and ELA). The school has completed the second district Quarterly Math Assessment at the time of the review. Secondly, the school lacks the technology to support the teachers, particularly the math CITs, to grade the assessments, and to perform item analyses for each student. Teachers grade the Calendar Math assessments by hand, and all the performance data for the class and grade are compiled by hand. The school creates Individual Student Success Plans (ISSPs) for students in the 'Warning/Failing' category. A review of these folders found limited information, but the ISSP folders contain essential elements: an item analysis of the student's MCAS results, a list of student weaknesses, and intervention strategies to be used for the following year. The folders reviewed by the team did not provide information

concerning whether the goal was attained or if the support was provided as planned. Since after school remediation programs for the MCAS test were cut, the school can only offer the in-school interventions that are available.

The school support specialist reported that the district is revamping the math program. First, the district plans to re-align the math curriculum to the standards, assessments, the trimester schedule, and the three student report cards. One school is departmentalizing for grades 3-5. The district is replacing the Growing with Math program. The schools will continue to use GWM in the 2006 and 2007 school years. The district plans to implement a new program, currently undecided, in the 2007-2008 school year. The district reports that a quality assurance specialist within the district will evaluate the programs prior to selection.

Technology

Interviewees reported that Harrington lacks sufficient technology. Eight Lynn schools were granted technology upgrades by the district including computers, laptops, and projectors after being identified for improvement in 2002 under NCLB. The Harrington School was not identified to receive technology upgrades. Interviewees report that the school lacks adequate technology for scoring and analyzing math assessment data, for teachers to plan and analyze class data, and for computer-based support that could aid differentiation of instruction. However, teachers continue to plan and use assessment data without the benefit of adequate technology. The district trains all principals and CITs in TestWiz, and training sessions are offered to teachers. Also, documents reviewed and interviewees conducted by the team indicate that the district plans to implement the use of Risographs to score assessments. Further, after the completion of the site visit, the school notified the team that the district received a settlement for over \$950,000 from Microsoft. Administrators reported that part of the funding will be used to support technology upgrades at the Harrington School, including the purchase of hardware and software for student and faculty use.

Student Attendance and Time on Learning

The district and the school recognize the need to improve student attendance at the Harrington and are working to increase student time on learning.

Harrington met state student attendance requirement of 92 percent to make AYP, but with an attendance rate of 92.8 percent, the school had the second lowest attendance rate of all the district's elementary schools. The school also has high rates of chronic student absences, or, the numbers of students absent 18 days or more per school year. Table 2 in the profile section provides the school and district attendance statistics. Compared to the district in 2005, the school had approximately twice the percentage of chronically absent students in Pre-Kindergarten (46.6 percent versus 21.2 percent), and Kindergarten (50 percent versus 25.2 percent). For grades 1-5, Grade 3 had the widest gap, 13.3 points between Harrington (22.8) and the district (9.5). In Grade 2, the gap was 7.4 points between Harrington (17.1) and the district (9.7) In Grade 1, the gap was 4.8 points between Harrington (22.2) and the district (9.5). In grades 4 and 5, the gap was 0.9 points between the school (9.3) and the district (8.4). The school had a lower attendance rate and a higher average number of days absent than the district at all grade levels.

The principal and staff surmised that school attendance is affected by the socio-economic factors, cultural differences, and related circumstances. The school has a controlled choice student assignment plan that guarantees seats to students in their neighborhood school. District staff noted that the Harrington is located in the inner-city of Lynn, in the proximity of three homeless shelters, and that the area has a higher low-income, minority, transient, and FLNE population than the other Lynn neighborhoods. Staff reported that the mobility rate at the school is high, especially given that the school is within the proximity of three homeless shelters, and that the rate of chronic student absences is partially due to a large population of students whose families visit family for two-three week periods during the school year.

School and district administrators understand the causes of student absenteeism, and are working to increase student attendance. Administrators reported that the half day PK and K currently offered by the school is inadequate. Administrators explained to the team that the district applied for a full day Kindergarten grant because full day programs increase attendance rates as well as instructional time. After the on-site visit, the school presented a March 2006 letter from the Department of Education indicating that the district received a \$735,000 award. Additionally, the district has purchased ConnectEd to improve student attendance; the new ConnectEd system automatically calls families when a student is absent. Also, the principal reports that she makes attempts to encourage good attendance by calling families herself and providing student attendance awards.

Planning Time

The school schedule allows limited planning time for teachers. The teachers receive 90 minutes of personal planning time per week and 30 additional minutes of common planning time during which they meet in grade level teams. When asked if the time was adequate to the task, the teachers responded that “we would like more, but 30 minutes is better than nothing.” The teachers expressed a sense of understanding about the limits of the scheduling based on the limited number of specialist classes when planning time can occur. Staff indicated that most teachers worked beyond expectations, and that the unpaid hours of extra work created stress in the working environment, although staff volunteered to do so because of their levels of personal commitment to the school’s mission. The leadership team mentioned that if teachers had more common planning time, they would possibly add a block to look at student work, which would help them to consider more carefully the qualitative evidence they collect in their evidence boxes, the effectiveness of their rubrics, and the pieces of work students collect in their math and writing folders.

The Impact of Funding on Resources for Teachers and Students

In consideration of the special needs of the Harrington, the district chose Harrington as the site for Mass Insight training in 2004, as a recipients of the Reading First grant in school year 2004, as one of the four schools to participate in the Raising Student Achievement conference in the summer of 2005, as the only school to receive a permanent daily building teacher substitute, and as the only school to receive six instructional support teachers (five CITs and one Reading First coach).

The district has secured a Read First grant to fund the reading coach and has used Title I to fund CIT positions. A health and wellness grant has funded a school adjustment counselor. The district has also acquired business support to augment professional development efforts. Mass Insights MATH was funded by General Electric, and a Lynn business partnership provided supplemental support for the “Results of Raising Achievement” professional development.

The superintendent stated that the district has suffered from a number of funding cuts due to declining student enrolment and cutbacks in Title I and MCAS funds. Funding cuts have resulted in the district closing a middle school and eliminating teaching positions. The superintendent noted that the district maintained increased levels of support for the Harrington in spite of overall funding cutbacks and that the district is committed to maintaining the current level of support at Harrington even in the event of future funding cutbacks.

In spite of the superintendent’s reported efforts to include a data specialist in the budget to assist the district in making data-driven decisions and to raise the level of data analysis, no data analyst currently exists. Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten classes are half-day programs. The provision of staff for individual student support is inadequate, according to 69 percent of the teachers in the instructional staff survey who reported that individual tutoring during school was either “not adequate” or “not available but needed.” The district representatives stated that no funds were available for after-school program support. Eighty-nine percent of the staff in the instructional staff survey reported that after-school academic support was either “not adequate” or “not available.” Further, in a survey shared by the principal, 21 percent of the students reported that they had no homework help available from any source, including family members and agencies. In the staff survey, the district received mixed reviews on the adequacy of resources and material support. A little over half of the teachers (57 percent) stated that resources and materials were available and adequate; 44 percent of the instructional staff reported otherwise.

The school has attempted to close the gaps caused by funding shortfalls. The CITs provide school-level data analysis, and the school seeks assistance from the school support specialist. The school has acquired three academic support programs from external partnerships. Tower Reads, an America Reads tutoring program, and after-school provided by Gordon College. Still, according to numerous focus groups and interviews, more after-school program capacity is needed. School leadership and staff reported that have attempted to meet student academic needs in spite of shortfalls in the resources by willingly dedicating a substantial amount time and effort to improve student achievement.

The district has been successful in acquiring some support from business partners to provide supplementary funding for the DOE-sponsored three-day Raising Student Achievement workshop that included almost all instructional staff, including paraprofessionals. The district worked with their American Federation of Teachers (AFT) representative to help secure the workshop as well. The district was also successful in acquiring funds from General Electric to pay for a portion of the Mass Insights math training.

Classroom Observations

To assess the effectiveness of instruction at the Harrington, the team observed thirteen classes, six math classes and seven English Language Arts classes. Observations included one kindergarten class, two Grade 1 classes, one Grade 2 class, two Grade 3 classes, four Grade 4 classes, two mixed Grade 3/Grade 4 classes, and one Grade 5 class. The team observed seven regular education classes with class sizes ranging from 13-21, four Sheltered English Instruction classes with class sizes ranging from 7-13, one cognitively delayed special needs class with 9 students, and one behavioral disorder special needs class with 4 students.

Overall, classroom instruction was rated above average. The team rated each classroom observation on a 1-3 scale of 'low' ("does not meet an acceptable standard"), 'average' ("meets an acceptable standard") and 'high' ("exemplifies good practice"). Three classrooms were rated 'average,' six above 'average,' and three 'high.' No classroom was rated 'low'. One unscheduled classroom visit was unrated because of the brevity of the observation.

All the instruction observed was standards-based, aligned with the school's SIP, and aligned with the district curriculum. The team observed instruction using Calendar Math in two classes, Growing with Math in three classes, guided reading in two classes, Harcourt-Trophies in three ELA classes, a literature discussion in an ELA class, and supplementary programs used in one math and one ELA classes.

Most classrooms had adequate resources, with the exception of technology, and existing resources were used effectively. Teachers in seven classes were assisted by a curriculum and instruction teacher, a special needs teacher, or a classroom aide. The morning SEI Kindergarten class observed had one teacher and two aides. Five classes observed were taught by one teacher; three were SEI and two were regular education classes. In some classrooms, additional staff was actively involved in providing instruction, but in some classrooms, additional staff was not actively involved in classroom instruction.

Many classrooms had leveled books, adequate program materials, overhead projectors, and four had listening centers. Only one computer was observed in one classroom. The school has a computer lab, used by students two to four times a month when they receive instruction from a half-time computer teacher. Staff reports that the building computers are outdated, even those in the administrative offices. A district staff member reported that Lynn purchased computers for the eight schools labeled as "identified for improvement" in 2002, but did not have the funds to upgrade technology at the Harrington. Teachers do not have classroom computers or Internet access to assist in instructional planning, to analyze data to provide differentiated computer-based instruction, or to use the computer-based instructional materials in Harcourt-Trophies.

In all classrooms, the team observed written learning objectives for each lesson that were reviewed by the teacher at the beginning and end of the lesson, depending on when the observer was present. Objectives and instruction was standards-based. The team observed the effective use of classroom routines, effective classroom management strategies, positive reinforcement, a warm classroom culture, and teacher-student rapport. Classroom environments were stimulating

and well-organized, with updated vocabulary words, objectives, and strategies posted and varied arrangements of seating to allow students to work in groups. The team observed Sheltered Instruction strategies in all classrooms, including modeling, scaffolding, the use of visuals, and provisioning for gaps in background knowledge.

Instruction was based on clear objectives, with effective directions, presentations, and tasks. Most teachers used strategies for checking for understanding, including dip-sticking, asking questions, use of hand-signals, the use of small group white boards, and circulating in the classroom. Most teachers also used attention-getting strategies, and students usually responded with cooperative behaviors, participation, and attention to the lesson.

The team observed some instances of average pedagogy and ineffective practices, which included ineffective pacing, inadequate preparation, loss of momentum, the lack of higher-order questions, visuals that were difficult to see, and the lack of engagement of students on higher levels.

The use of differentiated instruction varied in the classrooms observed. In some classrooms, instruction was differentiated through mini-lessons or group activities in which students could choose roles requiring different skill levels, or in which students could seek assistance from peers or partners. Other differentiation strategies included assignments allowing students to use different solution strategies to obtain the solutions, oral questions targeting students at different levels of achievement, and differentiated support. Teachers also reported that they created flexible reading groups after identifying student needs following DIBELS assessments. At-risk students receive targeted interventions in reading fluency. In some classrooms observed, instruction was directed by the teacher towards the whole group, so that all students received the same instruction and had the same activity even when arranged in groups.

In summary, the primary factors contributing to the school's ability to implement the plan include a well-placed efficacious staff and supplementary funding for improvement initiatives. However, staff efficacy is limited by several school and district factors and the supplementary funding is inadequate for all the desired initiatives. Under Key Question 4, we will further discuss the tenability of funding because this could impact the sustainability of improvement initiatives at the Harrington over the long period.

KEY QUESTION 4: Are the conditions in place to sustain the gains achieved and support continued improvement in student performance?

Yes. Conditions are currently in place to sustain the gains achieved and to support continued improvement in student performance; however, further preparation is needed for additional challenges the school and district will face.

The school has put in place the leadership, staff, and structures to sustain the gains achieved and to support continued improvement in student performance. Leadership continues to prepare the school and district for further challenges.

School leadership, with support from district and staff, consistently monitors SIP implementation. The school is focused on priority improvements to teaching and learning, using formative student achievement data. The school makes effective use of distributive management. The school has a skilled staff with key responsibility areas, teachers continue to work to improve the implementation of the curricular program and the use of data, and there is a high level of staff involvement, collaboration, and commitment. Stakeholders report an increased level of student buy-in and parental involvement.

Leadership continues to prepare the school and district for further improvement. The initial PIM process for the SIP focused on a small number of manageable goals as advised by DOE. The leadership team cites this as a reason the school chose to create goals for the entire school rather than focus on subgroup analyses. Achievement was low for all subgroups and the high percentage of low-income and FLNE students led them to create goals that would target instructional support around student needs related to language acquisition and poverty. The leadership team indicated that subgroup analysis would be a potential next step for the school, and that the district and school are continuing to refine their processes for collecting and using data. Teachers explained to the team how staff members refine and improve school processes for collecting and analyzing formative and summative student assessments in order to identify ways to improve student achievement. The district has implemented quarterly assessments to monitor student growth in ELA and math, purchased Risograph equipment with the plan to develop an individual pupil profile organizing assessment data for each student. The math CIT is seeking diagnostic math assessments for progress monitoring, as the school has in place for reading. According to interviewees, the district is working on benchmarks for mathematics and plans to purchase another scanning system for analysis of the quarterly assessments.

The district reports that Lynn is working to overcome current funding threats to the school's continued improvement. District staff reports that funding is unavailable for all identified needs, such as a comprehensive after-school program, adequate technology and a district data analyst. Funding is also unavailable for a grant writer, so all central office curriculum team staff participate in the writing of competitive and entitlement grants. Funding was reduced because of the decline in student population and because of the reductions in grants. For example, district interviewees reported that there was a federal reduction of Title I funds.

The team found that an over-reliance on grants for key initiatives could threaten the school's funding for staff, especially the CIT positions. This is a threat because staff members report that CITs are a key part of the school's formula for improved achievement. At the same time, because Title I funds CIT positions rather than direct services to students, these funds are not available for after-school tutoring and supplemental instruction. The school could experience diminishing returns from Title I funds as teachers skills improve as a result of CIT training, but with the school continuing to lack sufficient learning opportunities after school that parents and staff report are needed.

Staff turnover is a potential threat to continued school improvement. A decline in student population may result in staff reductions and "bumping" of Harrington staff. Further, staff indicated teacher burnout could result in turnover, in spite of high levels of staff commitment. Much of the professional development and teacher planning efforts rely on staff committing

extra hours of work. Further, technology is inadequate for the desired level of preparation, use of data, and communication with colleagues, and there is currently no technology plan for the school. District and school leadership have worked to overcome threats to problematic staff turnover. The Superintendent supports the school leadership in maintaining an effective staff through the supervision, evaluation and screening processes. Leadership turnover is another potential threat, as the principal has been the lead organizer of school change. There is currently no document connecting all school structures, roles, and assessments, creating the threat that current connections could weaken without explicitness in the event of leadership or staff changes. However, school leadership is aware of the needs, and continues to focus on priorities to build capacity and systems for longevity. Further, staff indicated to the team that the school's distributive management, staff buy-in, and the staff professional capacity support the sustenance of the Harrington's school improvement systems. The principal and staff see its distributive management system of organizing responsibility and decision-making as key to the sustainability of the Harrington's successes.

CONCLUSION

The team found Harrington has improved student achievement and that the leadership has put in place effective processes, structures, and staff to carry out school improvement efforts.

The Harrington staff continues to refine strategies to meet the needs of a student population that is very unique. In 2005, compared to other Lynn elementary schools, Harrington had the highest percentages of low-income students (91 percent) and LEP students (41 percent), and the third highest percentage of FLNE students (66 percent). Compared to other public schools in the state, Harrington is in the top three percent in the percentages of low-income, LEP, and FLNE students. Further, Harrington's LEP student population includes "newcomers" in need of school and cultural adjustment as well English language instruction. Additionally, approximately 29 percent of the White students are FLNE students. The school's population is diverse and changing. For the 2005-2006 school year, the school has acquired an SEI classroom of newcomers and a classroom of severely cognitively and physically challenged students.

After a rigorous SIP planning and implementation process, Harrington student achievement has improved overall. The school's aggregate CPI in ELA and math increased by 7.8 and 18.3 in 2004 and by 7.5 and 0.8 in 2005. CPI scores for all subgroups improved in 2004 and 2005. In 2005, Hispanics had a 10.7 gain in ELA. In 2004, LEP students made a 20 point gain in ELA and a 29.5 point gain in math. Also in 2004, CPI gains in math were 30.4 points for SPED students, 19.9 points for low-income students and 19.4 points for Hispanic students. On the Grade 4 ELA test, the percentage of students scoring at or above the level of 'Proficient' increased steadily from 2001-2005.

The school does have challenges to overcome. The team found that school lacks sufficient technology and planning time for teachers. The team found that the school has more work to do to improve student attendance and performance on the MCAS tests. Also, because some school improvement initiatives rely on external funding and continued extra staff efforts, the team determined that long-range planning is key to the sustainability of the improvement efforts at the Harrington School.

However, the school has improved substantially since the initial Panel Review. During the site visit, the team found that improvement efforts continue. The school has established a culture and practices that support the use of targeted strategies and quantitative and qualitative data to inform instruction. The school has empowered and equipped staff to continuously improve teaching and learning to address diverse student needs. Improvement efforts are supported by a collegial school environment, high levels of staff commitment, ongoing professional development, coaching, district support, effective instructional leadership, and supervision and evaluation processes that monitor the implementation of improvement initiatives.

Thus, the team determined that conditions are currently in place to sustain achievement at the Harrington School.

**APPENDIX A
Team Members**

Eva Mitchell, Examiner and Coordinator, Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

Helen Apostolides, Examiner, Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

Jim McAuliffe, Examiner, Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

Joe Nigro, Examiner, Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

**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 a.m. Team members meet with the principal.
- 9:00—10:00 a.m. Team members meet with the district superintendent (and assistant superintendent, if appropriate).
- 10:00—11:00 a.m. Team members meet with the school’s curriculum and instruction leadership team and members of the school site council.
- 11:00—1:00 p.m. 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 p.m. Team members meet with teachers in focus groups.

	REVIEWER A and REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C and REVIEWER D
1:00-1:30	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #1	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #2
1:30-2:00	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #3	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #4
2:00-2:30	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #5	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #6

- 2:30-3:00 p.m. 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 p.m. 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 p.m. 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 p.m. Team structured time. Members identify any gaps in the evidence collected and 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	Interview with School Specialist	Observation of team meeting	Document Review	Document Review

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.