

REPORT OF TWO YEAR FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

Elihu Greenwood Elementary School Boston Public Schools

Executive Summary

The Elihu Greenwood is a school that continues to struggle in its efforts to improve students' MCAS test performance in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (math). A comparison of Cycle III (2002-2004) to Cycle IV (2004-2006) testing reveals that despite changes in performance relative to meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the school has maintained an overall student performance rating of "Low" in ELA and "Very Low" in math.

In Cycle III (2004), student performance in ELA showed a gain of 4.9 index points for a Composite Performance Index (CPI) score of 63.8, thereby, meeting AYP for both the aggregate of all students and for all subgroup student categories. In Math, AYP was met in the aggregate with only a .8 index point gain to 42.9 CPI. However, the school failed to meet AYP for all subgroups in math.

In Mid-cycle IV testing (2005), ELA performance remained essentially flat with only a 0.8 index point gain to a CPI of 64.6 which failed to meet AYP for the aggregate and for all subgroups. However, in math, the student performance made a gain of 9.9 index points for a total 52.8 CPI. AYP in math was achieved for both the aggregate and all subgroups.

In Cycle IV (2006) testing, ELA performance declined by 3.8 index points to a total of 60.0 CPI. Thus, for a second year, the school failed to meet AYP in ELA in the aggregate as well as for all subgroups. Math performance, however, continued to improve with students achieving a 10.8 index point gain to 53.7 CPI. AYP in math was again met for both the aggregate and for all subgroups.

While the measurable progress in math may be attributed to a renewed focus on math instruction during the period of this review, statements of interviewed stakeholders as well as testing results confirm that the level of focus and effort in ELA performance was diminished. Several factors appear to have contributed to this decline: the school adopted a new reading program (Harcourt series is in year two of implementation) with minimal teacher training support; new teachers to the school were not given sufficient training support; and the amount of coaching help was diminished with the loss of "Superintendent's School" designation in 2005, a supplementary program for schools identified in need, which had provided added learning time, full-time on-site ELA coaching support to teachers, and increased professional development. The district administrator acknowledged the problem in ELA but expressed confidence that the situation "can be turned around" at Elihu Greenwood School since the principal has experience as a literacy coach and new focus will now be made on a literacy model in ELA.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a document spanning 2004 to 2007. While the SIP document was authored by the previous principal and former staff members, the current principal led a team of seven staff members through the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process. Although documentation provided by the principal supports the contention that eight of the original ten PIM team members remain connected to the school, few members of the current staff interviewed acknowledged any familiarity with its contents. Similarly, from interviews with parents, it was clear that they had no personal involvement in the plan's development nor familiarity its contents. One parent with a longer-term connection to the school stated: "I seem to remember hearing about it a few years ago." The "root causes" for the failure of the school to improve are identified within the PIM document. These have subsequently been used by the school leadership to guide improvement efforts. However, the SIP has limited usefulness as a strategic tool for school improvement given the significant number of the people within the school who profess ignorance of the SIP contents and lay no claim to its ownership. A new SIP is due to be developed but the team found no evidence that this process had begun.

The quality of teaching at the Elihu Greenwood School was found to be good. Panel members observed instruction and conducted follow-up interviews with twelve of the school's thirty-one classroom teachers. Panelists noted solid teaching strategies with teachers who engaged their students in thoughtful and reflective analysis of math problems. Students were asked to restate problems in their own words as a means for assessing understanding. Most impressive to panelists was the degree to which students responded to questions using higher level vocabulary in complete sentences. An agenda for each class session was prominently displayed either on the whiteboard or on posted chart paper. At the conclusion of the observed lessons, teachers summarized with students what was learned in the lesson. Lessons were well designed and were directly tied to curriculum standards. It was noted that the same content standards and instructional approach were followed for all students, including those with special learning needs through differentiated instructional strategies. In every case, students appeared to be engaged in productive learning activities that were building on previous teaching and learning. Students were, for the most part, well-behaved, courteous, and attentive to their teachers. Nonetheless, the panel noted with some concern a significant amount of time within each class session that students were without benefit of direct instruction by the teacher. Further, the sparse amount and relative working order of instructional equipment such as overhead projectors so essential to implementation of the math curriculum, was of concern to the panel.

The leadership style of the principal emerged as a significant issue for this school. Interviews of teachers revealed a significant divide between the principal and themselves. Teachers complained that they do not feel respected or trusted by the principal. In addition to not being included in decision-making, they claim, instead, to be recipients of terse announcements of policy changes without explanation or benefit of discussion. They complain that there is no support to their efforts at maintaining student discipline which is perceived as a growing issue at the school. The student behavior claims of teachers were supported by statements of parents who cited personal problems involving their own children and a lingering feeling that more should have been done. Teachers further claimed that a number of their colleagues who have, in the past, raised a voice of protest were subsequently targeted by the principal for retaliation. Teachers speculate that the high turnover rate is in part due to this situation. In contrast, the

principal spoke of team building, collaboration, and an emerging “culture of support.” While the team observed what appears to be improved teaching strategies within classrooms and testing data reveals that students achieved AYP in Mathematics, the students in aggregate continue to perform at the lowest performance levels in both ELA (Low) and math (Very Low). This apparent dichotomy is difficult to explain. However, from interviews with teachers, the team found wide-spread discontent with the principal’s leadership style. Real or perceived, this divide may be a major source of distraction from the full and effective attention that is needed in this if improved student performance is to be achieved.

Priority Findings

- I. The Elihu Greenwood School has failed to show consistent improvement in student performance on the MCAS tests over the period of this review.

Results of Cycle IV (2004-2006) testing show that performance in ELA has remained “Low” throughout the two-year period with a CPI that remained essentially unchanged in 2005 (+0.8) and declined in 2006 (-3.8). The school failed to meet AYP in ELA for both the aggregate and subgroups in both 2005 and 2006. Cycle IV CPI in ELA was 60.

Student performance in math remained “Very Low” throughout the two-year period. However, student CPI showed a significant improvement trend in Cycle IV with an increase of 9.9 index points in 2005 and .9 in 2006 for a total of 10.8 index points for the total cycle. With these changes, the school met its AYP targets for both years within Cycle IV. The Cycle IV CPI in math was 53.7.

The school has focused attention upon improving student performance in math during the Cycle IV period. Elements of these efforts included a refocused attention upon the district’s math curriculum (DMI) and instructional pacing guidelines, the addition of math skills practice within each lesson (10-minute math and AYP Math), increasing the daily instructional time period to 90 minutes, increased teacher mentoring/coaching from a full-time math specialist, and increased financial resources for extended student day and tutorial services resulting from being named a “superintendent’s school” for the 2004-2005 school year.

In the same period, ELA curriculum was changed with the adoption of the Harcourt reading program. Without similar focused improvement efforts or sense of urgency comparable to that being given to math instruction, the change was made with minimal attention to professional development or the teacher mentoring/coaching being devoted to the math area.

- II. The current School Improvement Plan lacks the understanding and support of all stakeholders in the school setting.

The current SIP with effective dates of 2004-2007 was written in 2003 under the direction of the former principal and then existing staff. In 2004, the current principal

gave leadership to the subsequent Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process that was utilized to develop strategic initiatives. Although eight of ten PIM team members remain connected to the Greenwood school, a majority of teachers and all parents interviewed expressed a lack of awareness of the SIP, its contents, or having any part in its creation in 2003.

Currently, 18 of the 37 individuals (including the principal) listed on the school staff roster have been at the E. Greenwood School for three or fewer years. This near 50% turn-over of staff, for whatever reason, appears significant and could account for why a majority of interviewed teachers stated that they had not been part of the SIP development and were not familiar with its contents. Only one parent acknowledged a vague recollection of the SIP.

An examination of the SIP reveals very specific student performance targets as measured by MCAS. It is unclear how these targets were identified. The subsequent gap between identified targets and actual performance is sufficient to raise doubt among members of the team about the appropriate or realistic nature of the SIP goals.

While the current SIP is in its last year, the team found no process taking place for the generation of a new plan with goals and objectives adjusted to the current realities of staffing, student population, or student performance.

III. District program and enrollment policies have had a negative impact on student performance at this school.

Elihu Greenwood School serves 53 students with disabilities which is 14.4% of its enrollment. This population is assigned to the school by the district given the availability of open seats. A student who may no longer be deemed in need of special educational services or a student who moves to another district will open a seat for a new student to be assigned to the school. Thus, the population of students with disabilities at this school is maintained at a predetermined level although the individual students within this group are in constant flux. With a 19.9% student mobility rate, the comparison of student performance levels from one year and/or one cycle to the next may be misleading.

Similarly, the highest performing students are invited to attend advanced classes located in other schools. The principal and teachers report that the timing of this migration of students takes place in the spring just ahead of the testing period. The routine withdrawal of top-performing students just before the testing period has a negative impact on the testing results by reducing the percentage of students who score in the top levels of the MCAS tests.

The principal stated that through her efforts, the Elihu Greenwood School would soon have an advanced class located within the school for the 2007-2008 school year, thereby, negating the need for students to leave the school in order to take advantage

of advanced-level coursework. This move is anticipated to have a positive impact on student testing results in the coming year (2007-2008).

The district named the Elihu Greenwood School as a “Superintendent’s School” for the 2004-2005 school year. This designation affords an increased level of funding resources to schools deemed in need of targeted assistance. The receipt of these funds was a great boost to the school’s ability to provide increased instructional time for students, added personnel for tutorial and remedial services to students, and added support and training to teachers. While the impact was initially positive, it only lasted for one year. The subsequent withdrawal of the designation and accompanying resources has had a negative impact on the school’s ability to sustain any gains that may have been realized.

- IV. A significant disparity exists between faculty and principal’s assessment of the status of their mutual professional relationship and communication that diminishes the potential for improved student performance in this school.

Data gathered from interviews with teachers revealed that the relationship between teachers and the principal is fraught with suspicion and mistrust. In her third year, the principal sees her role as a change agent who was assigned to the Elihu Greenwood School to fix the math program and to generally improve student performance. Under the leadership of the principal, a significant number of change initiatives in instructional programs and school organization have been implemented. However, teachers interviewed complained that important decisions have been made by the principal without consultation or benefit of staff input. Teachers claim that the number of changes introduced without explanation or apparent reason have led to confusion among staff and students and teacher mistrust of the principal.

Teachers also claimed that student discipline is a significant issue at the school and which inhibits their ability to improve student academic performance. They complained that they receive no support or leadership from the principal in addressing this issue. Supporting this claim, parents also expressed some amount of concern for a generalized lack of student discipline at the school and its negative effects on their own children in the school.

In contrast, however, the principal cited the status of student discipline upon her arrival which favored student suspensions or referral to special education. She noted improved procedures for students referrals and counseling support and well as professional development for teachers. In the case of severely disruptive students, an administrative staff member may refer the child to the main office where “de-escalation” and a return to the classroom learning is the overarching goal.

While noting these differences in the perceptions of teachers and the stated intentions of the principal, the team was, nonetheless, generally impressed with the comportment of students in their classes and as they passed through the halls. Examination of out-of-school student suspensions seems to mitigate the claims of

extraordinary disciplinary issues. The out-of-school suspension rate at Elihu Greenwood School in the 2005-2006 academic year was only 4.7% while the district average was 7.6% and the State average was 5.8%. Thus, with a lower than average rate of student suspensions, the school would not appear to have experienced extraordinary student disciplinary issues. Nonetheless, despite these data and the direct observations of the team, the divide of perceptions continues to exist.

In interviews, teachers sought assurances that they would not be identified in the Team report for fear of retribution. They claimed that unnamed “others” have attempted to speak out in the past and were subsequently targeted for retribution and removal. As evidence of their claims, they pointed to what they perceive as a high rate of teacher turnover. Real or perceived, this expressed fear on the part of teachers confirmed for the team the existence of a significant gap in communication and trust between the teachers and the principal in this school.

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 **Elihu Greenwood Elementary School** developed such a plan, and the Commissioner and Board of Education accepted the plan in **September 2004**. 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 **Elihu Greenwood Elementary School**. The Follow-Up Review was conducted on **April 4 and 5, 2007**.

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 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 conditions in place to sustain 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 **Elihu Greenwood Elementary School** is deemed to be chronically under-performing. The panel was not asked to formulate a sound plan for school improvement where such a plan does not presently exist or to recommend a course of action to create the conditions for successful implementation of sound improvement strategies where such conditions at present do not appear to exist.

Elihu Greenwood Elementary School Profile

The Elihu Greenwood Elementary School is one of 84 elementary schools in the Boston Public School district and the largest of four elementary schools serving the Hyde Park section of the city. Elihu Greenwood enrolls 374 students in grades K-5 with 97.8% of students from minority families: 64.4% African American, 31.3% Hispanic, 0.8% Native American, 0.5% Asian, and 0.8% Multi-Race Non-Hispanic. In addition, 69.3% of enrolled students are from low income families, 24.3% of live in homes where the first languages is not English and 10.4% of enrolled students are considered to be limited English proficient.

To place the E. Greenwood School into context, there are three other elementary schools serving the Hyde Park section of the city. Using data on enrollment, percentage of students enrolled that come from ethnic or racial minority families, the percentage of students from low income families, and the percentage of students receiving special education services, the three other elementary schools in Hyde Park appear comparable.

2007 Comparable Elementary School Comparative Data

	Enrollment	% Ethnic/Race Minority	% Low Income	% LEP	% SpEd
Elihu Greenwood	374	97.9	69.3	10.4	14.4
William Ellery Channing	323	93.8	63.5	8.7	11.5
Franklin D. Roosevelt	257	70	62.6	9.3	16.7

Henry Grew	247	88.3	86.2	9.7	11.3
District	56,388	86.5	72.7	18.3	19.7
State	968,661	28.5	28.9	5.6	16.9

Attendance

While the state attendance rate for 2005-2006 was 94.5%, the overall district rate was 91.5% and the Elihu Greenwood Elementary School rate was 93.0%, only slightly below the state average but slightly better than the overall district average. However, it is the lowest rate among the comparable elementary schools (Channing with 95.3, Grew with 94.3, and Roosevelt with 94.2). Nonetheless, as a performance indicator, student attendance does not appear to be a significant issue for this school.

Retention

At 3.7%, the student retention rate at the Elihu Greenwood School is one half the district rate of 7.4 % but is 1.2% greater than the state average of 2.5%. As compared to its Hyde Park counterpart schools, the Elihu Greenwood school ranks third of the four schools: Channing 1.6%, Roosevelt 2.3%, Greenwood 3.7%, and Grew 6.6%.

Out-of-School Suspension

The out-of-school suspension rates for the Elihu Greenwood Elementary School have remained consistently low throughout the 2004-2006 period. At 4.7% in 2006, it remains well below both the district rate (7.6%) and the state rate (5.8%). All three comparable schools also have similar out-of-school suspension rates that are below both district and state averages.

Staffing

Within the staffing data, the Elihu Greenwood school reports 93.5% of its teachers as being licensed in their teaching assignment and 88.9% of its teachers as being “highly qualified.” Although slightly lower than both district (94.2) and state (95.4) averages, the percentage of teachers holding licensure in their teaching area is within 1.9% of both. A greater difference is noted in the percentage of teachers reported as being “highly qualified.” At 88.9%, the Elihu Greenwood School is 3.2% lower than the district and 6.2% lower than the state average. It is also noted that all three of the other Hyde Park elementary schools report 100% of its teachers as being both licensed and highly qualified.

MCAS Results

The Composite Performance Index (CPI) scores are based on a 100 point scale measuring the extent to which students are progressing towards proficiency in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics MCAS testing. Relative changes in student performance as indicated by the CPI are used to determine the school and district’s relative success or failure in meeting Adequate Yearly Progress towards student performance targets. The data displayed in the following chart reflects student testing results since the Cycle III (2004) testing period. While the overall performance remained “low” in ELA and “very low” in math, Elihu Greenwood students were

successful in meeting three of four AYP targets in ELA and math with the exception of certain subgroups in math.

ELA

From Cycle III in 2004 to mid-cycle IV testing in 2005, ELA students only accomplished a 0.8 CPI gain which fell short of its AYP target. In the Cycle IV (2006) testing, ELA results actually declined. Instead of meeting an identified CPI gain target of 7.2, there was, instead, a decline of 3.8 points. Thus, the school failed to meet AYP in ELA for each year of the Cycle IV period. Performance remains low and the school has been “identified for improvement” in ELA.

Math

From 1999 through 2003, the school failed to make AYP in math. However, in the Cycle III (2004) testing, the school was successful in meeting its AYP target in the aggregate although not for all subgroups. Subsequently, in Cycle IV (2005 & 2006), the school was successful in meeting AYP in the aggregate and for all subgroups. The school moved from the “identified for corrective action” status to “no status.” Despite this improvement, the performance rating remains “very low.”

CPI Comparative Data (E. Greenwood, District, and State)

	Cycle III 2003-2004	Mid-Cycle IV 2004-2005	Change	Cycle IV 2005-2006	Change	District 2006	State Target
ELA	63.8	64.6	0.8	60	-3.8	68.8	80.5
Math	42.9	52.8	9.9	53.7	10.8	58.2	68.7

Grade Three Reading

Grade 3 reading has shown a steady decline in proficiency with 49% of students scoring in the Advanced or Proficient levels in 2003 and only 23% scoring at these levels in 2006. After a two-year reduction in the Warning/Failure category from 20% in 2003 to 14% in 2004 and 15% in 2005, the percentage bounced back to 24% in 2006. Needs Improvement percentages have increased in proportion to the decreases in Advanced and Proficient percentages. The district has remained constant with few gains over the same period of time. Once boasting student performance scores above district performance averages, Elihu Greenwood grade three reading performance in 2006 has fallen back to parity with district levels and remains well below state performance levels.

Proficiency levels are summarized in the tables below:

Grade 3 Reading

	Greenwood			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	23	54	23	30	48	22	58	34	8
2005	43	42	15	31	48	21	62	31	7
2004	41	45	14	35	46	18	63	30	7

2003	49	31	20	32	47	21	63	30	7
------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---

Grade 4 Math

Grade 4 mathematics performance has shown a steady improvement with a decline in the percentage of students scoring at the warning/failure level, moving from 60 % of students in 2003 to 29% in 2006. However, the percentage of students scoring in the Needs Improvement category has steadily increased and remains high with only a modest increase in the percentage of students scoring in the Advanced & Proficient levels (3% in 2003 to 8% in 2006).

Grade 4 Mathematics

	Greenwood			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	8	63	29	26	47	27	40	45	15
2005	12	49	39	21	47	32	41	44	15
2004	14	46	40	22	48	31	42	44	14
2003	3	37	60	16	46	38	40	43	16

Grade 4 English Language Arts

Grade 4 ELA testing results reflect a reversal of what had been a positive trend in previous testing periods. Students scoring in the Advanced and Proficient levels moved from 10% in 2003 to 21% in 2004 and to 23% in 2005 only to fall back to 10% in 2006. Similarly, the reduction in the number of students scoring in the warning/failure levels from 48% in 2003 to 28% in 2004 was subsequently followed by an increase to 33% in 2005 and 32% in 2006. While remaining very close to district average, these scores remain well below state average and NCLB performance improvement expectations.

Grade 4 ELA

	Greenwood			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	10	52	39	26	46	28	59	31	9
2005	23	44	33	25	48	27	50	31	10
2004	21	51	28	30	46	23	56	35	9
2003	10	42	48	27	45	28	55	34	10

Grade 5 Mathematics

Inclusion of grade five testing in Math and ELA was initiated in the 2006 testing cycle. While no trends can be observed with only first year results, the math scores suggest a significant falling-off in performance levels from the grade four results. While 25% of grade four students performed in the warning/failure levels in math, fully 53% of grade five students did so. Math performance for grade five students is significantly below both district and state performance levels.

Grade 5 Mathematics

	Greenwood			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	14	33	53	25	35	40	43	34	23

Grade 5 ELA

Testing of grade 5 students in ELA was initiated in 2006. With only one year of data, trends cannot be determined for the grade level performance. However, when compared to grade four ELA data, there would appear to be a positive movement in student scores with the percentage of students scoring in the Advanced and Proficient levels almost three times greater at grade five than is reflected in grade four testing results (10% in grade four to 27% in grade five). There are also commensurate reductions in the warning/failure (39% to 32%) and the needs improvement (52% to 41%) categories.

Grade 5 ELA

	Greenwood			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	27	41	32	35	43	22	59	31	9

Subgroups

An examination of Cycle IV CPI for student subgroups reveals that all subgroups of Elihu Greenwood students continued to perform well below both district and state levels for both ELA and math. Of these subgroups, the lowest performance scores were obtained by students with disabilities who performed only half as well in ELA as their counterparts in the district (21.7 vs. 43.3) and less than one third as well as compared to state average (38.3 vs. 59.8). While students with disabilities performed a bit closer to local district and state averages in math (38.3 CPI vs. 46.9 CPI for the district and 57.1 CPI for the state), overall performance remained in “very low.”

**Comparative Subgroup Performance
Elihu Greenwood Grade Four
Cycle IV Performance CPI**

	ELA	District	State	Math	District	State
Students with Disabilities	21.7	43.3	59.8	38.3	46.9	57.1
LEP	48.1	60.5	60.1	53.8	62.6	58.2
Low Income	46.4	60.2	65.5	54.9	60.0	60.3
African American	52.6	58.6	65.1	55.1	56.3	57.9
Hispanic	40.0	57.4	62.2	52.5	58.2	57.0

PANEL REPOSSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

No in ELA. Yes in Math.

ELA

Elihu Greenwood students have not shown improvement in English Language Arts (ELA) during the two year period of this review. Between Cycle III (2004) and Mid-cycle IV (2005), testing results reflect a small (.8) gain in aggregate student performance CPI (63.8 to 64.6). In Cycle IV (2006) testing, the aggregate CPI declined by 4.6 points (64.6 to 60.0). The performance rating for the Cycle IV testing period was identified as “low” and an improvement rating of “declined” was assigned in light of the significant 4.6 point drop in CPI.

Math.

Elihu Greenwood students have shown improvement in both mid-cycle IV and Cycle IV testing as measured by the Composite Performance Index (CPI). In the two-year period of this review, students gained 9.9 CPI in the mid-cycle IV testing and a more modest 0.9 CPI gain in Cycle IV testing. While the performance rating remains “very low”, the improvement rating is “on target” for the Cycle IV testing period.

Comparative Aggregate Performance CPI

	Cycle III 2004	Mid-Cycle IV 2005	Difference	Cycle IV 2006	Difference
ELA	63.8	64.6	0.8	60.0	-4.6
MATH	42.9	52.8	9.9	53.7	0.9

The Cycle IV student performance testing results for the Elihu Greenwood school is also well below both district and state performance levels. When compared with the district, Elihu Greenwood students scored 8.8 CPI points below district in ELA and 4.5 CPI points below district in math. Comparisons to student performance results state-wide reflects even greater discrepancies with Elihu Greenwood students performing 18.8 CPI points below in ELA and 19.6 CPI points below in math.

2006 Cycle IV Aggregate Performance CPI

	Greenwood	District	Difference	State	Difference
ELA	60.0	68.8	-8.8	78.8	-18.8
MATH	53.7	58.2	-4.5	73.3	-19.6

An examination of Elihu Greenwood Cycle IV student performance testing results as compared with students in the three identified comparable elementary schools serving the Hyde Park section of Boston, reveals that Elihu Greenwood students achieved results that were lower than all other comparable schools ranging from 3.3 to 17.7 CPI points in ELA and 3.7 to 14.5 CPI points in math.

**2006 Cycle IV Aggregate Performance CPI
Comparable In-district Comparison**

	ELA	MATH
Elihu Greenwood	60.0	53.7
William Channing	63.3	57.4
Henry Grew	66.4	65.9
Franklin Roosevelt	77.7	68.2

Students with Disabilities

With a CPI score of 21.7 in ELA and 38.3 in math, grade four students with disabilities were the least proficient among all subgroups of students in Cycle IV testing. In ELA, their performance was 21.6 CPI points lower than the district average CPI score of 43.3 and 38.1 CPI points lower than the state average CPI score of 59.8. In math, E. Greenwood grade four students with disabilities were 8.6 CPI points lower than the district average and 18.8 CPI points below state average. Only the students with disabilities subgroup had no individuals who scored at the proficient level in either ELA or math.

A comparison of percentage results in each of the four categories (advanced, proficient, needs improvement, and warning) reveals that students with disabilities have made virtually no improvement over the last three testing periods with 99% scoring in the warning and needs improvement range in 2004, 96% in 2005, and 100% in the 2006 testing.

Other Subgroups

Other subgroups (LEP, low income, African American, and Hispanic) while achieving CPI scores somewhat closer to both district and state averages, nonetheless, scored below both district and state levels in both ELA and math. The overall trend for all major subgroups in this school is declining. For students identified as from low income families, 79% scored in the warning and needs improvement in both the 2004 and 2005 testing periods and increased to 91% in 2006. The African American subgroup has maintained 79%-81% for the years 2004 and 2005 respectively and in 2006 this percentage jumped to 85%. For the Hispanic subgroup, a solid improvement in 2005 that saw the number of students scoring in the NI/W range drop from 90% in 2004 to 75% in 2005 was reversed in 2006 when a full 100% of Hispanic students tested scored in the NI/W categories.

**Grade Four ELA
Comparative Subgroup Performance
Cycles III & IV**

	Cycle III (2004)				Mid-Cycle IV (2005)				Cycle IV (2006)			
	A	P	NI	W	A	P	NI	W	A	P	NI	W
Students with Disabilities	0	0	33	67	0	4	36	61	0	0	13	87
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	15	46	38
Low Income	0	21	49	30	0	21	46	33	0	9	50	41
African American	0	21	51	28	0	20	48	33	0	15	49	36
Hispanic	0	10	40	50	0	25	40	35	0	0	55	45

*Less than 10 students identified in this category

**Grade Four Math
Comparative Subgroup Performance
Cycles III & IV**

	Cycle III (2004)				Mid-Cycle IV (2005)				Cycle IV (2006)			
	A	P	NI	W	A	P	NI	W	A	P	NI	W
Students with Disabilities	0	5	24	71	0	7	36	57	0	0	47	53
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	8	69	23
Low Income	1	10	45	43	0	5	45	51	2	7	63	29
African American	1	12	46	40	0	4	46	50	0	8	62	31
Hispanic	0	10	30	60	0	18	9	73	5	5	60	30

* Less than 10 students identified in this category

Staffing

Reported teacher data indicates that the percentage of teachers licensed in their teaching assignment is somewhat lower than that for both the district and the state averages. The school reports that 93.5% of teachers are licensed in their teaching area while the district reports 94.2% and the state 95.4%. Elihu Greenwood teachers reported to be “highly qualified” stands at 88.9% while the district reports 92.1% and the state 95.1% of teachers in this category.

A review of teacher data further reveals that 20 of the school’s 40 professional staff members (regular education, special education, specialists, and principal) have been at the school for 3 years or less. While the principal denies there is a significant turnover rate, teachers interviewed disagree with this view. Overall, the lower rate of teacher qualifications and the large percentage (50%) of professional teaching staff with three or less years at the school are conditions that might well be hampering the effectiveness of efforts to improve student performance at this school.

KEY QUESTION 2: Is the school effective in using an improvement plan that results in the continuous improvement of student performance?**No.**

The current School Improvement Plan (SIP) was written in 2003 under the leadership of the former principal and her team of faculty and district leadership. The current principal was hired in 2004 and was actively engaged in the PIM process for the development of improvement strategies addressing the SIP goals. The PIM plan identified “root causes” of the lack of student performance and strategic programmatic initiatives to address them. However, staffing data reveals that 6 of 19 regular education classroom teachers (31%) and 5 of the 6 (83%) of special education teachers have “turned over” in the last 3 years. Of the total 46 staff positions listed by the principal, 22 (47.8%) have experienced change. Thus, staffing change presents a challenge to keeping the school informed of SIP goals and on-track with PIM-generated improvement efforts.

In addition, according to school personnel interviewed, a substantial portion of the student population is in constant flux. Two elements of the BPS operating structure helps fuel this change state: the special education program that serves a multi-school area so that any reduction in the numbers assigned to special needs classes is quickly replaced from outside the immediate school service area. Second is the Advanced Work Classes that students may “test into”. Students at the Elihu Greenwood have 1.41 students per 25 invited to enroll in these classes that are housed in other schools. Such a system not only keeps the student population in flux but draws from the “brightest and best” within the school. According to interviewed teachers and members of the school leadership team, this move takes place each spring just ahead of the MCAS testing. Both of these conditions are believed by school staff to have a negative impact on the school’s ability to improve student performance.

With so much change in school staff and students, the old SIP is not well understood by the current school staff or parents. Although familiar with on-going program improvement strategies emergent from the PIM process, a majority of staff and parents acknowledged only vague awareness that the SIP was written “a few years ago” but they had no knowledge of what it contains and they were not involved in its creation.

An examination of the SIP document dated 2004-2007 lists eight major goals with benchmarks in math and ELA. Data suggests that few (if any) of the specified goals have been met. As an example, Math goal number one specifies that all students who scored Advanced or Proficient on the grade four MCAS will increase from 3% in 2003 to 17% in 2005 and to 23% in 2006. In fact, the actual percentages were 4% in 2003 to a high of 14% in 2004 only to fall back to 11% in 2005 and 6% in 2006. Similarly for ELA goal two, a set of percentages are identified as goals that appear to have little connection to actual testing data. This goal states that “all students who scored in advanced and proficient on the grades 3&4 Reading/ELA MCAS tests will increase from 27.1% in 2003 to 33.1% in 2005 and 42.3% in 2006. In fact, only 10% scored in the proficient category in 2003 ELA while in Grade 3, 50% scored proficient in reading. In 2005, there were 22% scoring proficient in grade 4 ELA and 48% in grade 3 reading. This fell back to only 10% scoring proficient in grade 4 ELA in 2006 and 23% scoring in proficient or advanced

in 2006. The plan's goals are incompatible with student performance since it was first written. Also, the plan has not been adjusted or updated with realistic numbers. Indeed, when asked if they had ever been a party to the SIP planning and implementation process, teachers and parents admitted to little or no involvement with the SIP. Since the current plan ends in 2007, the team also inquired as to the status of the re-writing process for the next phase of the plan. The team found no evidence of SIP planning or re-writing for a new SIP that should take effect in the fall of 2007.

Strategic initiatives of the PIM process with the most positive results are in the area of mathematics. The district-wide math program *Investigations* has been supplemented with changes to the school's instructional schedule to provide increased time for math instruction; adoption of a consistent school-wide problem-solving approach to math instruction known as RUSL (Read, Understand, Solve, and Look back); inclusion of supplemental skills-targeted practice strategies known as "AYP Math" and "10-minute math"; professional development for teachers to implement these strategies; implementation of a Collaborative Coaching & Learning (CCL) model that provides teachers with the support of a math specialist three days per week. In addition, the school has an established Math Leadership Team to coordinate and monitor implementation of the school's math program. While SIP goals for improved student performance on the MCAS fell short of identified targets, an overall improvement trend was seen in math sufficient to meet AYP expectations and was a likely result of these PIM initiatives.

Similarly, the identified SIP performance goals in math for SPED and LEP subgroups also fell short of target. For the SPED subgroup, a promising 10.1 point CPI improvement in 2005 testing fell back to a 7.3 point improvement in 2006. For LEP students, the consistency of improvement is difficult to track since the number of students was insufficient to report a valid percentage score in 2004 and 2005. However, a comparison of 2003 CPI of 33.8 to the 2006 CPI of 53.8 is notably positive.

**SIP Subgroup Goals
Math CPI
Mid-cycle III to Cycle IV**

	Mid-Cycle III (2003)	Mid-Cycle IV (2005)		Cycle IV (2006)		
	CPI	SIP Goal	Actual	SIP Goal	Actual	Difference
SPED	31.0	51.1	41.1	55.1	38.3	+7.3
LEP	33.8	50.0	N/A	65.0	53.8	+20.0

While the bright spot in student performance is math, ELA is clearly demonstrating a negative trend with a decline in 2006 of -3.8 CPI. Interviewed stakeholders attribute this phenomenon to several factors including the enhanced focus on math that appears to have achieved some positive results perhaps at the expense of progress in ELA, a new curriculum adoption (Harcourt) which is only in the second year of implementation, a lack of teacher training for the implementation of the new reading program, the existence of new teachers in the building who

have not received essential ELA curriculum training, and a new principal who brings changed expectations, priorities, and leadership style.

Given acknowledged lack of familiarity by a majority of teachers and parents with the SIP process and its goals, it is difficult to imagine how this school can be effective in achieving the improved student performance results envisioned in it.

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

Through the PIM process, the use of MCAS data to identify “root causes” of why students were failing to reach proficiency has led to significant changes to curriculum and instructional models at this school. Given the failure in Cycle III to meet AYP in Math, the school initiated a series of comprehensive changes to its math curriculum. Instructional time was increased to a 90-minute block daily. In addition to the regular 55-minute instructional period devoted to the Investigations curriculum, all class sessions also include 15 minutes of focused practice known as “AYP math” with materials developed and provided by district math personnel. This is further supplemented by local classroom drill and practice known as “10 minute math”. All classes school-wide follow a consistent approach known as RUSL (read, understand, solve, look-back) strategy. These efforts enable students to easily transition from grade to grade with a coordinated system of instruction and clear scope and sequence in content. Supporting this curriculum change is the added support of Instructional Support Specialists whose time was increased to full-time for the E. Greenwood School when it was named a “Superintendent’s School” for the 2004-2005 school year. Such designation afforded the school additional financial resources to provide added instructional and tutorial services for students as well as professional development opportunities and enhanced coaching support for teachers. For reasons not understood by school stakeholders, this designation was lost in the 2005-2006 school year but has been restored for the coming 2007-2008 school year.

Other changes included the assignment of a new principal who brought with her the mandate to turn around student performance in math. The school had met AYP in ELA in 2003 and the new principal had a background in reading. Thus, there was confidence at the district level that the reading program was already in-hand at the E. Greenwood School and, therefore, the priority focus was rightly focused on improving student math performance. However, a significant change was made to the school’s reading program when the school adopted the district’s Harcourt reading program now in year two of implementation. In interviews, teachers reported that they have received little training. They also explain that the change is confusing for students, especially when they are without benefit of the previous year’s “foundation in the program” to build upon.

A change in school leadership was a major part of the district’s strategy to bring improvement to student performance at Elihu Greenwood School. In an interview, the assistant superintendent

shared that the change of principal was necessary to bring about a “shift in culture” at the school. Explaining further, the assistant superintendent stated that, previously, teachers at E. Greenwood did not want to “own the problem” but now come with a “willingness to participate”. Teachers, she opined, are “finding their voice” in relation to the principal.

Completing her third year, the principal spoke of developing a “culture of support” in which teachers use each other for mutual support and instructional improvement efforts. She noted that the school is organized around teaching teams which have built-in team planning time for discussion of curriculum implementation issues. She sees teachers as “directly engaged” in the assessment and improvement process with teachers “prepared and able to engage in discussions” of student performance.

In contrast, teachers expressed concern over a perceived lack of communication and trust between the principal and themselves. They claim: changes to programs and school policies that come without warning or explanation; lack of support for student discipline issues that routinely interfere in their ability to teach; and, claims of retribution when anyone dares speak out or complain. Teachers cited a high turnover of staff as evidence of their plight while the principal denied a staff turnover issue exists. Regardless of reason, an examination of staff data reflects approximately 16 of 31 teachers have three or less years of service in the school.

Other district enrollment policies impact the school’s ability to effectively implement its SIP. The special education classrooms in this school serves students beyond the school’s service area. Thus, whenever a SPED student leaves for any reason, another student is assigned from outside the school service area. This “magnet” policy negatively distorts the school’s subgroup testing results. Similarly, high achieving students who test well are invited to attend “advanced learning” classes in another school with the effect of removing top achievers from the school’s testing results and effectively lowering its average student performance profile.

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

No.

While the Elihu Greenwood School has initiated a number of curricular and instructional changes that appear to hold promise, conditions do not appear to be in place to sustain these gains nor support continued improvement. Holding promise are initiatives in Mathematics instruction that include increased time-on-task and student tutorials, a clearly defined curriculum supplemented with skills practice and focused drill (AYP and 10-Minute Math), classroom coaching from an in-house math specialist/coach, sufficient professional development, and the coordination of instruction through grade level team planning and a school-wide math leadership team, have produced positive student outcomes sufficient to meet AYP in Math for 2006.

However, the district has implemented programs and policies that have created instability in the school’s improvement efforts. The designation of the Elihu Greenwood as a “Superintendent’s School” for only one year fostered instability of resources that, after the one year period, required a cut-back of resources to the school including reduced specialist time for teacher

support and the roll-back of an extended instructional day for students. The stalled student scores in ELA are most notable evidence of this. In addition, the district maintains a “testing-out” program for top students to leave the school for advanced classes elsewhere while transferring special education students into the school as seats become open. In interviews, teachers expressed a belief that these policies have had a negative impact on their school-based improvement efforts as well as on measures of student performance.

The observation and subsequent interview of twelve of twenty-seven classroom teachers revealed consistent teaching strategies across grade levels in math. Teachers engaged students in instructional activities designed for developing understanding. Students with special learning needs were using the same curriculum addressing the same learning standards as their regular education counterparts. The AYP packets appeared very useful for ensuring against possible gaps in learning. Classroom technology was lacking and teachers complained that overhead projectors were aging and not well maintained. Several teachers cited the lack of replacement bulbs as an issue and one teacher related that her best Christmas present this year was receiving her own overhead projector from her husband! Of concern to team members was the amount of time that students worked “independently” while the teacher focused on the needs of small groups.

Also missing is adequate evaluation of teacher performance by administrators. One veteran teacher with at least fifteen years service claimed that she had never been evaluated in her time at the Elihu Greenwood School. When the principal was subsequently asked if this would be possible, she acknowledged in the affirmative explaining that the evaluation process stipulates that only teachers new to the building are required to be evaluated at least once in their first year. She further explained that the evaluation instrument is “lengthy” and time consuming to use. The principal stated that she prefers to use “walk-throughs and feedback” [to teachers] in place of the evaluation instrument. The principal’s stated intention is “to ensure teachers are receiving feedback on a consistent and on-going basis”. However, teachers openly questioned the effectiveness of the “walk-through” strategy.

An apparent lack of trust was evident between the teachers and the new principal. A majority of teachers interviewed expressed frustration with a perceived lack of support and respect from the principal. They claimed that unnamed “others” on the Elihu Greenwood faculty had been unfairly targeted for retribution when they tried to speak out “they’re gone.” The principal acknowledged no such rift but instead alluded to developing a “culture of support.” Without trying to judge relative veracity of these claims, it is clear to this team that a rift does exist between staff and principal that undermines efforts at building a cohesive instructional team focused on improved student learning so essential to sustaining improved student performance.

CONCLUSION

Despite some promising curricular and program initiatives, many of which were implemented within the last two years, student performance at the Elihu Greenwood Elementary School continues to be rated as “low” in ELA and “Very Low” in Mathematics. An examination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) reveals that while in Mathematics, student performance met

Cycle IV targets, in ELA, student performance not only failed to meet Cycle IV targets but, indeed, actually declined.

All student subgroups continue to perform significantly below proficient levels with 100% of students with disabilities scoring in either the warning or needs improvement categories of the 2006 MCAS. The remaining major subgroups of students fared little better: Limited English Proficient (LEP) 92%, Low Income 92%, African American 93%, and Hispanic 90% scored at the Warning or Needs Improvement levels. The CPI for all subgroups in 2005 was 52.8 and in 2006 was 54.8 which reflects a modest improvement of 2 index points.

The Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process was employed in 2004 under the leadership of the current principal and six-member team in response to the SIP written in 2003 and covering the three-year period 2004 through 2007. It is clear that MCAS student performance data were analyzed to identify instructional priorities as well as implementation strategies for the SIP. However, the identified student performance goals while specific appear ambitious and, indeed, students have failed to reach these identified goals in each of the years covered by the current SIP. Interviews of teachers and parents revealed that since the current SIP was written years before by former staff members, the contents of the current SIP is not widely understood nor owned by the current stakeholders. The PIM strategy of engaging teachers in the process of analyzing student data to identify “root causes” subsequently used to develop instructional change strategies, appears to have been an effective countermeasure.

However, despite what appears to be improved teaching strategies within the classrooms, Elihu Greenwood students continue to perform below both district and state levels in both ELA and math as measured by the Composite Performance Index. Further, given the significant amount of negative feedback received from classroom teachers about their relationship to the principal, the team wonders if this discontent is a distraction from the full focus and coordinated and collaborative instructional efforts essential for student improvement.

While the district has attempted to provide added support to the Elihu Greenwood school through a change of leadership and added funding through the “Superintendent’s School” designation, the important funding resources were only available for one year (2004-2005) which was insufficient to establish enduring change initiatives or accomplish measurable student performance results. Existing district policies for student reassignment to “Advanced Learning Classes” in other district schools and students with disabilities to special education classes housed at Elihu Greenwood exacerbates the problem of student mobility, wherein, approximately 19.5% of students are new to the school annually. Further, the district’s teacher evaluation system characterized by the school administrator as “long” and “time-consuming” has added to an overall lack of regular and timely evaluation and quality performance feed-back to teachers.

The rate of staff turnover is an area of concern for the team given its potential to negatively impact the school’s efforts to improve student achievement. While the principal denies there is a staff turnover problem, teachers express an opposite view. A review of DOE and school staffing data reveals that 20 of 43 listed staff members, including the principal, have three years or less experience at Elihu Greenwood School. In addition to the 47% turnover of staff in the last three years, the review of DOE data reflects that the percentage of teachers who are licensed to teach

in their assigned areas (93.5%) and the percentage of teachers identified as “highly qualified” (88.9%) is slightly below both district and state averages.

The assignment of new principal to this school was a change strategy on the part of the district. However, this has been a major change that has consumed substantial time and energy for the school community to accommodate, drawing focus away from full attention to improving student performance. Teachers complained of frequent curriculum changes ordered by the principal that leave them and their students confused (as example, use of math journals stopped then reinstated without explanation). Teachers also reported feeling a lack of support for what they view as a serious student behavior problem as well as a fear of reprisals for “speaking out”. In juxtaposition, the principal highlighted the implementation of new policies and procedures designed to enhance discipline and keep children in-school and learning. She spoke of the development of a new “culture of support” in a school organization that facilitates team planning.

Thus, from interviews with parents, teachers, and the principal, it is clear to the Team that the most recent leadership change in this school has not been fully embraced by all stakeholders. The existing disparity of perceptions between principal and faculty significantly mitigates improvement efforts. Lacking a cohesive, mutually respectful and trusting professional team whose full attention and collaborative efforts are focused on a well-designed strategic school improvement plan, it is difficult to imagine how this school will succeed in advancing and sustaining improved student performance.

**APPENDIX A
Team Members**

Malcolm L. Patterson, Ed.D. Chairman, Senior Consultant, Class Measures
 Jo Napolito, Associate Consultant, Class Measures
 Marcia Anselmo, Leadership Consultant, Class Measures
 William C. Wolfe, Jr., Ph.D., Senior 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

- 8:00—9:00 Team members met with Principal Ms. Ida Weldon and Ms. Carrie Maille Hickey, School Support Specialist.
- 9:00—10:00. Team members met with the Deputy Superintendent, Dr. Muriel Jackson Leonard, and Assistant Superintendent, Ms. Nancy Zamierowski.
- 10:00—11:00. Team members met with the school’s curriculum and instruction leadership team and members of the school site council.
Math Leadership Team (MLT):
 Ms. Karyn LaSota, Gr. 1
 Ms. Felicia Tong, Grade 2
 Ms. Julie Power, Grade 3
 Ms. Marian Murphy, Grade 4
 Ms. Jill Potsaid, Grade 5
 Ms. Margaret Bonnice, Math Specialist
 Ms. Varda Deschineau, Math Coach
- 11:00—1:00. Team members met to discuss findings thus far and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch). Panelists used the time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information; panelists conducted an informal walk through with a focus on school culture and climate for learning.
- 1:00—3:00. Team members meet with teachers in focus groups.

	REVIEWER A and REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C and REVIEWER D
1:00-1:30	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #1 Fifth Grade Michele Bynoe Jill Potsaid	TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #2 Second Grade Caroline Chin Glenda Williamson

1:40-2:10	<p align="center">TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #3</p> <p>First Grade Karyn LaSota Christin Ciano Ella Swain</p>	<p align="center">TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #4</p> <p>Special Education Felicia Tong first/second grade Ameera Hassan Third Grade Diane O'Donovan Fourth Grade Kimberlee Carroll Fifth Grade</p>
2:20-2:50	<p align="center">TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #5</p> <p>Fourth Grade Kimberly Moss Marian Murphy Abby Farricker</p>	<p align="center">TEACHER FOCUS GROUP #6</p> <p>Third Grade Beth McLean Julie Powers Betty Solomon</p>

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

	REVIEWER A	REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C	REVIEWER D
2:30 - 3:00	<p align="center">ELA Central & School-level Team</p> <p>Ann Devewney, ELA K-5 Director</p> <p>Marianne Ouellette, ELA K-5 Program Director</p> <p>Linda Borelli, Reading Recovery</p> <p>Beth Ailinger, Literacy Coach</p>	<p align="center">Math Central & School-level Team</p> <p>Linda Davenport, K-5 Math Senior Program Director</p> <p>Varda Deschineau, Math Coach</p> <p>Margaret Bonnice, Math Specialist</p>	<p align="center">Parent FOCUS GROUP</p> <p>Cynthia Upchurch</p> <p>Sandra Fernandez</p> <p>Zunilda Roman</p>	<p align="center">STUDENT FOCUS GROUP</p> <p>Wileena Colon-Baptist, Grade 5</p> <p>Naphtalie Dorcius, Grade 5</p> <p>Amaree Murray, Grade 5</p>

3:30—5:00 Panelists synthesized information, further defined findings, prepared additional questions, and developed a team strategy for second day of the on-site visit.

Day 2 On-site Schedule

9:00—9:30 a.m. Team members met with the principal for follow-up questions

9:30—12:30 a.m. Team members visited classrooms and interviewed teachers.*

	REVIEWER A	REVIEWER B	REVIEWER C	REVIEWER D
9:30-	Observe teacher 1	Observe teacher 2	Observe teacher 3	Observe teacher 4
10:00	Ms. Murphy Room 204 Grade 4	Ms. LaSota Room 105 First Grade	Ms. Chin Room 107 Second Grade	Ms. Power Room 202 Third Grade
10:00- 10:30	Interview teacher 1	Interview teacher 2	Interview teacher 3	Interview teacher 4
10:30- 11:00	Observe teacher 5 Ms. Swain Room 103 First Grade	Observe teacher 6 Ms. O’Donovan Special Education	Observe teacher 7 Ms. Solomon Room 201 Third Grade	Observe teacher 8 Ms. Moss Room 203 Fourth Grade
11:00- 11:30	Interview teacher 5	Interview teacher 6	Interview teacher 7	Interview teacher 8
11:30- 12:00	Observe teacher 9 Ms. McLean Room 206 Third Grade	Observe teacher 10 Ms. Farricker Room 205 Fourth Grade	Observe teacher 11 Ms. Potsaid Room 106 Fifth Grade	Observe teacher 12 Ms. Hassan Room 208A Third Grade
12:00 - 12:30	Interview teacher 9	Interview teacher 10	Interview teacher 11	Interview teacher 12

12:30—2:30 Team members met to discuss findings and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch). Members used time to analyze findings and to gather more information.

2:30—3:30 Team structured time: Members identified gaps in the evidence collected and may request additional information from the principal in the form of documents, follow-up 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		Principal Assistant Principal for Curriculum & Instruction	Principal Assistant Principal for Curriculum & Instruction	

3:30—4:00 Closing meeting with the principal to discuss next steps (all members present)

4:00+ Members deliberated and formed conclusions.