

# **REPORT OF TWO YEAR FOLLOW UP REVIEW**

## **Office of Educational Quality and Accountability**

### **Michael J. Perkins School** **Boston Public Schools**

#### **Executive Summary**

The Perkins School has shown some improvement in student performance over the time of this review. Math MCAS scores have improved and AYP has been met in Math. Special Needs students however have not attained the same achievement levels with 70% of Grade 4 SPED students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category in 2006. ELA results have shown little improvement with AYP being met in 2004 and 2005 but not in 2006. Special Need results show 40% of students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category on 2006 MCAS Grade 4 ELA. Reading First assessments, DIBELS and GRADE in Grades K-3 show strong gains. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) gains with decreases in High risk students averaging 12.6% and increases in Low risk students improving by an average of 14%. The Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) is a norm referenced, group administered assessment focused on the five components of reading. Results on the GRADE test for the Grade 3 cohort of students show gains for students moving to the average and strength categories from 11% to 48% and a decrease in the weakness category from 89% to 21%.

The current School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a result of a thorough self-examination using the PIM process as conducted by the staff of the Perkins School during the summer of 2004. Since the plan was written a new principal has been appointed and only three of the original classroom teachers are still part of the faculty. The new Principal undertook the task of making a cumbersome plan of 113 pages into a more usable document. The seventeen standards have now been helpfully organized into focus areas. Headings for these focus areas include, writing, math, general and differentiation. Staff has met as members of a "Task Force" to examine the standards and make them relevant to classroom instruction. Curriculum materials have been augmented to support students in meeting the standards. For example: TERC math is now used along with AYP Math and Ten Minute Math; Harcourt Trophies has been introduced to bring systematic explicit instruction to students in K-3, while students in Grades 4&5 still maintain the use of Readers' and Writers' Workshop as their Core instruction.

The learning culture at Perkins is one of high expectations and student engagement. In 8 of the 12 classrooms the team visited, students were observed to be very engaged in learning; in 3 of the 12 classrooms, students were observed to be engaged in learning and in only one classroom, students were observed to be less engaged in learning. Standards based instruction and objective driven lessons were seen in all classrooms observed. All lessons observed challenged students intellectually and demanded that they communicate articulately and fully.

## Priority Findings

I The Michael J. Perkins School has shown some improvement in student performance over the period of this review.

- ❖ Math MCAS scores have continually risen and AYP has been met in Math each year
- ❖ ELA MCAS results have shown little improvement with AYP being met in 2004, 2005 but not in 2006
- ❖ Reading First Assessments show strong gains in Grades K-3

II The SIP/PIM plan and Curriculum and Program changes have created a Learning Community at Perkins

- ❖ Monitoring of instruction and looking at data as set forth in the SIP/PIM plan are collegial activities and part of ILT walkthrough protocols, CCL coaching cycles and Common Planning Time. Coaches also help create a strong learning community
- ❖ Program changes including the addition of AYP Math, Ten Minute Math and Harcourt Trophies have aligned the curriculum more closely with state standards and made it more accessible.

III Classroom instruction is effective and there is a learning culture of high expectations and student engagement.

- ❖ In 8 of the 12 classrooms visited students were very engaged in learning, in 3 of the 12 classrooms students were engaged in learning; in only one classroom students were less engaged.
- ❖ Standards-based instruction and objective driven lessons were observed in all classrooms observed.
- ❖ All lessons observed challenged students intellectually and demanded that they communicate articulately and fully

## 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 under performing and in need of state guidance to improve student performance. Schools declared to be under performing 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 **Michael J. Perkins 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 Under performing 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 **Michael J. Perkins Elementary School**. The Follow Up Review was conducted on **April 11 & 12 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. To what extent did the school implement the improvement plan which was approved by the State Board of Education?
3. Are there other factors (changes in conditions or circumstances, i.e., policies, practices) in the school or district which have contributed to or impeded the school's ability to implement their plan?
4. 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 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 **Perkins 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.

### **Michael J. Perkins Profile:**

The Perkins School is one of 84 Elementary Schools in the Boston Public Schools District. Perkins has an enrollment of 221 students in grades K-5. The school also houses one Supportive Academic Remediation (SAR), a substantially separate SPED class for students in grades 3,4,&5. These students are assigned to Perkins by the district. The school demographics ethnically are 48% African American, 22.2% Hispanic, 19.5% White, 5.9% Asian and 4.1% other racial categories. This compares to a District profile of 40.9% African American, 35.2% Hispanic, 13.5% White, 8.5% Asian and 1.9% other categories. The Perkins school boasts an attendance rate of 92.4% compared to 91.5% for the District with Out of School Suspension rates at 1.4% compared to 7.6% at the District level and a retention rate of 2.3% compared to the District with 7.4%.

**2007 Comparable Elementary School & District Comparative Data**

	Enrollment	% Low Income	% LEP	% SpEd
Perkins	221	93.2	16.3	20.8
Everett	267	77.5	20.2	14.6
Tynan	333	86.5	6.6	25.8
Russell	331	90.6	39.9	15.1
District	56,388	72.7	18.3	19.7

### **Staffing**

The completed Staff Data Report as submitted for the Follow-up review state the staffing is as follows: 1 Principal; 2 teachers per grade K-4 with a single grade5 (11 General Ed Classroom teachers) ; 1 SAR (SPED) classroom teacher grades 3-5; 1 full time Reading First Coach; 1 Math Coach .5FTE; 1 Literacy Coach .5FTE; 1 Science Teacher; 1 Music Teacher; 1 Art Teacher; 1 Instructional Support Teacher; 1 Resource Room Teacher (SPED) and 2 Para professionals. All teaching staff are appropriately certified. According to DOE reports 86.5% of Core academic teachers are identified as highly qualified.

## MCAS Results

## Grade 3 Reading

	Perkins			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	26	68	6	30	48	22	58	34	8
2005	31	54	15	31	48	21	62	31	7
2004	48	52	0	35	46	18	63	30	7
2003	30	59	11	32	47	21	63	30	7

In Grade 3 Reading the Perkins school has shown uneven results. Scores in the Warning/Failure performance category have fluctuated from 0% to 15% with a 6% Warning/Failure in 2006. In each year of testing, however, the Perkins School has had consistently lower percentages in the Warning/Failure performance category than the District and in 2004 and 2006 had a lower percentage of students in the Warning/Failure performance category than the State. Students in the Advanced/Proficient performance category did see an increase in 2004 of 18%; however, these scores have been in decline since then, with a decrease in 2005 of 17% and a further decline of 5% in 2006. This is a cumulative decline of 22% from 2004 levels.

## Grade 4 Mathematics

	Perkins			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	13	70	17	26	47	27	40	45	15
2005	7	61	32	21	47	32	41	45	15
2004	18	46	36	22	48	31	42	44	14
2003	0	38	62	16	46	38	40	43	16

In student achievement in Grade 4 mathematics the Perkins School has made progress. Scores of students in the Warning/Failure performance category decreased by 45% from 62% in 2003 to a low of 17% in 2006. While the number of students scoring in the Warning/ Failure performance range has decreased the number of students scoring in the Advanced/Proficient performance range has increased from 0% in 2003 and fluctuating from a high of 18% in 2004 to 13% in 2006. In 2003 students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category were nearly double the District, in 2006 the scores are 10% fewer students in the Warning/Failure performance category than the District. Scores of students in the Advanced/Proficient performance category have increased however they consistently remain below District and State levels. The percentage of Special Needs students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category is 70%. This is double the State failure rate of 36% and 11% higher than District scores. No Special Needs students achieved scores in the Advanced performance range, 10% or 1 student scored in the Proficient performance category.

**Grade 4 ELA**

	Perkins			District			State		
	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F	Adv/Prof	NI	W/F
2006	27	40	33	26	46	28	50	39	12
2005	25	57	18	25	48	26	50	40	10
2004	29	39	32	30	46	23	56	35	9
2003	12	50	38	27	45	28	55	34	10

Student achievement in Grade 4 ELA, between 2003-2006 has been inconsistent; there was an increase, followed by a decrease of students scoring in the Advanced/Proficient performance category. These scores mirror the District progress.. Students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category, with the exception of 2005,are consistently higher than District and State scores. Gains made in 2005 with 18% of students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category reverted back to 2004 levels in 2006 with 33% scoring in the Warning/Failure Performance category. The percentage of Special Needs students scoring in the Warning/Failure performance category was 40%, this score is lower than both the District and the state by 12% and 1% respectively. At the Perkins School no student scored in either the Advanced or Proficient performance categories as compared to 6% Proficient for the District and 16% for the State.

**Key Question 1: *Has school shown improvement in student performance?***

Yes. The Perkins School has made AYP in Math for the past three years 2004-2006. They also made AYP in ELA in 2004 and 2005 but not in 2006. The school is identified for improvement in the Low Income subgroup. Perkins has 93.2% of the school designated Low Income so that in essence this subgroup is the whole school.

The data trends point to consistent improvement in Math. A pattern of continual decrease in students scoring in the Warning range has occurred since 2003. In 2003 there was a high of 62% of students scoring in the warning range with a decline in consecutive years: in 2004 to 36%; in 2005 to 32% and in 2006 to 17%. In 2003 no students scored in the Advanced or Proficient categories. Since that time, the number of students reaching proficiency has increased, though inconsistently: 2004 -18%, 2005 -7%, 2006 -13%. No students have achieved Advanced level scores at any time. CPI scores also demonstrate steady progress with CPI scores of: 2003 - 35.6; 2004 - 44.0; 2005 - 52.7 and in 2006- 61.7. SPED students in 2006 had a CPI of 45.0 a difference from the aggregate of 16.7. Improvement in the overall decrease of students in the Warning category does not translate to the SPED population where 40% of the students are in the Warning category for 2006 compared to 17% in the aggregate. Scores for this population were not disaggregated in previous years due to enrollment size. The school posts an overall average SPED population of 20.8 % it is noteworthy however, that in Grade 4 the SPED population is 33%. Moreover, at the end of Grade 3 some gifted and talented students are

identified to attend the district's Advanced Work Class setting. The school had six students leave from Grade 3 to attend Advanced Work Class, in 2006 that did not enroll in Grade 4 at Perkins.

The data trends in Grade 4 ELA are less consistent. A variable series of scores for students scoring in the Warning range has occurred since 2003. In 2003 there was a high of 38% of students scoring in the warning range with a decline in the next year (2004) to 32%, followed by a further decline in 2005 to 18%. However, in 2006 a loss of the 2005 gains resulted in 33% of the population scoring in the warning category. In 2003, no students scored in the Advanced category and that has remained the case throughout the testing cycles. Scores have reached a plateau in the Proficient category moving from 12% in 2003 to little variation between 2004 - 29%; 2005 - 25% and 2006 - 27%. CPI scores have decreased. Following a CPI gain from 2003-2004 from 62.7 to 67.2, in 2005 the CPI score was 63.4 and in 2006 - 60.0.

SPED students in 2006 had a CPI of 37.5 a difference from the aggregate of 22.5. A rise in students in the Warning category of 33% in the aggregate is still only half of the 70% of SPED students scoring in that category in 2006.

The data trends for Grade 3 Reading are also mixed. There is an uneven distribution of students in the Warning category from 2003 to the present. Scores in this category have fluctuated from 0% to 15% and to 6% in 2006. In 2006 students did move from Warning into Needs Improvement but at the same time the percent of students in Advanced/Proficient dropped by 5%.

Perkins is a Reading First School and has data related to student performance in addition to MCAS results. The additional assessments used are in Grades K-3, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) a norm referenced group administered assessment focused on the five components of reading. Using DIBELS winter benchmark scores the school has evidence of increased student performance from 2005 to 2006. Over this period, referring to the Oral Reading Fluency, (ORF) indicator Grade 3 students have increased in the Low Risk category from 43% to 46% and decreased students in the At Risk category from 33% to 31%. Over the same period, students in Grade 2 show higher levels of growth with increases in the Low Risk category from 40% to 60% and decreases in the At Risk from 43% to 19%. Students in Grade 1 also show promising results, over the same period with increases in Low Risk students from 45% to 64% and decreases in At Risk students from 29% to 14%. Examining Fall GRADE test results and following a cohort of Grade 3 students with continuous attendance at the Perkins School results show progress. The percent of students identified in the Weak category, has decreased each year from 89% in 2004, to 53% in 2005 and 21% in 2006. In the Average and Strength categories, percentages of students scoring in these combined categories have risen from 11% in 2004, to 37% in 2005 and to 48% & in 2006. Research has shown DIBELS and GRADE to be indicators of success in later grades. The level of increase as documented on these measures bodes well for future MCAS scores.

**Key Question 2: *Is the school effective in using an improvement plan that results in the continuous improvement of student performance?***

Yes. The current School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a result of a thorough self-examination using the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process as conducted by the staff of the Perkins School during the summer of 2004. Since the plan was written a new principal has been appointed and only three of the original classroom teachers are still part of the faculty. The new Principal undertook the task of making a cumbersome plan of 113 pages into a more usable document. The original School Improvement Plan has been rationalized and reduced to a set of seventeen standards. The seventeen standards have now been helpfully organized into focus areas. Headings for these focus areas include; Writing, Math, General (relating to a comprehensive curriculum, higher order questioning, data driven instruction) and Differentiation. Staff has met as members of a “Task Force”, during professional development time, to examine the standards and make them relevant to classroom instruction.

Change strategies that have been a result of the plan include:

- the establishment of a “safety net” for struggling students in both ELA and Math, (these interventions are part of Reading First for K-3, ELA and are supported through the Student Support Team (SST) for ELA in grades 4&5 and math in grades K-5)
- the thoughtful implementation of the Boston Public Schools (BPS) Math Curriculum supported by District Professional Development (TERC Investigations, AYP Math and 10MinMath)
- the implementation of the Reading First initiative, including the addition of the Harcourt Trophies curriculum in Grades K-3, (teachers in Grades 4&5 chose to remain with Guided Reading and Process Writing using the techniques of Readers & Writers Workshop as their instructional model for ELA)
- development and use of Writing Curriculum Maps and Rubric (completed 2006-2007)
- the building of collegiality and effective classroom practices using the CCL model
- the use of Common Planning Time to meet to Look At Student Work and other data to inform instruction (and including SPED staff in these discussions)
- the Instructional Leadership Team’s role in Learning Walks and other monitoring of the Implementation of the plan
- There is also a BPS requirement that schools choose two of Six Instructional Priorities to focus on each year. For 2006-2007 the Perkins School has chosen Accountable Talk/Student Engagement and Notebooks. This choice supports the Improvement Objectives within their own SIP.

Implementation of the plan was reported to be inconsistent in 2004-2005 because of its complexity and inadequate communication to staff of expectations. As a result, in

September 2005, under the direction of the new principal, the plan's Improvement Objectives were reorganized into sets of goals. The goals identified the following areas of priority for the school, Summary (comprehensive curriculum, higher order questioning, data driven instruction), Literacy, Math and Differentiation. Additionally, in 2006-2007 five professional development sessions were devoted to reviewing current MCAS data and establishing task forces; groups of teachers working together to develop and implement the sets of Improvement Objectives. This activity was referred to in staff focus groups during the visit, in the principal's regular communications with staff, in common planning time schedules and in the documents that were the result of the work. This collegial process was described as "an exercise in seeing how what you do relates to the plan". Thus, the plan does not drive instruction; the curriculum drives instruction that in turn fulfills the plan. The focus on the Improvement Objectives is applauded however, the plan includes specific methods of monitoring implementation i.e. learning walks, and these are only minimally documented.

As reported earlier, the Perkins School has had a significant change of personnel since the writing of the Board approved plan. To get an historical perspective the team was able to meet with some members of the original team as part of their interview with the current Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). These included two classroom teachers, the District School Support Specialist and the Change Coach. As described by these staff members at the time of the summer 2004 PIM retreat, the Perkins School had just been assigned their third Principal since the process began. The team consisted of the new Principal, three teachers, two of whom are still at Perkins, the District School Support Specialist and the Change Coach. Following the initial retreat the team continued to meet over the summer months. Only one staff member did not take advantage of the opportunity to work with the team and have input into the development of the plan.

Responsibility for monitoring implementation of the plan rests with the Principal, his ILT, and the active participation of teachers and support staff. The existing PIM plan looks to the ILT, in collaboration with the staff, to monitor the implementation of the plan. This is achieved by using walk through protocols and collection of other documentation. Examples of these protocols and other documentation were examined by the team during the visit. There was significantly more documentation prior to the 2006-2007 school year. This was in part due to the BTU work action and the cessation of ILT meetings.

The school has received support from the district the form of: increased ELA and math coaching time to .5 FTE in each case; professional development to support the math and ELA curricula a School Support Specialist to aid in formation and implementation of the SIP; designation as a Superintendent's School 2004-2005 which included additional to professional development for teachers: Supplemental Educational Services, (SES), and funds to enable before and after school tutoring providing the "safety net" referred to in the SIP. In addition, Comprehensive School Reform, (CSR) funds have been used to strengthen the implementation of the TERC curriculum.

As a Reading First school staff in Grades K-3 has had access to extensive professional development including summer workshops. The school also benefits from full time Reading Specialist who has established benchmark assessments and progress monitoring (DIBELS /GRADE ), as well as monthly data meetings. The Reading Specialist also oversees interventions for students in the High Risk category as reported on DIBELS. The intervention programs used at Perkins are (Early Intervention in Reading (EIR), Early Success I, and Early Success II)

In accordance with the plan, teachers and students engage in a broad range of formative and summative assessments. Teachers in Grades K-3 following Reading First guidelines and administer DIBELS as fall, winter and spring benchmark times. In addition the progress of students scoring in the high-risk category on the DIBELS assessment is monitored bi-monthly. Common planning time (CPT) sessions are then devoted to reviewing and using the data to adjust groupings of students and interventions. Teachers are required to give monthly combination assessments from the Math department as well as District cumulative assessments twice a year. TERC Investigations unit assessments are administered and discussed with the Math coach. The Math coach also reviews end year data with teachers with reference to their new teaching groups in September.

***Key Question 3: Are there other factors (changes in conditions or circumstances, ie policies, practices) in the school or district which have contributed to or impeded the school's ability to implement their plan?***

The current Principal was hired summer 2005. He brings to the position a myriad of managerial and educational experience. In addition, the District supports new school leaders with ongoing Professional Development, support meetings and mentors. All new Principals are provided with district sponsored new Principal training as well as new Principal support groups for two years and an assigned mentor. Professional Development this year has focused on Adaptive Leadership and a consultancy model for problem solving. Principal breakfasts in Math and Literacy as well as Cluster meetings are additional opportunities in place by the District to support Principals. The Triad Deputy Superintendent is available and participates in school level walk through using BPS protocols

Support services including Supplemental Educational Services( SES) Comprehensive School Reform funds (CSR) and Superintendent's School status have provided needed opportunities for before school and after school tutoring, an additional twenty hours of professional development for teachers, flexibility in the assigning of 50% of the staff and additional coaching hours. Administration and staff credit these interventions with helping their students make AYP in 2004 and 2005. However, these resources were subsequently removed in September of 2006 leaving a gap in the school's safety net for struggling students.

Placement of students into the BPS Advanced Work Class at the end of Grade 3 resulted in the top six students not returning to Grade 4 this year. Perkins has a district Supportive

Academic Remediation (SAR) class. This is a mixed grade (3,4&5) class, the students of which are subject to MCAS testing in the relevant grades.

During the past year, 2006-2007 the Boston Teacher's Union (BTU), in response to contract negotiations, organized a work to rule action. The Perkins School professional development (PD) and Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) schedule was suspended from November 21, 2006 through March 2, 2007. Any meeting times outside of the regular school day were cancelled. This action resulted in limited Collaborative Coaching and Learning, (CCL) cycles, lack of continuity with the ILT in monitoring the SIP, and reduction in time spent on professional development. Members of the Instructional Leadership Team stated that it was an option to hold ILT meetings during the school day and that they were willing to participate. The Principal chose not to arrange for ILT meetings during the work action. He stated that teachers were already out of classrooms often and whatever accommodation was made for meetings would likely be challenged, given the climate of negotiations. According to interviews with coaches, CCL cycles did not begin again following the settling of the contract.

In June 2006 the Perkins School Site Council unanimously approved "School-Based Rules." These agreed upon standards of behavior give the school a common language when talking about student behavior and discipline. The 10 Boys Initiative is in place to mentor 10 minority males with the goal of drop out prevention. Structured as a mentoring initiative the boys meet regularly with a staff member to build self-esteem and motivation. The staff member is there to support their academic and social needs. Reaching into the community Perkins has been successful in maintaining City Year( a service organization matching youth ages 17-24 with full time placements in community service positions) and Generation INC ( providing in-school and after school literacy mentoring and community service using older adult volunteers) members as volunteers in classrooms.

BPS has awarded the school a two year \$150,000 grant, CASASTART. This is a research based program of the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. This will put into place a school based case managers that will be coordinating intensive prevention services including social and family services, education service, after-school and summer activities, mentoring, community policing and incentives. Additional staff will be included in the grant funding:

- Project Manager – part time
- Clerical support – part time
- Case Managers – full time

In addition to these grant funded initiatives the Principal has successfully secured a significant private donation to fund a Summer Program in 2006.

Perkins has again been named a Superintendent's School, with the goal of "transforming" low or under-performing schools to schools of excellence through a comprehensive slate of supports, incentives, collaborations, resources, flexibilities, structural improvements,

and accountability measures. Within the new collective bargaining agreement specific language is in place to ensure that this initiative will be implemented. The major components include: all teachers and staff will be required to work an additional hour per day with compensation; the principal will have sole discretion in filling 75% of vacancies; teachers will engage in classroom instruction for between 160 and 180 minutes, up to a total of 300 minutes per day. Under the special contractual arrangements, teachers will also receive an additional twenty hours of professional development.

The current School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a result of a thorough self-examination using the PIM process as conducted by the staff of the Perkins School during the summer of 2004. Since the plan was written a new principal has been appointed and only three of the original classroom teachers are still part of the faculty. The new Principal undertook the task of making a cumbersome plan of 113 pages into a more usable document. The seventeen standards have now been helpfully organized into focus areas. Headings for these focus areas include, writing, math, general (comprehensive curriculum, higher order questioning, data driven instruction) and differentiation. Staff has met as members of a "Task Force" to examine the standards and make them relevant to classroom instruction. As a result of these negotiations, in the fall of 2007 Perkins will extend its school day by one hour. Students will begin school at 8:30 AM instead of 9:30 AM.

***Key Question 4: Are the conditions in place to sustain the gains achieved and support continued improvement in student performance?***

Yes The Perkins school has an administrator with an enthusiasm for student success and a faculty equally dedicated to instructional quality and high academic expectations. While closely measuring the capacity of the team to take on leadership responsibilities, the principal is committed to establishing a distributed leadership model at the school, in time, and the team saw evidence of this shift in the professional culture of the school.

The principal has networked and augmented District financial support with additional funds from private sources bringing a summer program and before-school tutoring to replace assets lost when AYP was met and the school no longer had Superintendent's School status.

The Principal has used his management skills to secure an experienced faculty is at Perkins, and reached into the community to provide support for the Reading First program with City Year and Generations Incorporated volunteers acting as interventionists. Teachers report he supports their needs for resources.

Through his work rationalizing the PIM plan he has increased staff knowledge and engagement in school improvement planning. Because the BTU work to rule has affected availability of profession development time, the Principal made the sound decision to use the limited time available to examine MCAS results and engage staff in the attendant improvement planning process.

Meeting with the ILT (Instructional Leadership Team) including the School Support Specialist, Change Coach and two senior teachers that participated in the original PIM plan it was reported that the original PIM plan was completed through a collaborative effort. The ILT has had the role of monitoring the implementation of the plan. The strong review of activities has been impacted this year by the BTU work to rule. Document review showed consistent minutes of meetings in 2005-2006 with sporadic evidence for this year. The ILT was identified in focus groups and teacher interviews as formerly providing the instructional leadership of the school. The principal reported his intention to re-establish this function next year by managing staff expertise to productively moving the school forward.

At this time both the staff and administration are focused on priority improvements using the four Task Force Areas. They will have the opportunity with the School Reform Plan for Superintendent's School to be able to work together to create a common vision for improvement as they move forward. The Principal is looking forward to the additional resources attracted as a Superintendent's School. With a short time frame for submitting the School Reform Plan a schedule of meetings has been set that doesn't give the opportunity for large-scale participation of the staff on the team. The Principal has committed to the involvement of the entire staff, however, in the culminating plan.

District Leadership offers adequate support to the school in the form of funding, grant opportunities, Superintendent's School status, professional development for the staff and leadership development for the Principal. However, concern was raised by administration that once the school again meets their AYP the Superintendent's School status will be withdrawn before initiatives are ready to be sustained.

## **Conclusion**

The Michael J. Perkins School has made progress during the time of this review. An effective Principal is in place to continue to move the school forward. Effective instruction is in place with a dedicated staff that works towards having all students meet the Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards. Effective formative and summative assessments inform instruction, student grouping and scheduling. Supports are in place to make sure that individual student needs are being met within the general education program. The opportunity presented as being a Superintendent's School and the ability to formulate a new School Reform Plan that includes the additional funding and time, positions the Perkins School to continue on a path of success.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Team Members**

Marcia Anselmo, Leadership Consultant, Class Measures

Lisa Demoulias, Consultant-Teacher Licensure and Service Outsourcing, Class Measures

Dr. Peter Clark, Senior Consultant – Accountability, Class Measures

Peter Davies, President and Director of Accountability and Leadership, Class Measures

Jim McAuliffe, Senior Examiner, Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

**APPENDIX B****Michael J. Perkins School  
Two Year Review****April 11 – 12, 2007****Review Team**

Marcia Anselmo, Chair	Lisa Demoulais (April 11)
Dr. Peter Clark	Peter Davies (April 12)
Jim Mcauliffe	
Sally Bachofer – DOE observer	

**Wednesday, April 11**

8:00 – 9:00	Visiting Team arrives, sets up shop in the Computer Room. The Computer Room will be closed to classes on April 11-12, for exclusive use by the Review Team. The dividing doors to the Science Room will be closed. The Science Room will be available for regular classes, unless requested otherwise by the Review Team.	
9:00 – 10:00	Review Team meets with Barney Brawer, Principal	
10:00 – 11:00	Review Team meets with Dr. Ingrid Carney, Deputy Superintendent	
11:00 – 12:00	Review Team meets with ILT / School Reform Plan (SRP) Group	
	Kelly Stevens – Kindergarten	Jodi Innerfeld – Grades 4-5
	Melissa Leverett-King – Grade 1	Adam Moore – Special Ed.
	Eleanor Dewire – Grade 2	Carolyn Sullivan – Reading First Coach
	Marian Meadows – Grade 3	Slavojka Sheehan – Sch. Support Specialist
12:00 – 1:00	Review Team lunch and meeting -- private	
1:00 – 1:30	<u>Reviewers A and B</u> – Cmptr.Rm. Faculty Focus Group # 1 Joyce Smith – Kindergarten Kelly Stevens – Kindergarten Annette Haney – Grade 1 Melissa Leverett-King – Grade 1	<u>Reviewers C and D</u> – Coaches' Room Faculty Focus Group # 2 Carolyn Sullivan – Reading First Coach Barbara Barros – Literacy Coach Paul Russo – Math Coach
1:30 – 2:00	<u>Reviewers A and B</u> – Cmptr.Rm. Faculty Focus Group # 3 Eleanor Dewire – Grade 2 Barbara Price – Grade 2 Wendy Alert – Grade 3 Marian Meadows – Grade 3	<u>Reviewers C and D</u> – Coaches' Room Faculty Focus Group # 4 Adam Moore – Resource Room Rachel Santora – Instructional Support Allison-Hutchinson – 3-4-5 Class (Sp.Ed.) Rebecca Witte, Othniel St-Ulme – Counselors

2:00 – 2:30	<u>Reviewers A and B</u> – Cmptr.Rm. Faculty Focus Group # 5 Jodi Innerfeld – Grade 4 Cindy Muenkel – Grade 4 Laura Ross – Grade 5 Mary Balaconis – Grade 5	<u>Reviewers C and D</u> – Coaches' Room Faculty Focus Group # 6 Elizabetha Zawaski – Kdg. Paraprof. Adelia Lee-Hinton – 3-4-5 Paraprof. Haven Ripley – Science Alice Nicholas – Literacy Enhancement
2:30 – 3:00	<u>Reviewers A and B</u> – Cmptr.Rm. Parents' Focus Group Kim Buckman Glenda Clarke Jennifer Crockton Two or three additional parents including at least one parent of a Special Needs student	<u>Reviewers C and D</u> – Coaches' Room Students' Focus Group Grade 3 – two students Grade 4 – two students Grade 5 – two students including at least one Special Needs student
3:00 – 5:30	Review Team meeting – private	

### Thursday, April 12

8:00 – 10:00 Review Team meeting – private

Please note: A number of teachers may be asked to change their usual schedules on this day so that the Review Team can observe Math lessons and a Science lesson, as they have requested. Art with 4I and Music with the 3-4-5 class will begin at 10:15 on this day. Grade 5 will have Science from 11:30 – 12:30. Other schedule changes will be arranged with teachers individually.

	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Reviewer D
10:00 – 10:30	<u>Observe</u> Kdg.-Stevens	<u>Observe</u> Kdg.-Smith	<u>Observe</u> Gr.1-Haney	<u>Observe</u> Gr.1-Leverett-King
10:30 – 11:00	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Stevens	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Smith	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Haney	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Leverett-King
11:00 – 11:30	<u>Observe</u> Gr.2-Dewire	<u>Observe</u> Gr.2-Price	<u>Observe</u> Gr.3-Alert	<u>Observe</u> Gr.3-Meadows
11:30 – 12:00	<u>Interview</u> Ms.Dewire	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Price	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Alert	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Meadows
12:00 – 12:30	<u>Observe</u> Gr.4-Innerfeld	<u>Observe</u> Gr.4-Muenkel	<u>Observe</u> Gr.5-Science	<u>Observe</u> Gr.3-4-5 Hutchinson

12:30 – 1:00	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Innerfeld	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Muenkel	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Ripley	<u>Interview</u> Ms. Hutchinson
1:00 – 2:30	Review Team lunch and meeting – private			
2:30 – 3:00	Closing meeting with Barney Brawer, Principal to discuss next steps			
3:00 – 5:30	Reviewers deliberate and form conclusions. – private			