

REPORT OF TWO YEAR FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

M. Marcus Kiley Middle School

Springfield Public Schools

The M. Marcus Kiley Middle School in Springfield has not shown improvement in student performance. The school is in ‘Restructuring’ status for both English language arts (ELA) and math. Kiley has not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the aggregate student population or for subgroups from 1999 through 2006 in ELA or math, except in 2003 in ELA. The performance gap between Kiley students and their respective district peers widens across grades 6, 7, and 8. Kiley students spend little time learning, due to high levels of student and teacher absenteeism, excessive interruptions due to discipline problems, and poor classroom management.

Kiley Middle School is not effective in using an improvement plan and student performance is not improving. Currently, the school lacks the capacity to implement the school improvement plan (SIP) because all staff members are not committed to and fully capable of implementing it. Since the time the school was declared ‘underperforming’ by the Board of Education in 2004, the Kiley Middle School has struggled to implement an improvement plan. The 2004-2005 SIP approved by the Board of Education was not implemented, and the 2005-2006 SIP was not approved by the faculty and had little implementation. At the time of the Follow-up Review in 2007, the school had only recently begun implementing an improvement plan. Even in the 2006-2007 school year administration and staff stated that the SIP has not been fully or consistently implemented.

The principal and the district described the primary work of the school’s leaders as exposing the enormous deficiencies at the school. As a result of doing so, she has faced relentless opposition from the Springfield Education Association (SEA) and stonewalling and resistance from vocal faculty members.

Union grievances have been a substantial distraction to the principal’s time. Teachers expressed that administrators should take more responsibility for monitoring hallways, enforcing the code of conduct, providing more team time, and having grade-level meetings. Team time was not consistently used to discuss ways to improve student achievement, and most teams were not provided with enough consistent team time to plan at all.

Conditions are not in place to improve student performance at the Kiley Middle School. School leaders made a number of attempts to focus on priority improvements in teaching and learning through the 2006-2007 SIP development process, professional development initiatives, classroom practice procedures, and a uniform standards-based lesson plan. However, the leadership in the school has not been able to effectively implement instructional improvement initiatives within the 18 months of the principal’s administration. The principal planned to retire at the end of the school year. The district had no succession plan at the time of the EQA site visit.

Priority Findings

1. The school is in 'Restructuring' status in ELA and math and is not moving any students to proficiency. Kiley has not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the aggregate or for subgroups from 1999 through 2006 in ELA or math, except in 2003 in ELA in the aggregate.
 - Instruction is not moving students toward proficiency.
 - Kiley students spend little time learning.
 - Kiley does not have an environment conducive to learning and growth.
 - Prospects for improvement are low given the circumstances. Some initiatives could have potential, they have not been implemented, and will not be successful without drastic changes to the school.

2. While the school has a school improvement plan (SIP) that focuses on instruction based on a root cause analysis, no school improvement plan can be implemented given the current obstacles.
 - The Springfield Education Association (SEA) is an obstacle to implementing a school improvement plan.
 - The school lacks professional responsibility for student achievement.
 - Many staff members lack skills to implement strategies in the SIP.
 - Prospects for improvement are low given the circumstances. Some initiatives could have potential, they have not been implemented, and will not be successful without drastic changes to the school.

3. Kiley Middle School is in crisis, and this is a critical juncture for district and school leadership to transform this school entirely with a unified staff committed to attaining high levels of student achievement.

Two Year Follow-up Review Process

The Two Year Follow-up Review is the fourth and final stage of 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 identified as in need of improvement is underperforming and in need of state guidance to improve student performance. The Panel Review of the Kiley Middle School occurred on February 2, 2004. 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. Following the Fact-finding Review on April 13, 2004, the Kiley Middle School developed such a plan, and the Commissioner and Board of Education accepted the plan

on October 26, 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 Follow-up Review was conducted on March 7, 2007. 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 Kiley Middle School.

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 a school improvement plan that results in the continuous improvement in 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 its plan?
4. Are the conditions in place to sustain the gains achieved and support continued improvement in student performance?

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

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

Kiley Middle School Profile

The Kiley Middle School is one of six middle schools in Springfield Public Schools. Kiley enrolled 961 students in 2006. According to school data, the student body was 939 in 2007.

The student population reflects that of the district, with all subgroups within a five percentage-point range in the difference between the school and district populations. The majority population in the school is Hispanic (48.1 percent) and African-American (27.9 percent), followed by white students (18.4 percent). One-quarter of the student population is classified as special education and one quarter is classified as first language not English (14 percent are limited English proficient). The student body is overwhelmingly low income, with 82.3 percent

receiving free or reduced-cost lunch, compared to 77.5 percent of the district students. See Table 1.

**Table 1. Demographic Composition, 2007
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Student Subgroup	Percentage of Students		
	School	District	State
African-American	27.9	25.5	8.2
Asian	1.9	2.1	4.8
Hispanic	48.1	49.9	13.3
Native American	0.0	0.1	0.3
White	18.4	18.3	71.5
Multi-race, non-Hispanic	3.6	4.1	1.7
FLNE	25.0	21.8	14.9
LEP	14.0	13.7	5.6
Low Income	82.3	77.5	28.9
Special Education	25.0	22.0	16.9

Source: Department of Education

The Kiley population has remained demographically stable from 2004 to 2007. Most of the variance occurred in the special education population, which has grown every year, from 18.4 percent in 2004 to 25.0 percent in 2007.

**Table 2. Demographic Changes, 2004-2007
Kiley Middle School**

Subgroup	2004	2005	2006	2007
LEP	17.6	16.1	17.5	14.0
Low Income	81.0	82.2	81.0	82.3
Special Education	18.4	19.4	21.4	25
FLNE	NA	23.0	26.1	25.0
Migrant	1.5	1.4	2.2	NA

Source: The school reported the 2004-2006 figures. The 2006 data were verified with Department of Education data. The source of 2007 data is the DOE.

In 2006, Kiley was demographically similar to other middle schools in the district, with subgroup populations in the median for every subgroup with the exception of special education students. Unlike in 2007, Kiley’s special education population in 2006 was the lowest among the middle schools that year. See Table 3.

AYP data for 2006 show an attendance rate of 90.0 percent for Kiley. The AYP data show that the subgroups with the highest attendance rates were white students (92.7 percent), followed by African-American students (91.5 percent), low-income students (89.4 percent), special education students (89.1 percent), Hispanic students (87.9 percent) and LEP students (87.1 percent). DOE data report attendance differently. Compared to the other district middle schools, Kiley’s and Duggan’s attendance rate of 89.3 percent was the lowest in 2006.

In 2006, Kiley had the highest in-school suspension rate, at 25.7 percent. However, Kiley had the lowest out-of-school suspension rate, at 21.2 percent. See Table 3.

**Table 3. Demographics, Attendance, and Discipline, 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield Middle Schools**

School	Enrollment	Minority	LEP	Low Income	SPED	Attendance Rate	In-School Suspension	Out-of-School Suspension
Chestnut Middle	1,230	87	21	83	25	91.5	19.2	24.0
Duggan Middle	699	91	18	84	27	89.3	12.7	30.2
Forest Park Middle	979	74	8	77	22	91.2	12.9	22.4
Kennedy Middle	639	82	7	86	23	90.1	18.2	26.9
Kiley Middle	961	83	17	81	21	89.3	25.7	21.2
Van Sickle Middle	1,109	82	11	82	23	91.1	17.1	24.2
District	25,206	81.7	13.7	77.5	20.5	89.6	10.2	13.7
State	972,371	28.5	5.6	28.9	16.5	94.4	3.5	6.0

Source: Department of Education. With the exception of enrollment data, all figures are percentages.

District-wide in 2006, 28.8 percent of grade 6 students, 35.3 percent of grade 7 students, and 35.3 percent of grade 8 students were chronically absent. While the EQA team did not have Kiley's figures of chronically absent students, the data suggest that one-third of all students were absent 10 or more days from school.

According to DOE data, Kiley's in-school and out-of-school suspension peaked in 2005 and declined in 2006 to rates higher than those in 2004. From 2004 to 2006, in-school suspension rates changed from 15.3 to 22.3 to 20.0 percent. From 2004 to 2006, out-of-school suspension rates changed from 20.1 to 25.8 to 21.2 percent. Over the three-year period, the discipline data collected by the DOE reveals that Kiley had the third highest in-school suspension rate, 19.1 percent, in the district; Putnam Vocational Technical High School had a three-year rate of 32.6 and Chestnut Middle School had a three-year rate of 25.9 percent. Kiley's three-year out-of-school suspension rate was the seventh highest in the district at 22.4 percent, but lower than four of the six middle schools and two of five high schools, with rates ranging from 30.4 to 25.0 percent.

Staffing

At the time of the review, Kiley's five administrators were the principal and four assistant principals. The principal and three of the assistant principals were in their second year at Kiley. One of the assistant principals had been at the school for 12 years, but had spent 11 years teaching. The principal was the only administrator with administrative experience prior to the 2006-2007 school year. All 12 years of her experience were in an elementary school. All the administrators were certified for grades 6-8. See Table 4.

Kiley had 66 classroom teachers. Of the 66 classroom teachers, 59 percent were certified; all the remaining had waivers. Forty-one percent of the teachers (27) were in their first year at the school, and 27 percent (18) were in their first year of teaching.

Documents provided to the team by the school revealed that all (9) of the ELA teachers were certified; only one was a first-year teacher. The group of math, special education, and English language learner (ELL) teachers lacked similar qualifications. Twenty-five percent (4) of the 16

math teachers were teaching on a waiver; 50 percent (6) were in their first year of teaching, and 75 percent (8) were in their first year at Kiley. Ninety percent (9) of the 10 special education teachers were teaching on a waiver; 50 percent were in their first year of teaching. All four of the ELL teachers were on a waiver, and three were in their first year of teaching.

The school also employed four substitute teachers, two education team leaders, a speech pathologist, a librarian, three guidance staff members, a nurse, and 13 paraprofessionals.

**Table 4. Staffing, 2007
Kiley Middle School**

Role	Total	Total with current certification in area/HQ if paraprofessional	Average years experience in position	Average years in school
Administrators	5	5	3.0	3.8
Classroom Teachers	66	39 (27 on waiver)	10.7	5.7
Substitutes Teachers	4	0 (2 on waiver)	5.1	1.0
Other	4	3 (1 on waiver)	12.0	7.2
Support Staff	4	3 (1 on waiver)	-	2.5
Paraprofessionals	13	13	6.3	3.8

Source: Data provided by school. "Other" includes special education team leaders, speech pathologist, and the librarian. "Support staff" includes guidance and the nurse. Data on experience were collected only for teaching and administrative experience.

Information provided to the EQA for the district-wide review of Springfield Public Schools in March 2007 suggest that Kiley students spent less time in classrooms with their regular classroom teacher compared to those in other schools in the district in 2006. The average teacher at Kiley was absent 17.5 days, almost 10 percent of the time and a rate much higher than the district middle school average of 12.7 days absent. When absences for professional development were included, the team learned that the average classroom was not taught by the students' regular classroom teacher for 18.4 days, or over 10 percent of the days students attend school. See Table 5.

**Table 5. Teacher Attendance Data, 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield Schools**

School	Number of Teachers	Days Absent for Short-Term Illness	Days Absent for Other Reasons	Total Days Absent Excluding PD	Average per Teacher Excluding PD	Days Absent for PD	Total Days Absent Including PD	Average per Teacher Including PD
Homer Street (K-5)	40.00	333.00	126.00	459.00	11.48	52.00	511.00	12.78
Washington (K-5)	30.00	164.00	43.00	207.00	6.90	19.00	226.00	7.53
White (K-5)	38.00	398.00	91.00	489.00	12.87	76.00	565.00	14.87
K-5 Average	38.97	309.47	123.33	433.53	11.02	32.25	470.79	12.11
Kiley (6-8)	83.00	919.00	530.00	1449.00	17.46	80.00	1529.00	18.42
6-8 Average	79.83	738.00	286.67	1024.67	12.71	133.00	1157.67	14.46

Source: Data provided by school. PD=professional development.

MCAS Results

In 2006, Kiley was in 'Restructuring' status for both ELA and math. Since 1999 when the data were recorded, the school only made AYP once—in 2003 for ELA in the aggregate, but not for

all subgroups. Math performance has been ‘Critically Low’ for the past two cycles, and ELA has been ‘Low’ for Cycles III and IV as well. See Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6. ELA Adequate Yearly Progress Cycle Data, 2004-2006
Kiley Middle School

Year / Cycle	ELA CPI	CPI change	AYP Aggregate	AYP Subgroups	School Status
2004 Cycle III (03-04)	60.5	+4.5	Yes in 2003 No in 2004	No in 2003 No in 2004	Low On Target Identified for Improvement
2006 Cycle IV (05-06)	63.9	+3.4	No in 2005 No in 2006	No in 2005 No in 2006	Low Improved Below Target Restructuring

Source: Department of Education

Table 7. Math Adequate Yearly Progress Cycle Data, 2004-2006
Kiley Middle School

Year / Cycle	Math CPI	CPI change	AYP Aggregate	AYP Subgroups	School Status
2004 Cycle III (03-04)	34.3	+3.7	No in 2003 No in 2004	No in 2003 No in 2004	Critically Low Improved Below Target Identified for Restructuring
2006 Cycle IV (05-06)	38.0	+3.7	No in 2005 No in 2006	No in 2005 No in 2006	Critically Low Improved Below Target Restructuring

Source: Department of Education

Subgroup Performance

While the rate of CPI growth has been far too slow to move the school toward proficiency, the school has experienced no decline in the ELA or math CPI in 2005 or 2006, for the aggregate or for any of the subgroups.

In 2006, special education students (196 total) met the improvement target in ELA, with a CPI change of +13.5 points. However, with an 89.1 percent attendance rate and a -0.1 percentage point change from the prior year, the subgroup did not meet the attendance target or make AYP. The other subgroup to meet the improvement target was white students (178 total) in ELA, with a +8.7 CPI change and a +1.5 change in the attendance rate. The white student subgroup met the improvement target and made AYP in ELA; this was the only subgroup to make AYP in either content area.

In order to reveal trends in subgroup data, Tables 8 through 13 show subgroup performance on all the 2006 MCAS tests, including the tests not counted for accountability purposes in 2006. In comparisons between subgroup CPI data of the school and district, it is important to note that Springfield Public Schools’ subgroup performance is significantly lower than the state on ELA and math tests in grades 6, 7, and 8.

In ELA, Kiley’s subgroups achieved a slightly lower CPI on average in ELA, compared to their district peers.

Comparing Kiley to the district on the grade 6 ELA test, composite proficiency index data by subgroup reveal that the Kiley's grade 6 subgroup performance was higher than district-wide for African-American and white students or within a two-point range for the other subgroups, with the exception of LEP/FLEP students who scored 7.8 CPI points below the district average. See Table 8.

**Table 8. Grade 6 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	68.5	65.2	72.3
Asian	–	73.2	87.3
Hispanic	56.3	58.2	67.0
Native American	–	–	79.8
White	79.4	78.3	89.2
LEP/FLEP	38.6	44.4	59.7
Low Income	61.0	61.4	71.5
Special Education	47.3	48.9	65.7

Source: Department of Education

In grade 7, all of the Kiley's subgroups underperformed the district except for special education students, with a CPI higher than the district by 9.1 points. Hispanic students underperformed their district peers by 5.9 CPI points. The other subgroups were within a three-point range. See Table 9.

**Table 9. Grade 7 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	67.1	67.8	72.4
Asian	–	79.7	86.6
Hispanic	50.2	56.1	67.2
Native American	–	–	82.9
White	75.0	75.8	88.9
LEP/FLEP	43.3	45.7	58.3
Low Income	59.1	61.4	71.8
Special Education	58.9	49.8	63.8

Source: Department of Education

On the grade 8 ELA test, all of Kiley's subgroups slightly underperformed the district by three or less index points. See Table 10.

**Table 10. Grade 8 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	71.1	73.8	78.2
Asian	–	84.3	89.2
Hispanic	60.6	63.0	72.1
Native American	–	–	84.3
White	83.8	84.1	92.3
LEP/FLEP	41.8	46.7	59.8
Low Income	66.0	67.8	76.7
Special Education	52.6	53.9	69.1
<i>Source: Department of Education</i>			

In math, Kiley’s subgroups achieved a noticeably lower CPI on average compared to their district peers.

Comparing Kiley to the district on the grade 6 math test, composite performance index data by subgroup reveal that the Kiley’s grade 6 subgroup performance was higher for African-American students (by 5.9 points) and low-income students (by 0.5 points) or within a two-point range of their district peers except for white students, who scored 5.7 points below their peers in Springfield. See Table 11.

**Table 11. Grade 6 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	43.8	37.9	51.3
Asian	–	57.1	80.7
Hispanic	35.1	36.0	48.7
Native American	–	–	59.3
White	51.0	56.7	75.8
LEP/FLEP	26.7	27.8	47.0
Low Income	38.2	37.7	53.0
Special Education	30.5	31.1	47.0
<i>Source: Department of Education</i>			

In grade 7 math, all Kiley subgroups underperformed the district. The performance gaps ranged from 3.2 (special education students) to 6.4 (white students) CPI points.

**Table 12. Grade 7 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	31.7	37.0	46.8
Asian	–	61.7	78.3
Hispanic	26.2	32.0	44.5
Native American	–	–	59.3
White	44.1	50.5	72.1
LEP/FLEP	24.5	28.3	43.1
Low Income	29.1	35.3	48.8
Special Education	28.4	31.6	42.5

Source: Department of Education

In grade 8 math, all Kiley subgroups underperformed the district. Only African-American students had a gap of 1.5 points or less. The performance gaps for other subgroups were between 4.5 and 6.3 index points. Specifically, the gap between the Kiley and district CPI was 6.3 points for Hispanic students, 5.3 points for white students, 4.5 points for LEP/FLEP students, 5.0 points for low-income students, and 5.5 points for special education students. See Table 13.

**Table 13. Grade 8 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	36.4	37.9	47.0
Asian	–	64.5	77.7
Hispanic	27.6	33.9	45.0
Native American	–	–	59.9
White	50.4	55.7	71.6
LEP/FLEP	21.6	26.1	40.7
Low Income	32.1	37.1	48.4
Special Education	25.0	30.5	41.6

Source: Department of Education

Proficiency on the Content Area Tests

Tables 14 through 17 show proficiency trend data on the MCAS tests for grade 7 ELA and for grades 6 and 8 in math from 2004 to 2006.

Table 14 shows that proficiency in ELA declined from 25 to 20 percent between 2004 and 2006. There was an increase in proficiency to 29 percent in 2005, but it was not sustained the next year. For the three-year period, the school had a lower percentage of students performing at or above the 'Proficient' level compared to the district; proficiency was lower than the district by 10 percentage points in 2004 and 2006, and three percentage points in 2005. The percentage of students in 'Warning/Failing' declined from 29 percent in 2004 to 22 percent in 2005 to 23 percent in 2006. In 2006, Kiley had a lower percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category compared to the district.

**Table 14. Grade 7 ELA MCAS Results, 2004-2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Year		n	Percentage of Students				
			A	P	A/P	NI	W
2004	Kiley Middle School	365	0	25	25	46	29
	District	2,102	1	34	35	41	23
	State	77,386	9	59	68	25	7
2005	Kiley Middle School	355	0	29	29	49	22
	District	2,070	2	30	32	46	23
	State	76,719	10	56	66	27	7
2006	Kiley Middle School	274	0	20	20	57	23
	District	1,974	2	28	30	42	29
	State	74,509	10	55	65	26	9

Source: DOE. n=number of students tested, A=Advanced, P=Proficient, A/P=Advanced/Proficient (at or above the proficiency level), NI=Needs Improvement, W=Warning/Failing.

Between 2004 and 2006, in grade 6 math Kiley’s performance remained low, and comparable to the district. Only nine percent of Kiley students scored at or above the ‘Proficient’ level in 2004 and 2005; 12 percent achieved proficiency in 2006. The percentage of students in ‘Warning/Failing’ remained flat over the three-year period, with 65 percent in 2004, 62 percent in 2005, and 64 percent in 2006. See Table 15.

**Table 15. Grade 6 Math MCAS Results, 2004-2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Year		n	Percentage of Students				
			A	P	A/P	NI	W
2004	Kiley Middle School	354	1	8	9	27	65
	District	2,027	3	8	11	26	63
	State	76,661	17	25	42	32	25
2005	Kiley Middle School	319	1	8	9	29	62
	District	1,978	2	10	12	26	62
	State	74,784	17	29	46	30	23
2006	Kiley Middle School	247	2	10	12	24	64
	District	1,965	2	9	11	24	65
	State	73,470	17	29	46	29	25

Source: DOE. n=number of students tested, A=Advanced, P=Proficient, A/P=Advanced/Proficient (at or above the proficiency level), NI=Needs Improvement, W=Warning/Failing.

In grade 8 math, Kiley’s performance was mostly flat. Only four percent of students achieved proficiency in 2004, and seven percent did so in 2005 and 2006. The percentage of students in ‘Warning/Failing’ decreased from 74 to 71 to 67 percent during the period. Kiley underperformed the district all three years.

**Table 16. Grade 8 Math MCAS Results, 2004-2006
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield and the State**

Year		n	Percentage of Students				
			A	P	A/P	NI	W
2004	Kiley Middle School	344	0	4	4	22	74
	District	1,981	2	7	9	24	67
	State	78,893	13	26	39	32	29
2005	Kiley Middle School	342	1	6	7	22	71
	District	2,022	2	7	9	22	69
	State	77,025	13	26	39	30	31
2006	Kiley Middle School	270	1	6	7	26	67
	District	1,992	2	8	10	24	66
	State	76,276	12	28	40	31	29

Source: DOE. n=number of students tested, A=Advanced, P=Proficient, A/P=Advanced/Proficient (at or above the proficiency level), NI=Needs Improvement, W=Warning/Failing.

Kiley performed at or below the district level of proficiency on each of the Springfield Public Schools’ formative assessments in 2006 and in 2007. At the time of the review, the school had administered only the second of three District Formative Assessments (DFAs) to the students. DFA data did not demonstrate school achievement leading to improved performance on the MCAS tests in 2007. See Table 17.

**Table 17. Proficiency on District Formative Assessments
Kiley Middle School Compared to Springfield
2006 3rd Cycle Test – 2007 2nd Cycle Test**

School	Grade	ELA			Math		
		2005-2006	2006-2007	Change	2005-2006	2006-2007	Change
Kiley	Grade 6	20	14	-6	26	23	-3
	Grade 7	28	26	-2	9	9	0
	Grade 8	35	28	-7	30	24	-6
District	Grade 6	29	22	-7	30	27	-3
	Grade 7	35	33	-2	18	9	-9
	Grade 8	44	36	-8	25	24	-1

Source: Springfield Public Schools. Note: 2006-2007 scores represented the second of three assessment cycles. Upward trends mean improvement, but downward trends do not, since the chart compares the 3rd cycle of the 2005-2006 assessments with the 2nd cycle of the 2006-2007 assessments. The team used the information available from the district.

Panel Responses to the Key Questions

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

No. The school has not shown improvement in student performance. The school is in ‘Restructuring’ status for both ELA and math. Kiley Middle School has not made AYP in the aggregate or for subgroups from 1999 through 2006 in ELA or math except in 2003 in ELA.

In 2006, the performance gaps between Kiley subgroups and their district peers widened across grades 6, 7, and 8. In grade 6 ELA, all subgroup CPI scores were lower than the district except for African-American and white students. In grade 6 math, all subgroup CPI scores were lower than the district except for the African-American and low-income subgroups. In grade 7 ELA, all subgroup CPI scores were lower than the district except for the special education subgroup. All subgroup CPI scores were lower than the district in grade 7 math, grade 8 ELA, and grade 8 math. All of the school’s subgroups substantially underperformed the state, based on the CPI, in math and ELA at all three grade levels.

Cycle IV AYP data for 2005 and 2006 show that the aggregate population improved slightly, but not enough, to make AYP, and performance improvements slowed further compared to the previous year. In 2006, only the white subgroup made AYP in ELA. The subgroups that did not make AYP in ELA included the LEP, special education, low-income, African-American, and Hispanic subgroups. None of the subgroups made AYP in math, including the white, LEP, special education, low-income, African-American, and Hispanic subgroups. None of the subgroups met the performance target in either subject. In ELA, only the white and special education subgroups met the improvement target. No subgroup met the improvement target in math. None of the subgroups met the attendance target except for the white subgroup.

In 2005, the special education subgroup made AYP in ELA and math. The African-American subgroup also made AYP in ELA that year. None of the other subgroups made AYP in 2005 in either ELA or math, including the LEP, low-income, Hispanic, and white subgroups. White students in ELA met the performance target in 2005, but no other subgroup met the performance target. In ELA, all of the subgroups met the improvement target. However, because only the special education and African-American subgroups met the attendance target, these were the only subgroups to make AYP in ELA. In math, no subgroups met the performance target. Only special education students met the improvement and attendance targets so that they could make AYP. African-American students met the attendance target, but not the improvement target.

In Cycle IV, Kiley Middle School improved below target in both ELA, with a CPI change of 3.4 points, and in math, with a CPI change of 3.7 points. In Cycle IV (2005 and 2006 data), the areas of greatest improvement were for the two subgroups that met the improvement targets in ELA: the special education and white subgroups. Special education students had a CPI improvement of 13.5 index points and white students had a CPI improvement of 8.7 index points. Although LEP students did not meet the improvement target, the subgroup gained in ELA by 7.0 index points. While no subgroups met the improvement target in math, special education students improved by 7.4 index points, and African-American students improved by 6.7 index points.

Although the school has not improved enough to make AYP, the CPI change has moved in a positive direction for the aggregate and for subgroups. In 2005, since the school met all the improvement targets in ELA, it could have made AYP in ELA for the aggregate population and for all of its subgroups if it had met attendance targets.

Attendance is a huge issue affecting student performance at the Kiley Middle School. The attendance rate has increased slightly from 2003 to 2006, from 89.1 to 89.5 to 89.8 to 90.0 percent, according to AYP reports. However, the attendance rate is still below target.

The school report indicated that subgroup proportions have affected the school's ability to implement an improvement plan, noting that LEP, low-income, special education, first language not English, and migrant populations proportionally increased more at Kiley than they did district-wide. However, in comparison to the other middle schools, the Kiley subgroup populations were approximately in the median and similar to the district average. Additionally, the school's population did not change significantly between 2004 and 2006. See Tables 1 through 3.

The student population has decreased in the school from 1,024 in 2005, to 961 in 2006, to 939 in 2007. Yet, the student-teacher ratio increased during the same period, from 11.8 to 12.0 to 13.9 percent, according to the school's self-published report card.

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

No. Kiley Middle School is not effective in using an improvement plan and student performance is not improving. Currently, the school lacks the capacity to implement the plan because not all staff members are committed to and fully capable of implementing the SIP.

Since the time that the DOE declared the school to be underperforming, the Kiley Middle School has struggled to implement an improvement plan. Staff reported that the former principal did not implement the 2004-2005 SIP approved by the Board of Education.

The current principal was hired in July 2005, more than a year after the school was declared underperforming in March 2004. The deadline for voluntary transfers in the district was in April, so that the principal began with the existing staff in the 2005-2006 school year.

Off to a rocky start, the 2005-2006 SIP was not approved by the faculty nor the school-centered decision-making (SCDM) team and had little implementation, according to interviews. The SEA filed grievances because the principal did not submit the newly amended SIP for SCDM team review and approval. The union grieved SIP amendments beginning September 2, 2005. With the exception of the objection to the standards-based lesson planning (for example, the SIP states that lesson plan books have to demonstrate pacing and vocabulary), the grievances were tangential to SIP strategies. However, the grievances created a context that made focusing on SIP implementation challenging.

In 2006-2007, Kiley experienced heavy administrative team and staff turnover. The principal indicated that the idea of school change and improvement had mixed support from the staff. In terms of staff support for the SIP, the principal described the staff as one-third “very supportive,” one-third “resistors,” and one-third “either way”.

In spite of a rocky start to her tenure at Kiley Middle School, the 2006-2007 plan was developed through a process that supports successful implementation. The principal stated that she welcomed resistors to participate. Unlike in 2005-2006, she brought the SIP to the SCDM team for review and approval. The district scored the SIP a 2.78 on its three-point rubric. The 2006-2007 plan was the first SIP approved by the faculty. In interviews, the staff was widely supportive of many of the SIP strategies in interviews, and many staff members knew content of the SIP. The team saw evidence of the implementation of SIP strategies in the classroom.

The management of the SIP implementation is not yet strong, although the school has structures in place. A planning team managed SIP implementation, holding monthly meetings. The SIP team reported to faculty in faculty meetings. The district report stated that the school support specialist meets bimonthly with the principal and the collaborative professional development teachers (CPDTs) to monitor the implementation of the SIP. The SIP plan delineates responsibility of implementation of the SIP. However, interviewees indicated that department-level implementation was uneven, and dependent on the availability of staff members during the designated meeting times and the people in the department.

The district put supports in place to help the school implement an improvement plan. Notably, the district provided an additional assistant principal to the school to oversee curriculum and instruction. However, the assistant principal for curriculum and instruction also handles discipline, and estimated that she spends 50 percent of her time managing student behavior.

The district also provided Kiley with instructional leadership specialists (ILSs) to coach teachers, as a service provided to all underperforming schools; performing schools in the district had access to CPDTs, who performed similar roles but had less rigorous entry standards for the position. For all schools, the district provides school support specialists, support for school-based professional development (Kiley selected Ribas training, for example), the new Connected Math Program (CMP) materials and training, the math instructional guide (MIG), and the new grade 6 online instructional resources. The principal stated that school and district intervention with the regular learning walk visits were helpful in providing feedback on how to improve instruction in her building.

At the time of the review, the school had only recently begun implementing an improvement plan. Even in the 2006-2007 school year, the school has not fully or consistently implemented the SIP, according to members of the administration and staff. The school has addressed four key SIP strategies in 2007. Two strategies, first introduced in the previous SIP (2005-2006), were open-response practices and an emphasis on vocabulary. The other two strategies, the standards-based lesson planning and the new structure for the 90-minute block, met resistance.

The 2006-2007 SIP has a root cause analysis that is linked to plans. The SIP includes goals for student performance in ELA and math for the aggregate student population and for the LEP and special education subgroups. These MCAS performance benchmarks are based on improvement targets to make AYP so that all students will be proficient by 2014. The SIP addresses the key areas in need of change, including organization and management, classroom expectations, team expectations, the use of assessments, instructional strategies, and classroom practices.

For example, in the classroom, expectations included consistent use of agenda boards, a warm-up activity, a lesson or unit question of the day, homework, and agenda books for all students. Teams were expected to use a team binder system, establish team procedures and protocols when students do not meet expectations, establish team rules and a discipline code, follow the school rules and discipline code, and appropriately manage student behavior and attendance. The school assessments were the SRI, DFA, district writing assessments, writing and literacy folders, district math assessments, district curriculum assessments, and staff-developed Kiley School math questions. Key school instructional strategies expected include the use of rubrics and exemplars, Creating Independence through Student Owned Strategies (CRISS), differentiated instruction, the use of regular classroom assessments to inform instruction, modeling and guided practice, the Kiley vocabulary protocol, and Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) for ELL students. Expected classroom practices were direct instruction and feedback, support for the Kiley Reads program (requiring 20 minutes a night), and in math the use of the math instructional guide and accurate math vocabulary.

Promising strategies in the SIP have not positively affected student achievement so far, as the school has not fully implemented the SIP. However, some SIP change initiatives have potential to improve classroom instruction if fully implemented, since they include higher standards for instruction, clearer expectations for classroom practices, more effective instructional strategies, and the integration of district-wide resources and expectations for the Kiley school. The SIP and the leadership team promoted changes to instruction that have promise, including standards-based lesson planning, more effective use of the 90-minute instructional block, open-response practices, and an emphasis on vocabulary. They have established clear expectations for the instructional block, and the team observed that teachers in focus groups articulated, and some teachers used during classroom observations, the expected instructional block structure. Practices include beginning class with a “do now,” or a warm-up activity, keeping agenda boards, having a lesson unit question of the day, and using the launch-explore-summary format in math. Administrators reported that Kiley teachers received professional development to support them implementing a new structure for the 90-minute block with three distinct parts: a 15-minute teacher directed lesson; a 60-minute activity allowing students activities, grouping and centers; and a 15-minute summary of the lesson of the day. Open-response practices include weekly writing prompts in math and ELA, teacher grading on the school’s four-point rubric, teaching students to the rubric, and using exemplars to help students understand and achieve the standard. In some classrooms, observers saw rubrics posted and teachers providing instruction on the rubric. The emphasis on vocabulary included the use of word walls and emphasizing the use of accurate and rich content-appropriate vocabulary in instruction.

District initiatives were interwoven into the school SIP and had promise. The district math instructional guide aligned instruction vertically, horizontally, with the frameworks, and with the

math resources. The district also purchased the Connected Math Program and provided professional development to the math teachers on its use. The district provided CPDTs in math and ELA to provide content-specific coaching to teachers in the use of effective instructional strategies. The district created new a position called instructional leadership specialists with a similar role in 2007. These positions had a higher level of qualifications, and many CPDTs became ILSs.

In spite of a well written SIP, district support, administrative leadership, and staff support for SIP strategies, Kiley is unable to implement its improvement plan. The school currently lacks a collective understanding, will, and knowledge of how to target instruction to the needs of students, assess students to check for understanding of specific skill areas, modify instruction using specific strategies, and re-teach, regroup, and differentiate instruction as needed in response to assessments that measure student progress toward specific performance benchmarks.

The principal, assistant principals, and the CPDTs/ILSs articulated understanding of the root causes for poor student achievement and the connections between changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment and the improvements in student performance. However, this was not true for the majority of teachers, who in the instructional staff survey and in focus groups consistently cited student background and behavior as reasons for poor student achievement. Even supportive teachers did not often refer to causes of poor student achievement related to teacher performance, such as teacher attendance, classroom management skills, knowledge of pedagogy, or knowledge of content matter. Nor did teachers refer to instructional causes such as the need to improve teaching strategies, assessment and student grouping practices, or modifying instruction to meet student needs.

The school did not have effective practices in place to use data to modify instruction. The team did not find that the leadership or faculty had school-wide practices of using formative data to make improvements to curriculum or instruction and to ensure that all students were receiving support for areas of weaknesses. There were some exceptions regarding the use of data at the administrative level. Administrators did use MCAS test item analysis data to determine SIP strands and identify strategies. They used SRI data to place students in Read 180, and half of Read 180 students received the computer-based assessments, which determine levels for computer-aided instruction and reading levels. They collected and scored open responses, but the impact was not deep. They provided supplemental educational services for students who met criteria under the law through the Princeton Review. The school lacked professional development in the use of data. The school had one workshop planned for March 2007 in "Using teacher-made, local and state assessments to inform your instruction." However, the plan was modified later to be MCAS administration, and the SEA indicated in March that it was requesting a half an hour of the hour-long professional day to discuss teacher complaints against administration.

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 its plan?

Yes. Chronic student absenteeism, poor teacher attendance, ineffective management of student behavior, inadequate teacher planning time, complaints from the collective bargaining unit (SEA), and a school climate that is not conducive to teaching or learning have rendered Kiley Middle School incapable of implementing an improvement plan.

District administrators and the principal acknowledged that the district brought in the current principal to be a school change agent. The school and district reports and the principal interviews indicated that the principal's job was to overhaul the academic expectations of the school by changing the school culture, increasing the academic rigor, and changing staff awareness and attitudes about the role of effective classroom instruction in improving student achievement. She also took ownership to improve the facility, filling nine dumpsters with trash. The school facility has improved noticeably, but issues of school climate and instruction have remained.

Kiley students spend little time learning, due to high levels of absence of students and teachers, excessive interruptions due to discipline problems, and poor classroom management.

The data suggest that multiple compounding issues contribute to Kiley students losing substantial instructional time with their teachers. Teacher absenteeism is the second highest teacher absenteeism rate in district. The average Kiley teacher is not teaching in the classroom over 10 percent of the time. The daily student attendance rate is 89.3 percent. On average, a typical student may not be taught by his/her regular classroom teacher one or two times in a two-week period, and may lose a month of schooling during the course of the year. The site visit team observed multiple classroom interruptions to discipline students and teachers sending students out of class constantly. The room used for in-school suspensions under the Kiley Alternative Program (KAP) was crowded with students, who were not all able to enter the room. The data revealed excessive out-of-school and in-school suspensions, which resulted in a great loss of instructional time for students. The loss of instructional time is higher for the one-third of students who are chronically absent (10 or more days per year), the one-quarter who receive one or more in school suspensions, and the one-fifth who receive one or more out-of-school suspensions. When the classroom disruption, due to attendance and discipline, is compounded with learning gaps due to the lack of continuity in instruction, the result is that little classroom time is left for students to learn new skills.

The principal expected that certain change initiatives would decrease the incidence of disciplinary action. The principal structurally reconfigured the school into two houses, each with grades 6-8 and overseen by an assistant principal. She also adopted a rules and procedures manual and implemented a two-day routines and procedures training to reduce behavior incidents. Teams were expected to enforce school rules and determine and enforce team standards. The district added an attendance specialist to Kiley in 2005-2006, but student attendance declined from 2005 to 2006. Assistant principals, teachers, and CPDTs reported they spent substantial time dealing with student behavior, but behavior remains a serious distraction to learning.

At the time of the review, the team did not see evidence of effective school and classroom management of student behavior. In one observation, the teacher let the students wander around the room talking for 10 minutes before she told them to sit down and take a test. The teacher continued to sit at her desk when students entered, and there were no clear instructions for entering and beginning work in the class. Students protested, indicating that the teacher had been absent for two days and had not prepared them to take a test. The teacher admonished the class and sent out students who exclaimed upon seeing the test that the material on the test was new material they had not learned. Students sat for 15 minutes without engagement. Some students who asked the teacher questions had their tests taken and the teacher stated that the students would receive a failing grade for the exam. The five students sent out during the first 20 minutes of class were uncertain where to go. When they asked the teacher, she told them to sit in the back of the class of another teacher on the team. After seating three students in the back of another class, with no work to do, the teacher receiving the students told the two new incoming students that no more students could enter the room. The two students wandered around with nowhere to go. When asked about the practice of having students sit in the back of other classrooms, an administrator explained that this is a practice established by some teams.

None of the changes in student policies had notable causal relationships with the school's inability to implement its improvement plan. The district boundary plan changed student assignments, resulting in changes to the returning student population. Only three teachers in focus groups mentioned any impact of the boundary plan to the student body: the possibility of neighborhood peer group battles. They cited no incidents. However, the demographic data remained relatively stable from year to year. A district policy with anticipated impact to the Kiley School is Springfield's new pupil progression policy. Administrators at the district and school levels explained that the policy will require incoming grade 6 students to pass summer school before entering Kiley; failing grade 8 students will not matriculate from Kiley without passing summer school. The impacts to the school are still unknown. Ironically, the student population at Kiley decreased between 2005 and 2007 (from over 1,000 to 961 to 939), while the student-teacher ratio increased from 11.8 to 12.0 to 13.9 students per teacher, according to school report card data and the school's two-year report.

The new budget allocation formula in 2005-2006 resulted in a loss of 10 teaching staff. In the subsequent year of 2006-2007, two additional staff members were lost. Ironically, as Kiley lost teachers, the percentage of licensed and 'highly qualified' teachers in their core subjects decreased. The school report card data, also noted in the school's two-year report, showed that from 2004 to 2007, the percentage of licensed teachers declined from 89.3 to 85.1 to 70.0 to 64.4 percent. Over the same period, the percentage of teachers highly qualified in their subject matter declined from 87.1 to 81.0 to 65.2 to 46.7 percent.

The school did not have the capacity to turn around a school with the long-standing history of poor performance that the Kiley Middle School has. All of the assistant principals were in their first or second years as administrators, and the principal was new to the school and middle school administration when she arrived two years ago. In 2007, of the 66 classroom teachers, 59 percent were certified and 27 percent were on waivers. Forty-one percent of the teachers were in their first year at the school, and 27 percent were in their first year of teaching. In math, 25

percent of the teachers were teaching on a waiver, 50 percent were in their first year teaching, and 75 percent were in their first year at Kiley. In special education, 90 percent were teaching on a waiver, and 50 percent were in their first year of teaching. All of the ELL teachers were on a waiver, and 75 percent were in their first year teaching. The school has made some changes to the special education and the English language learner programs. The EQA team found ineffective delivery of special education and ELL services because of lack of responsibility for the students while they received services in the regular education classrooms.

The administration's relationship with the collective bargaining unit has hindered the Kiley Middle School's progress. The principal cited the excessive administrator time needed to evaluate out poorly performing teachers. When asked about the new Springfield teachers' contract that allows principals to transfer teachers out of the building, school and district leadership responded that the district had no transfer options available. Union grievances have been a substantial distraction to the principal's time. The grievance reports shared with the team began on September 2, 2005. Among the complaints, teachers cited that administrators should take more responsibility for monitoring hallways, enforcing code of conduct, providing more team time, and having grade-level meetings.

Indeed, the teacher's loss of common planning time was significant. The new schedule in 2006-2007 resulted in some teams without common meeting time. Instead, three team members may share common meeting time, but the other team members may have a different planning time. The situation was different for all teams. Teachers in focus groups noted that although teams did not consistently use team time to discuss ways to improve student achievement, most teams were not provided with enough consistent team time to plan at all.

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

No. Conditions are not in place to improve student performance at the Kiley Middle School; student performance has not improved.

The leadership in the school has not been able to effectively implement instructional improvement initiatives within the 18 months of the new principal's administration. School leaders made a number of attempts to focus on priority improvement in teaching and learning through the 2006-2007 SIP development process, professional development initiatives, classroom practice procedures, and a uniform standards-based lesson plan. Assistant principals stated they spent 50 to 65 percent of their time dealing with student behavior. In classroom observations and in walk-throughs throughout the building, the team learned that staff did not consistently implement classroom management practices and the code of conduct, and not all staff took responsibility for managing student behavior. Administrators and Springfield Education Association (SEA) complaints indicated that teachers blamed the leadership for behavior problems.

However, the principal and the district have described much of the school leadership's work as exposing the enormous deficiencies at the school. As a result of doing so, she has faced relentless opposition from the SEA and stonewalling and resistance from vocal faculty. Parents in focus

groups, the curricular and instructional leadership, and the central office leadership interviewed by the team all recognized this. The principal's time was consumed with responding to the SEA, addressing teacher infractions, and addressing student discipline issues.

The principal plans to retire at the end of the school year. The district currently has no succession plan, and has not decided whether to retain current assistant principals. According to the district's report submitted to the team, the superintendent has the ability to "transfer or reassign teachers" who are impeding or blocking reform efforts from underperforming schools according to the newly negotiated contract. When asked by the team whether the superintendent intended to use this authority to move said staff at Kiley, the assistant superintendent stated that there are currently no plans to move Kiley teachers because of limited placement options.

Although the principal has stated that she has received guidance and support from the district leadership, the EQA team determined that the district leadership did not provide the principal with the resources and authority required to make the radical changes necessary to put the Kiley Middle School on the trajectory to have all students proficient by 2014. The school replaced neither school leadership nor staff members until a year after the Board of Education declared it underperforming. The school's physical plant had deteriorated and the building was full of trash and outdated books when the new principal was appointed. Nine dumpsters were required for trash removal. The principal was appointed in July, after the voluntary teacher transfer period had ended. Therefore, teachers were not able to transfer after learning the new principal's expectations. District involvement with the SEA grievances has not protected the principal to allow her to focus on her role as instructional leader at Kiley. As an example, according to the principal, the district reduced the professional development time scheduled for MCAS administration training from 60 to 30 minutes to allow the SEA 30 minutes for a discussion of teacher complaints.

Although the union grievances and the interviews with administrators suggest that a significant number of teachers were resistant to the SIP, staff members stated in interviews that they are generally supportive of the goals and objectives articulated in the SIP. However, the team found low levels of SIP implementation throughout the school. In classrooms observations, only six of 18 observed classrooms implemented SIP strategies. The team observed overall poor instructional quality, lack of rigor, and lack of student homework. The instructional conditions described in the Panel Review and the Fact-finding Review remained.

Interviews with administrators, teachers, parents, and students indicated that the school climate was negative and there was no professional culture of collegiality. Therefore, a committed, cohesive team effort to improving student achievement did not exist.

Conclusion

The Kiley Middle School was in 'Restructuring' status in ELA and math and was not moving any students to proficiency. Overall, the school suffered from generally poor quality instruction, inexperienced teachers with insufficient support, and a low level of rigor and low expectations. Kiley students spent little time learning because of excessive chronic student absence, excessive teacher absence (the second highest in district), excessive in- and out-of-school suspension, and

time spent in the Kiley Alternative Program (a time-out room). Teachers constantly sent students out of class. Kiley did not have an environment conducive to learning and growth. A negative climate existed among teachers, and student misbehavior was chronic. The SEA was an obstacle to implementing a school improvement plan. The EQA team found that prospects for improvement were low given the circumstances. Although some initiatives had potential, change initiatives have not been implemented, and successful implementation requires drastic changes to the school. At the time of the site visit, the district did not have a plan to identify and hire the next principal, to ensure that the school has a strong leadership team supportive of new leadership, or to strengthen the teachers' skills. No school improvement plan could be implemented given the current obstacles. There was insufficient professional responsibility for low student achievement, and many staff members lacked skills or sufficient support to implement strategies in the SIP. The team found that the Kiley Middle School was in crisis and had reached a critical juncture. The team saw an urgent need for district and school leadership to transform this school entirely with a unified staff committed to attaining high levels of student achievement.

Appendix A

Team Members

Eva Mitchell, Coordinator. Eva Mitchell has 15 years of experience in urban education. She was a founding member of a Boston public pilot school and her administrative roles have included Assistant Principal and Director of Student Support. Eva has taught in Boston and in Brockton public schools at the elementary, middle, and high school levels as a school social studies teacher, lead teacher in an alternative school for students with behavioral disabilities, and as an after-school program leader for a 21st Century grant-funded enrichment initiative. Eva has also worked on public school construction compliance teams, having led city-community urban development processes for a decade. For educational and community development organizations, she has served as a program developer, grant writer, and board chair. Eva received her B.A. from Harvard University, and received her teacher certification through Harvard's UTEP program. She received her Master's in Education from Boston University under a Martin Luther King Fellowship, and her doctoral studies have focused on effective schooling in urban environments.

Helen Apostolides, Examiner. Ms. Apostolides has over 34 years of experience as both a teacher and administrator in public education. Ms. Apostolides worked for 11 years as an Elementary School Principal in Peabody, Massachusetts. She instituted the Skills for Life program at her school, which won national recognition. Her school was the first to collaborate with Lesley University Literacy Collaborative and then restructure the reading program to the Collaborative's standard. Additionally, she helped facilitate the development of full-day kindergarten throughout the district. She was an assistant principal for 14 years and a mathematics teacher in numerous grade levels (3, 5, 6, and 7) for over 10 years. Ms. Apostolides received the Pride of Peabody award in 2003 and was a semi-finalist in Massachusetts in NASA's Teacher in Space Program. Ms. Apostolides earned a Master of Education in Elementary Education from Boston State College and a Master of Teaching in History on the secondary level from Salem State College.

Lisa Bryant, Examiner. Lisa Bryant is in her second year as an examiner for EQA. She has been an educator in Massachusetts for over 40 years. Since leaving her most recent full-time position as Executive Director of the Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter School, she has served as an educational consultant, and adjunct faculty member at Salem State College. For 14 years, she was a K-8 and middle school principal at the Bartlett School in Lowell, and a middle school principal in Watertown. In Lowell, she was a special education supervisor and a bilingual (Spanish) school psychologist. She has taught in public and private schools at the elementary, middle and high school levels. She has served as an adjunct on the faculty of Regis College. Lisa has also served as co-chair of the Principal's Center at Harvard and as a board member of the New England Coalition of Educational Leaders. She has a degree in History from Boston University and a Master's degree in Education from the University of Massachusetts.

Joseph Nigro, Examiner. Joseph Nigro has 37 years of experience as a teacher in public education. Most recently, Mr. Nigro has served as a program supervisor in both the Simmons College and the Education Cooperative Teacher Licensure Programs. Prior to his work as a supervisor, Mr. Nigro was a biology and general science teacher at Holliston High School where

he served as the Science Department Chairperson for many years. As the Science Department Chairperson, Mr. Nigro was responsible for teacher supervision and was very involved in the area of curriculum development. In addition to serving as an instructor, he was instrumental in the design and implementation of College Preparatory Biology, A.P. Biology Science, Greenhouse Science, and Forensic Science programs at Holliston High School. He was also a co-founder of the Greenhouse Science Project, which focused on developing school partnerships with community resources such as landscapers and farmers. Mr. Nigro also procured funding and grants for several science projects, including the Holliston High School Courtyard Projects, which focused on the landscaping of one courtyard and the establishing of a bird sanctuary in the other courtyard. Also, Mr. Nigro was instrumental in procuring grant funds for equipment that resulted in the addition of a biotechnology lab component to the science curriculum and a week's training at Massachusetts Bay Community College in Wellesley in biotechnology for selected grade eight students in Holliston. Mr. Nigro has also worked as a consultant and teacher for The Education Cooperative in Dedham where he helped organize summer institute programs for science teachers and instructed elementary students in biotechnology enrichment programs. Since 1965, Mr. Nigro has been a member of the Phi Delta Kappa International (Professional Education Organization), where he served as secretary from 2001 to 2002. Mr. Nigro earned a Bachelor of Science in Biology and Education from Boston College and a Master of Education with a Biological Science Concentration from Framingham State College.

Appendix B Two Year Follow-up Review Schedule Detailed Schedule for School Site Visit

Day 1 – March 7, 2007

- 8:00-9:00 a.m.* Team members met with the principal.
- 9:00-10:00 a.m.* Team members met with the assistant superintendent and the school support specialist for the district.
- 10:00-11:00 a.m.* Team members met with the school’s curriculum and instruction leadership team and members of the school site council.
- 11:00-1:00 p.m.* 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; members conducted an informal walk-through with a focus on school culture and climate for learning.
- 1:00-3:00 p.m.* Team members met with teachers in focus groups.

	Reviewer A and Reviewer B	Reviewer C and Reviewer D
<i>1:00-1:30</i>	Teacher Focus Group #1 2 Teachers – Grade 7 1 Teacher – Grade 6 1 Teacher – Grade 6-7 1 Teacher – Grade 8 1 Teacher – All grades	Teacher Focus Group #2 2 Teachers – Grade 6 2 Teachers – Grade 7 1 Teacher – Grade 7-8 1 Teacher – All grades
<i>1:30-2:00</i>	Teacher Focus Group #3 2 Teachers – Grade 7 3 Teachers – Grade 6 1 Teacher – All grades	Teacher Focus Group #4 1 Teacher – Grade 8 1 Teacher – Grade 6 4 Teachers – All grades
<i>2:00-2:30</i>	Teacher Focus Group #5 2 Teachers – All grades 1 Teacher – Grade 6 1 Teacher – Grade 8 2 Teachers – Grade 7	Teacher Focus Group #6 2 Teachers – Grade 6 1 Teacher – Grade 7 1 Teacher – Grade 8 2 Teachers – All grades

2:30-3:00 p.m. Panelists met with parents and students in focus groups.

	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Reviewer D
<i>2:30-3:00</i>	Parent Focus Group #1	Parent Focus Group #2	Student Focus Group #1	Student Focus Group #2

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

Day 2 – March 8, 2007

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

8:00-11:00 a.m. Team members visited classrooms and interviewed teachers.

	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Reviewer D
8:00-8:30	Observe Teacher 1 ELA Grade 8	Observe Teacher 2 Science Grade 8	Observe Teacher 3 Math Grade 6	Observe Teacher 4 ELA Grade 6
8:30-9:00	Interview Teacher 1	Interview Teacher 2	Interview Teacher 3	Interview Teacher 4
9:00-9:30	Observe Teacher 5 Science Grade 8	Observe Teacher 6 Social Sciences Grade 7	Observe Teacher 7 Math Grade 6	Observe Teacher 8 Social Sciences Grade 8
9:30-10:00	Interview Teacher 5	Interview Teacher 6	Interview Teacher 7	Interview Teacher 8
10:00-10:30	Observe Teacher 9 SPED ELA Grade 7	Observe Teacher 10 Technical Educ. All Grades	Observe Teacher 11 ELA Grade 7	Observe Teacher 12 Social Sciences Grade 7
10:30-11:00	Interview Teacher 9	Interview Teacher 10	Interview Teacher 11	Interview Teacher 12

11:00-1:00 p.m. Team members met to discuss findings and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch). Members used time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information.

1:00-2:00 p.m. Team structured time.

2:00-2:30 p.m. Closing meeting with the principal to discuss next steps.

2:30-5:00 p.m. Members deliberated and formed conclusions.