

REPORT OF TWO YEAR FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability

James Sullivan Middle School **Lowell Public Schools**

The James Sullivan Middle School in Lowell has experienced a radical turnaround in the quality of teaching, learning, and overall climate since the Fact-finding Review in 2004 following the school's designation by the Board of Education as 'underperforming.' Although the school did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in math, Sullivan Middle School has shown overall improvement on the MCAS tests. The school has focused on improving math achievement through professional development in math content and the math program, and through regrouping students to strengthen areas of weakness. In addition, the Sullivan Middle School sought to improve student achievement using by assessments to adjust instruction, and by creating a culture of commitment and responsibility through responsive delegation of school improvement plan implementation from the district to the classroom level.

Priority Findings

1. The school has strong practices of using data to refine and modify instruction, refine the curriculum, adjust pacing, monitor student progress, and provide specific interventions to ensure that students at different levels master the standards.
 - The school designed pre- and post-assessments for math intervention based on the frameworks.
 - Math assessments have raised teacher awareness of the use of formative data.
 - The Sullivan regularly regroups and re-clusters students based on identified gaps in math.
 - The school tracks individual student improvement on the writing rubric and on the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).
 - ELA leadership disseminates summary and individual SRI scores and improvement trends.
 - Teachers, administrators, and students reported that the new rubric and exemplars help students perform at higher levels.
2. The school has strong instructional leadership and a staff focused on improving student achievement.
 - Instructional leaders provide a clear mission and direction, while promoting teacher input, collegiality, buy-in, and collaboration.
 - The school has developed a staff focused on student improvement through the cultivation of in-house leadership, teacher teams, coaching, and a learning community.

3. Sullivan Middle School provides ample opportunities for teacher growth through professional development programs that support the school's academic program.
 - Professional development is provided in the Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol, the Connected Math Program, Math Brigade, and Math Investigation, and through Comprehensive School Reform grant-funded training provided by Learning Innovations at WestEd.
 - Sullivan teachers have access to the Lowell Teacher Academy, a district math instructional specialist and math resource teacher, both of whom coach, and collaborative professional time to support their professional growth.
 - Involvement in the development of the Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP) through the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process and on USIP implementation committees provides additional opportunities for teachers to understand the connections between their instruction and improving school achievement.

4. Although the school did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in math, the Sullivan has shown improvement in performance on the MCAS tests.
 - In math, the school improved by 5.9 Composite Proficiency Index (CPI) points from Cycle III to Cycle IV. In grade 8 math, between 2003 and 2006 there was an overall increase in proficiency and a decrease in 'Warning/Failing'.
 - Grade 6 math had steady improvement from 2003 to 2005, with proficiency steadily increasing from 24 to 39 percent and 'Warning/Failing' decreasing from 46 to 27 percent, although from 2005 to 2006 performance was flat.
 - In a comparison of CPI data by subgroup, in grade 6 all subgroups outperformed the district.
 - LEP/FLEP, low-income, and Hispanic students outperformed the state on the grade 6 math test. Still, in 2006 in math, no subgroups made AYP except for white students, who had "Safe Harbor" status.
 - The school has made AYP in ELA in 2004, 2005, and 2006, and the school has 'no status' in ELA.
 - In Cycle IV, the school's improvement in ELA was above target.
 - In grade 6 and grade 7 ELA in 2006, all Sullivan subgroups outperformed the district, and LEP/FLEP and low-income students also outperformed the state.
 - Additionally, grade 6 Hispanic and white students and grade 6 Asian students also outperformed the state in ELA.

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 Sullivan Middle School occurred on February 9, 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 26, 2004, the Sullivan 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 of the Sullivan Middle School occurred on February 14-15, 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 Sullivan 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 Sullivan 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.

Sullivan Middle School Profile

The James Sullivan Middle School is one of seven middle schools in the Lowell Public Schools and enrolls students in grades 5-8. With a population of 606 students in the 2006-2007 school year, it was third largest school in the district.

Compared to the district, the Sullivan Middle School has comparable populations (within a three-percentage point range) of African-American, Hispanic, and special education students. The school has a significantly higher proportion of white students (19 percentage points higher than the district), and a significantly lower proportion of Asian students (19.2 percentage points lower than the district). The school also has smaller proportions of first language not English students (4.3 percentage points lower than the district), limited English proficient students (6.5 percentage points lower than the district), and low-income students (10.9 percentage points lower than the district). Compared to the state, both the school and the district have lower percentages of African-American and white students, and higher percentages of Asian, first language not English, limited English proficient, and low-income students. The population of the district can be described as a predominantly low-income population, with approximately half of its students whose first language is not English. The majority of the district's population is not white, and most of the racial minorities are Asian and Hispanic. See Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Composition, 2007
Sullivan Middle School in Comparison to Lowell and the State

Student Subgroup	Percentage of Students		
	School	District	State
African-American	4.0	6.2	8.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	9.7	28.9	4.8
Hispanic	25.2	22.4	13.3
Native American	0.0	0.0	0.3
White	60.9	41.9	71.5
Multi-race, non-Hispanic	0.2	0.6	1.7
FLNE	35.1	49.4	14.9
LEP	23.1	29.6	5.6
Low Income	56.8	67.7	28.9
Special Education	16.8	15.2	16.9

Source: Department of Education

The school's aggregate attendance rate in 2006 was 93.7 percent, and reportable subgroups met the attendance goals required for adequately yearly progress. The attendance rate at Sullivan Middle School was higher than the district average, but ranked fourth among the seven middle schools. The average number of days absent was lower than the district average, but school had the third highest average number of days absent compared to the other middle schools. The out-of-school suspension rate was higher than the district average, but was the third lowest compared to the other middle schools. All middle schools had in-school suspension rates of less than one percent. See Table 2 for a comparison between the school, district, and state.

**Table 2. Attendance and Suspensions, 2006
Sullivan Middle School in Comparison to Lowell and the State**

	School	District	State
Attendance Rate	93.7	92.7	94.5
Average number of days absent	10.4	11.9	9.4
In-School Suspension Rate	0.5	1.9	3.4
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	5.8	4.5	5.8
<i>Source: Department of Education</i>			

Staffing

The Sullivan Middle School benefited from a highly qualified, experienced, and stable faculty. All of the administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff members were certified and/or ‘highly qualified’ for their respective positions, according to 2006-2007 data provided by the Department of Education and the school. The principal was in her third year at the school, and had a total of 17 years of experience teaching and eight years of experience as an administrator. The vice principal was in her fifth year at the school, where she received all of her experience as an administrator, and taught for five years prior to her school leadership. According to data provided by the school, Sullivan’s 51 teachers had an average of 14 years of total teaching experience, and 6.5 years at the school. See Table 3. According to 2006-2007 DOE data, with 100 percent of teachers licensed and highly qualified, the school’s measures of teacher quality exceeded the district averages (with respective figures of 93.8 and 93.3 percent) and the state averages (with figures of 95.4 and 95.1 percent).

Table 3. Staffing, 2007

	Total	Total with applicable certification in area/HQ status	Average years experience		Average years in school
			Teaching	Admin.	
Administrators	2	2	11.0	6.5	4.0
Teachers	51	51	14.0	0	6.5
Paraprofessionals	13	13	0	0	4.4
Other	5	5	5.2	3.8	6.0
<i>Source: Data provided by school. Paraprofessionals include aides and tutors. Other includes the counselor, librarian, substitute, other. Note: averages are rounded to the nearest tenth.</i>					

MCAS Results

In 2006, Sullivan Middle School was in restructuring because the school has never made adequate yearly progress in math since accountability measures were established in 1999. The school has ‘no status’ in ELA, and has made adequate yearly progress in the aggregate and for subgroups in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

ELA performance was ‘moderate’ and improvement was ‘above target’ in 2006, with an aggregate CPI of 79.9 points and a CPI improvement of 8.6 points in Cycle IV. Low-income students made the largest gains in ELA during the cycle, with a CPI gain of 10.2 points. See Table 4.

Table 4. ELA Adequate Yearly Progress Cycle Data, 2005-2006

Student Group	ELA Cycle IV (2005 & 2006) Data					AYP 2006 in ELA
	n	Performance		Improvement		
		CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	301	79.9	No	8.6	Yes	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	96	66.4	No	10.1	Yes	Yes
Special Education	38	48.0	-	-	-	-
Low Income	152	72.2	No	10.2	Yes	Yes
African-American	10	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	23	94.6	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	87	65.2	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	181	85.5	Yes	6.7	Yes	Yes

Source: Department of Education. n=number of students.

The school's performance in math in 2006 remained 'very low' and the school 'improved below target' with an aggregate CPI gain of 5.9 points. Again, low-income students experienced the greatest CPI gains, with an increase of 8.5 points in math. The only subgroup making AYP was white students, who had a smaller CPI gain than the aggregate, but made "Safe Harbor." See Table 5.

Table 5. Math Adequate Yearly Progress Cycle Data, 2005-2006

Student Group	Math Cycle IV (2005 & 2006) Data					AYP 2006 in Math
	n	Performance		Improvement		
		CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	642	56.6	No	5.9	No	No
Lim. English Prof.	203	38.8	No	3.6	No	No
Special Education	89	34.6	-	-	-	-
Low Income	331	47.1	No	8.5	No	No
African-American	16	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	56	63.4	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	208	40.7	No	8.3	No	No
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	362	65.1	No	5.2	Yes/SH	Yes

Source: Department of Education. n=number of students, SH=Safe Harbor.

Improvement in ELA can only be measured in the grade 5-8 Sullivan Middle School using the grade 7 ELA test results, the only MCAS test used for accountability purposes for English language arts during the review period. The school significantly increased student proficiency in ELA from the year of its fact-finding review to the year of the two-year follow-up visit. From 2004 to 2006, the percentage of students in the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' categories combined increased from 44 to 58 percent, outperforming the district but still below the state average in 2006. The school also significantly decreased the percentage of students in the 'Warning/Failing' category, below the district average, from 24 percent in 2004 to 14 percent in 2006. See Table 6.

**Table 6. Grade 7 ELA MCAS Results, 2004-2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Year		n	Percentage of Students				
			A	P	A/P	NI	W
2004	Sullivan Middle School	172	2	42	44	31	24
	District	1,306	2	42	44	39	17
	State	77,386	9	59	68	25	7
2005	Sullivan Middle School	164	3	44	47	41	12
	District	1,278	2	39	41	44	14
	State	76,719	10	56	66	27	7
2006	Sullivan Middle School	147	3	55	58	28	14
	District	1,135	3	37	40	38	21
	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.

The school’s improvement in math is measured by the grade 6 and grade 8 MCAS tests. From 2004 to 2006, the school slightly increased the percentage of students scoring at or above the level of proficiency in grade 6 math from 32 to 39 percent. The gap between the school and the district in the percentage of students attaining proficiency in grade 6 math was wide at 20 percentage points in favor of the school. The school also greatly decreased the percentage of students in the ‘Warning/Failing’ category, from 37 percent in 2004 to 27 percent in 2006. This percentage is comparable to the state average of 25 percent, and far lower than the district average of 52 percent. See Table 7.

**Table 7. Grade 6 Math MCAS Results, 2004-2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Year		n	Percentage of Students				
			A	P	A/P	NI	W
2004	Sullivan Middle School	157	7	25	32	31	37
	District	1,281	3	14	17	34	49
	State	76,661	17	25	42	32	25
2005	Sullivan Middle School	161	14	24	38	34	28
	District	1,169	6	18	24	31	46
	State	74,784	17	29	46	30	23
2006	Sullivan Middle School	141	9	30	39	34	27
	District	1,071	4	15	19	29	52
	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.

With a dip in 2005, the school somewhat improved its performance in grade 8 math from 2004 to 2006, by increasing rates of proficiency from 18 to 25 percent and decreasing the percentage of students in ‘Warning/Failing’ from 50 to 46 percent. As was the case with the grade 6 math test, the school outperformed the district and underperformed the state. However, the gap between the school and the state was much wider in grade 8 math than in grade 6 math. In 2006, only 25 percent of grade 8 students attained proficiency in math compared to 40 percent in the state, and 46 percent were in ‘Warning/Failing’ compared to 29 percent in the state. See Table 8.

**Table 8. Grade 8 Math MCAS Results, 2004-2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Year		n	Percentage of Students				
			A	P	A/P	NI	W
2004	Sullivan Middle School	190	3	15	18	32	50
	District	1,309	4	14	18	30	52
	State	78,893	13	26	39	32	29
2005	Sullivan Middle School	192	4	10	14	22	64
	District	1,283	3	14	17	25	59
	State	77,025	13	26	39	30	31
2006	Sullivan Middle School	157	2	23	25	29	46
	District	1,257	3	16	19	27	54
	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.

Because the subgroup populations of the Sullivan Middle School vary widely from the district and the state, a subgroup performance analysis offers a more meaningful comparison. To increase the size of the data set, MCAS tests added in 2006 were included in this analysis, although they cannot provide information about student performance over time and are not factors in the accountability process.

Tables 9 through 12 compare 2006 subgroup ELA CPI scores by grade level for grades 5-8. The data show that, with a few exceptions, subgroups at Sullivan outperformed their peers in Lowell at each grade level. In cases where the district subgroups outperformed the school, there was less than a six percentage point gap: LEP and Hispanic students in grade 5, special education in grade 7, and LEP and special education in grade 8. Gaps between the school and district for some subgroups were wider in the higher grades of the school; some of the school’s subgroups surpassed the state in grades 7 and 8. For example, Asian students at Sullivan outperformed those in Lowell in all grades 5-8. In grades 7 and 8, Sullivan’s Asian subgroup CPI exceeded the state average. Hispanic students at Sullivan outperformed those in Lowell in grades 6-8, and the Hispanic CPI exceeded the state average in grade 6. LEP/FLEP students at Sullivan outperformed those in Lowell in grades 6-7, and the school and district exceeded the state CPI for this subgroup in grade 8. Sullivan’s low-income students outperformed their Lowell peers in grades 5-7, and outperformed their state peers in grades 6-7. See Tables 9-12.

**Table 9. Grade 5 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	71.0	71.0
Asian	75.0	62.5	85.6
Hispanic	50.7	52.7	65.6
Native American	–	–	80.5
White	80.1	68.4	88.1
LEP/FLEP	50.6	53.5	62.0
Low Income	61.5	58.8	70.4
Special Education	45.7	38.0	65.6

Source: Department of Education

**Table 10. Grade 6 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	75.8	72.3
Asian	79.7	67.9	87.3
Hispanic	70.0	59.2	67.0
Native American	–	–	79.8
White	90.7	74.7	89.2
LEP/FLEP	68.5	61.1	59.7
Low Income	74.2	64.3	71.5
Special Education	51.7	43.3	65.7

Source: Department of Education

**Table 11. Grade 7 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	66.8	72.4
Asian	94.2	69.9	86.6
Hispanic	64.6	58.8	67.2
Native American	–	–	82.9
White	84.7	76.8	88.9
LEP/FLEP	67.4	61.2	58.3
Low Income	73.4	65.9	71.8
Special Education	34.7	40.3	63.8

Source: Department of Education

**Table 12. Grade 8 ELA MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	75.4	78.2
Asian	84.1	73.8	89.2
Hispanic	64.0	63.7	72.1
Native American	–	–	84.3
White	86.8	82.3	92.3
LEP/FLEP	60.9	63.3	59.8
Low Income	67.0	71.0	76.7
Special Education	48.4	48.7	69.1

Source: Department of Education

Tables 13 through 16 compare subgroup 2006 math CPI scores by grade level for grades 5-8. Except for grade 5 LEP/FLEP students, all subgroups in grades 5-6 had a higher math CPI than their district peers.

**Table 13. Grade 5 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	43.0	52.4
Asian	73.1	52.2	80.8
Hispanic	38.2	35.2	50.4
Native American	–	–	66.0
White	63.7	51.4	75.0
LEP/FLEP	38.5	40.4	52.4
Low Income	46.7	42.2	54.3
Special Education	32.6	27.2	49.5

Source: Department of Education

**Table 14. Grade 6 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	42.9	51.3
Asian	64.1	53.6	80.7
Hispanic	48.9	38.8	48.7
Native American	–	–	59.3
White	75.6	52.2	75.8
LEP/FLEP	48.8	43.4	47.0
Low Income	55.1	43.9	53.0
Special Education	32.7	30.1	47.0

Source: Department of Education

**Table 15. Grade 7 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	44.5	46.8
Asian	73.1	58.5	78.3
Hispanic	46.5	36.9	44.5
Native American	–	–	59.3
White	68.1	56.7	72.1
LEP/FLEP	42.4	44.6	43.1
Low Income	49.4	46.9	48.8
Special Education	22.2	26.6	42.5

Source: Department of Education

**Table 16. Grade 8 Math MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Subgroup	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)		
	School	District	State
African-American	–	44.4	47.0
Asian	62.5	51.6	77.7
Hispanic	36.0	35.4	45.0
Native American	–	–	59.9
White	61.2	49.8	71.6
LEP/FLEP	35.4	39.2	40.7
Low Income	39.3	43.2	48.4
Special Education	32.8	25.6	41.6

Source: Department of Education

In the aggregate, Sullivan outperformed other Lowell middle schools in CPI comparisons. Sullivan had the highest CPI on all of the ELA, math and STE tests administered in grades 5-7. The Sullivan ranked second among the seven middle schools in grade 8 ELA and math, and third in grade 8 STE. See Table 17.

**Table 17. MCAS Subgroup Performance (CPI), 2006
Sullivan Middle School Compared to Lowell and the State**

Grade and Subject	Composite Proficiency Index (CPI)								
	Sullivan	Lowell	Butler	An Wang	E.N. Rogers	Robinson	Daley	Stoklosa	State
Grade 5 ELA	71.8	63.4	66.6	63.9	58.2	61.3	69.4	48.9	83.7
Grade 5 Math	57.7	47.4	51.1	45.8	40.2	42.5	55.0	41.3	70.2
Grade 5 STE	71.9	61.0	67.7	59.3	56.3	59.0	68.4	48.9	78.0
Grade 6 ELA	83.0	69.3	68.4	71.7	58.6	59.5	75.7	65.5	84.9
Grade 6 Math	65.8	49.0	42.4	52.0	33.3	36.2	58.1	60.8	70.5
Grade 7 ELA	80.1	69.8	72.0	79.5	66.9	56.6	74.3	61.3	84.6
Grade 7 Math	61.7	51.6	50.7	62.0	48.0	31.3	59.5	46.0	66.6
Grade 8 ELA	79.1	75.3	78.5	79.0	75.5	68.1	86.1	63.4	88.3
Grade 8 Math	53.0	46.8	41.5	52.7	49.8	34.5	54.8	40.4	66.3
Grade 8 STE	53.0	48.5	51.9	55.8	45.3	39.7	60.0	32.5	65.6
Cumulative	677.1	582.1	590.8	621.7	532.1	488.7	661.3	509.0	758.7
ELA	314.0	277.8	285.5	294.1	259.2	245.5	305.5	239.1	341.5
Math	238.2	194.8	185.7	212.5	171.3	144.5	227.4	188.5	273.6

Source: Department of Education. Note: all n values > 70

Panel Responses to the Key Questions

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

Yes. Although Sullivan School has not made AYP in math, the school has shown improvement in student performance.

In math, the school improved by 5.9 CPI points from Cycle III to Cycle IV, but did not make AYP in 2006. The baseline CPI (from 2004) in math was 50.7 and the school achieved a CPI of 56.6 in Cycle IV (2006). The school's gain target was 9.9 (a 60.6 CPI), but the school missed the on-target range of 58.1-63.1 by 1.5 CPI points. The school also missed the gain target in Cycle III, missing the on-target range by 0.2 points.

The district of Lowell improved below target in Cycle III and Cycle IV. Of the seven middle schools in the district, one declined (Butler) and three had no change (Robinson, Rogers, and Wang) in Cycle IV. Like the Sullivan, two other middle schools performed below target, but the improvement was less than at the Sullivan. Daley improved from a baseline of 52.3 to 56.1 in 2006, a CPI change of 3.8 points. Stoklosa improved from a baseline of 45.0 to 47.8 in 2006, a CPI change of 2.8.

Although the Sullivan Middle School is the only school in restructuring, having never made AYP in math, the school has improved more in math and has the highest CPI in math compared to other middle schools in the district. In 2006, Sullivan had the highest math CPI in grades 5 and 6 compared to the other district middle schools, and had the second highest math CPI in grades 7 and 8. It should be noted that the school has the smallest percentages of minority, FLNE, and low-income students.

In grade 8 math, between 2003 and 2006 the school had an overall increase in proficiency and decrease in 'Warning/Failing.' In 2005, there was a notable increase in 'Warning/Failing', but from 2005 to 2006 proficiency increased from 15 to 25 percent and 'Warning/Failing' decreased from 63 to 46 percent, which was the best performance in the four-year period.

Grade 6 math had steady improvement from 2003 to 2005. Proficiency steadily increased from 24 to 39 percent and 'Warning/Failing' decreased from 46 to 27 percent over the three-year period. From 2005 to 2006, performance was flat. There was no increase in the percentage of students who achieved proficiency and no movement of students from the 'Warning/Failing' category. In both years, 39 percent performed at or above the 'Proficient' level and 27 percent were in the 'Warning/Failing' category.

In 2006 in math, no subgroups made AYP except for white students, who had "Safe Harbor" status. In 2005, low-income and Hispanic students made AYP, but white, LEP and special education students did not.

The best subgroup performance overall was in grade 6. In a comparison of CPI data by subgroup, in grade 6 all subgroups outperformed the district, and LEP/FLEP, low-income, and Hispanic students outperformed the state.

In grade 5 math, all Sullivan subgroups performed lower than the state averages. Sullivan's subgroups outperformed the district except for LEP/FLEP students. In grade 7 math, the results were mixed across subgroups. Special education and LEP/FLEP students performed below the district and the state. Low-income and Hispanic students outperformed the district and state. Asian and white students outperformed the district, but underperformed the state. In grade 8 math, Sullivan's special education, Asian, Hispanic and white students outperformed their district peers, but LEP/FLEP and low-income students performed below their district peers. All grade 8 subgroups performed below the state.

As the restructuring status due to math achievement indicated, the area of greatest need of improvement at the Sullivan is math. In math, LEP/FLEP students underperformed the district and the state in grades 5, 7, and 8. In grade 6, however, LEP/FLEP students outperformed the district and the state. Grade 6 was the only grade to outperform the district for every subgroup. Grade 6 LEP/FLEP, low-income, and Hispanic students also outperformed the state.

The school has made the greatest improvement in ELA, making AYP in 2004, 2005, and 2006; the school has 'no status' in ELA. In Cycle IV, the school's improvement was above target in ELA, and the school improved from a baseline of 71.3 CPI points in 2004 to 79.9 points in 2006, which exceeded the target range of 74.5-79.5 and was only 0.6 points below the state target of 80.5. In grade 7 ELA, proficiency increased steadily from 37 to 45 to 47 to 58 percent from 2003 to 2006. 'Warning/Failing' fluctuated from 17 to 24 to 12 to 14 percent.

Additionally, on the 2006 ELA test in grades 6 and 7, Sullivan subgroups all outperformed the district, and LEP/FLEP and low-income students also outperformed the state. Additionally, grade 6 Hispanic and white students and grade 7 Asian students also outperformed the state. Sullivan subgroup data indicates that, in comparison to the other school subgroups, special education students have the lowest CPI. In comparison to their middle school peers in the district, the lowest performing subgroup was LEP/FLEP. The LEP/FLEP subgroup underperformed the district in grade 5 ELA and math, grade 7 math, and grade 8 ELA and math.

While the data should reflect the fact that the Sullivan Middle School is the district placement for newcomers—who are required to take the MCAS tests after the first year and remain at the Sullivan—grade 6 LEP/FLEP outperform the district and state in ELA and math, and grade 7 LEP/FLEP outperform the district and state in ELA. In comparison to their middle school peers in the district, the second lowest-performing subgroup was special education, which underperformed the district in grade 7 ELA and math and grade 8 ELA.

The Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP) is a working document that helps the school to set benchmarks for student performance within a specified timeframe, although it does not specify the grade level and subgroup benchmarks across all content areas, grade levels, and subgroups.

During the period under review, the school followed the 2004-2006 school improvement plan, titled "Outline of Plan to Improve Student Performance," which included benchmarks for aggregate performance in grade 8 math, math performance of LEP students, and math performance of special education students. It had neither goals for grade 6 nor overall ELA goals, but the school

was making AYP in ELA and the school instead included ELA goals for LEP and special education students taking the grade 7 exam.

The current USIP titled “Plan Outline for Lowell Public Schools-James Sullivan Middle School,” based on root cause analysis and developed during the school’s Sturbridge retreat, includes one aggregate ELA and one aggregate math MCAS performance goal. The CPI goals are based on AYP targets. It contains no subgroup goals and grade-level goals, but aggregate benchmark goals are contained in the plan and based on local formative assessments. Administrators indicated that they continue to revise the plan.

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

Yes.

The school’s Sturbridge retreat, in which staff used the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process to identify student weaknesses and to create a course for change, marked a turning point for the school. Teachers and administrators noted that this was a time that the school “came together as a group” and resulted in greater levels of staff buy-in to the school’s plan. Teachers learned how to overcome obstacles to student learning by making changes in the classroom.

The school improvement plan sets out clear improvement goals with specific objectives that are grounded in the school’s analysis of the reasons for poor student performance, and the improvement planning documents are clear and specific enough to guide implementation of the planned improvement initiatives. The USIP begins with a root cause analysis. The principal described how the school began its planning process in Sturbridge by giving serious thought to the underlying causes of poor student performance. The principal stated that this process helped root out previous teacher misperceptions of the primarily external causes of poor performance. The PIM document is clear, teacher friendly, and contains specific strategies. The PIM team carefully looked at poor performing areas and identified standards that teachers needed to emphasize. Teachers in interviews were able to articulate how to use the document as a guide to implement improvement initiatives in the classroom, and the review team saw evidence of the teacher teams using the USIP to create sustainable school practices to improve student learning. The USIP includes overall performance goals, causes, benchmarks, strategies, and evidence of implementation.

There were some areas in need of improvement in the USIP. The benchmarks were not yet capable of tracking student progress toward goals contained in plan, as Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) improvement was not tracked and math benchmarks have changed every year. The USIP lacked the LEP, special education, and grade-level goals in the previous USIP. The USIP did not include the implementation of subgroup goals/strategies. Inclusion/integration promoted exposure to the same curriculum for all students, but the USIP did not contain clear strategies for ensuring that students benefited from the co-teaching model (such as professional development to support the new practice) and from the 30-minute pullouts for special instruction in special education and ELL in grades 7 and 8. However, the EQA team did see evidence that the teams ac-

tively used data to improve student achievement and worked to identify weaknesses and adjust and modify their own school-based practices.

Following the PIM process and a change of leadership, the school made priority decisions to improve student achievement. One set of factors involved better use of time. The increase in instructional time for students and the addition of collaborative planning time for teachers resulted in more focused effort. The use of teacher leadership teams to promote improvement made a huge impact on the school. Teams that focused on improving areas in the school included the leadership team, the literacy team, the ELA USIP team, and the math CSR grant team. Ad-hoc committees were added to meet other needs identified by the faculty. The school had a data team that promoted better use of student achievement data in planning and decision-making, and greater use of data became more integrated into the school culture. Eventually, the data team was folded in between teams.

The school had structures to use data frequently to differentiate instruction. Each grade regularly regrouped and re-clustered students based on assessed levels and instructional needs. Teachers measured student learning through benchmark assessments using the Scholastic Reading Inventory and the newly-created Galileo ATI. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) training helped teachers make the curriculum more accessible to English language learner (ELL) students. The school had made efforts toward greater inclusion of ELL and special education students.

As the ELA USIP and math CSR teams worked to improve content area instruction, they focused on improving priority areas identified by the group. Improvements to the school's math program were notable, compared to ELA, in several areas. The curriculum guides were updated and gaps were identified to ensure more adequate coverage of MCAS skills. The math program benefited from a math resource specialist and instructional programs that accompanied training. Regrouping practices in math were strong, with students placed in skill groups to work on weaknesses identified through student assessments.

Improvements in ELA were most notable in several areas that exceeded their development in math. ELA had greater consistency in the use of assessments over time in reading (SRI) and in writing (Sullivan used the John Collins rubric). ELA had more support across the curriculum, with Oncore (specialist teachers) working to promote literacy skill building in their classes, and with a whole-school focus on writing across the curriculum. Two instructional leaders in the school focused on ELA improvements: a literacy-librarian focused on reading and modeling to teachers, and another focused on the development and use of the writing rubric as a tool for instruction and assessment.

One reason for the success of the plan was that it was developed through a process that supported its successful implementation. Teachers had ownership of the plan because they supported the direction of the leadership and were active participants and leaders in the school's change process. The USIP assigned the persons responsible for elements in the plan, and the school has teams specifically responsible for learning goals in the content areas. The leadership team oversees and manages the USIP and the principal and assistant principal monitor implementation in classrooms.

Faculty gave significant credit to the DOE for providing the initial technical assistance that united the school behind the improvement effort, through the PIM process. Many faculty members expressed that without the intervention through the PIM process, the school would not have united behind improvement efforts.

Lowell Public Schools' central office provided a solid foundation for the school's improvement efforts. The district developed math guides, administered the SRI and ATI Galileo as benchmark assessments, set district-wide standards for time on learning in content areas, provided the John Collins program, Lowell Teacher Academy for new teachers, and math professional development from Lucy West. The resources were not targeted to the Sullivan school; all Lowell public schools benefited from these resources provided by the district.

Grant-funded professional development supported USIP goals. The CSR grant provided professional development for one teacher at each grade level, and Math Brigade provided professional development for all math teachers at Sullivan. The Sullivan used a creative approach to ensure that all math teachers received the training. The school established a revolving schedule of math teachers for daylong professional development and conversations, sometimes incorporating observations and modeling. The Math Brigade led to the development of a new math rubric. At the time of the site visit, the Math Brigade was planning to focus on vertical alignment: how math standards build from grade to grade.

Some external programs and resources used by the school had far less of an impact and were not well integrated into the USIP. The use of Title I funds and the 21st Century grant were not integrated to support USIP implementation, and the faculty did not find Gear-Up to be effective.

The leadership, faculty, and even many students expressed an understanding of the factors affecting improvement. One of the factors the school had to address, according to the curriculum and instruction leadership team, was learning to systematically collect and use data to improve achievement.

Having identified the weaknesses, the school designed pre- and post-assessments for math intervention. Math assessments have raised teacher awareness of use of formative data. Faculty noted that before the school focused on data, teachers often treated the textbook as the curriculum. However, a new focus on MCAS data made curricular gaps apparent. A strength of the common math assessment is that it is based on the frameworks. Faculty identified the regrouping/re-clustering and the math seminar as a powerful way to address gaps in student learning.

The school tracked individual student improvement through the writing rubric and on the SRI. ELA leadership disseminated summary and individual SRI scores and improvement trends. Even students knew their scores and identified reasons for their personal performance changes. The school can track progress in reading, using Lexile scores, better than in math because of changes to the assessment. A revised evidence-based rubric to help students, especially ELL and special education and lower-performing students, and teachers had exemplars. The rubric and exemplars helped students perform at higher levels.

Even with data analysis practices that exceed use at many schools, the Sullivan faculty is focused on improving practice. Teachers understand the need to increase differentiated instruction as a daily classroom practice. The principal and the USIP noted the need to make better use of literacy circles.

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. More factors have contributed to, rather than impeded, the Sullivan Middle School's ability to implement the plan.

There have been no significant changes in policy that negatively affected the school, and the school has had no major changes in its student programs and/or services. Across the district, drops in enrollment did not result in major staffing cuts, and the Sullivan population experienced no significant gains or losses.

The school has benefited from district provisions and grants. In 2005-2006, the school received the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) grant, which funded professional development in math, and in 2006-2007 the school added a new math support specialist (for the Accelerated Math Initiative). The district has purchased and begun to use a new X2 student database system. The district provided National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training in 2006-2007 on the "DNA of school leadership," supporting growth in the leadership that school stakeholders reported was key to the school's improvement. The Lowell Teacher Academy and mentoring helped acclimate new teachers, with both general and content-specific monthly professional development. Faculty members described the support of the new assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction as beneficial, with an open and inclusive approach focused on helping the school with its identified needs, e.g., helping the school select a new ELA program and making adjustments to the delivery of the Connected Math Program (CMP) to ensure adequate instruction on the MCAS standards.

Staff changes were viewed positively, including a new instructional specialist and a new school math resource teacher. The previously high rates of teacher turnover noted in the Panel Report was not cited as an issue, and the school provided data that showed it was minimal. Staff viewed positively both a more open and inclusive school leadership model and the continuity of the assistant principal's leadership.

Collective bargaining has been a challenge in the district. At the time of the site visit, Lowell had lacked a teacher contract since July 2006. The union objected to faculty meetings and the use of collaborative planning time for professional development. However, the union issues did not affect the school, which had high levels of teacher collegiality and engagement in the school's efforts to meet improvement objectives. Evaluation processes were not helpful for administrators. The teacher evaluation tool was under negotiation, but contained a two-tiered ranking of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory, which was incapable of expressing a range of performance and teacher improvement. Principals were not allowed to evaluate the paraprofessionals in their buildings.

The school is on a steady course toward a refined model of instructional differentiation in content areas. The school has supported the emerging model by aligning new school resources and practices to support data-driven instruction.

The new resources included a new X2 student information database system to organize assessments, new staff to support differentiated instruction (such as the math support specialist hired in the 2006-2007 school year for the Accelerated Math Initiative), and ongoing professional development in differentiated instruction and subject area content. The principal expressed that Learning Innovations at WestEd, funded through the CSR grant, provides professional development that can strengthen teacher knowledge in math, although the school has more work to do to integrate the new teacher knowledge into classroom practice. Specifically, as the school noted in its two-year report, "Math teachers have been working on standards-based instruction and assessment using quarterly benchmark tests and creating common formative assessments."

The practices include the refinement of assessments with the power to diagnose gaps in learning and to group students in skill areas, school practices that facilitate regular regrouping and greater inclusion of special education students and English language learners.

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

Yes.

The school is focused in all functions on student achievement, from mission to practice, and from the administrator to the classroom level. The leadership in the school is clear about the school's priorities and has high expectations for students and teachers. It has aligned school practices to support the mission, and has promoted shared ownership and responsibility among the staff. School leadership is knowledgeable about curriculum, instruction, and the use of data. This knowledge is widely shared; professional growth for teachers is constantly supported and reinforced.

The style of leadership is responsive delegation. Teams and individuals take responsibility for discreet parts of the school's mission articulated through its USIP. The principal monitors the multiple team meetings through the written agendas and minutes. The principal is highly visible, frequently visiting in classrooms, and providing informal feedback to teachers. While the district evaluation tool lacks the clarity to promote improved practice, with a two-tiered rating system, staff members are clear about the principal's high expectations for students and teachers. Teachers reported that although feedback is often unwritten and without a consistent walk-through format, this did not undermine the school's culture of accountability. The reason is the principal was highly visible and gave frequent oral feedback. Teachers in focus groups explained that the principal always knew what was going on in their classrooms and that expectations for instruction were clear and high. The staff supports the principal's leadership.

The leadership and staff articulate understanding of the school's change process through the implementation of the USIP. The staff is focused on the USIP and the use of data. The diverse lead-

ership team is connected to school needs, and teachers are supported to implement the change process through coaching, modeling and support from non-evaluating staff.

The staff fully supports the goals and objectives articulated in the USIP and is intensely involved in the planning work. The school involves the staff through active participation in committees, subcommittees, USIP meetings, seeking input at regular faculty meetings, and creating avenues for grade-level and content area feedback to USIP teams.

Staff collegiality and a school climate conducive to learning characterize the Sullivan Middle School. In focus groups with teachers, staff collaboration and commitment was palpable. Examiners noted that classrooms often included more than one adult, with an average of 1.2 teachers and 0.5 paraprofessional in each classroom (with an average of 19 students). Examiners observed instances of a collaborative approach to support for learning. For example, examiners observed teacher interactions in hallways, focus groups, and the classroom centered on the learning task and student needs. Examiners noted in observations, and staff confirmed in interviews, that teachers often accepted and welcomed assistance with students, as administrators and teachers entered classrooms to check student understanding.

Hallways and common areas are well managed. Indicators of classroom practice as rated by the site team revealed that classroom management and climate were strengths of the school. The observed classrooms rated 96 percent on indicators of classroom management, 85 percent on student activity and behavior, and 92 percent on climate. Some of the indicators were consistent throughout 100 percent of the classrooms observed. All of the classrooms observed were orderly and interactions between teachers and students were respectful in all cases. The interaction between students was constructive and productive, and students were engaged in learning in all classrooms observed. All observed classrooms exhibited active listening, courtesy, fairness, and respect.

Teachers in focus groups indicated that, overall, problematic student behavior has drastically decreased since the panel and the fact-finding visits. When asked about the issues of poor relationships with ELL students noted in the fact-finding report, administrators and teachers noted that this was no longer an issue, and that ELL inclusion has led to an improvement in the school climate for this population.

District leadership has enabled the school's continued success in several powerful ways. The district provided the school with the type of leadership that fit the needs of this school during a period of crisis, and sufficient support, guidance, and autonomy to create a new path for the school. The district provided leadership training through NISL for the newly assigned principal and the returning assistant principal, and assigned the coordinator of school improvement to work with the principal. According to the district two-year report, the coordinator of school improvement is the liaison to the DOE's Accountability and Targeted Assistance (ATA) unit and attends curriculum meetings and common planning time. Sullivan has taken some innovative approaches to restructuring the classroom schedule and student groupings to differentiate learning, and the district has empowered the leadership with enough autonomy to enact new practices developed and refined by administrators and the school's staff. Lowell Public Schools has supported radical change at the Sullivan Middle School while working on massive overall change in the district.

The district is still evolving; for example, job descriptions are not all updated to provide accuracy and clarity for key new roles and expectations for the staff, the principal is not allowed to evaluate paraprofessionals in the building, the ELA curriculum is not fully developed, and the district is still working on refining math benchmark assessments. However, the Sullivan Middle School is an example of a school radically reforming expectations and practice in an urban district that is working steadily to make priority changes for its schools and students.

Conclusion

Overall, the EQA team found that Sullivan Middle School has strong practices of using data to refine and modify instruction, refine the curriculum, adjust pacing, monitor student progress, and provide specific interventions to ensure that students at different levels master the standards. The school has strong instructional leadership and a staff focused on improving student achievement. Instructional leaders provide a clear mission and direction, while promoting teacher input, collegiality, buy-in, and collaboration. The school has developed a staff focused on student improvement through the cultivation of in-house leadership, teacher teams, coaching, and a learning community. Sullivan Middle School provides ample opportunities for teacher growth through professional development programs that support the school's academic program. Finally, although the school did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in math, the Sullivan has shown improvement in performance on the MCAS tests. The school is engaged in improvement efforts that demonstrated promise in increasing student achievement in 2007-2008.

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 chairman. 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 – February 14, 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.
- 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, gather more information, and conduct an informal walk-through with a focus on school culture and climate for learning.
- 1:00-2:30 p.m. Team members met with teachers in focus groups.

	Reviewer A and Reviewer B	Reviewer C and Reviewer D
1:00-1:30	Teacher Focus Group #1 Grade 7 Team	Teacher Focus Group #2 Grade 6 Team
1:30-2:00	Teacher Focus Group #3 Grade 8 Team	Teacher Focus Group #4 Grade 5 Team
2:00-2:30	Teacher Focus Group #5 Literacy Team	Teacher Focus Group #6 CSR Math Leadership Team

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

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

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

Day 2 – February 15, 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
<i>8:00-8:30</i>	Observed Teacher 1 Grade 7 Math	Observed Teacher 2 Grade 6 Math	Observed Teacher 3 Grade 6 ELA	Observed Teacher 4 Grade 7 Math
<i>8:30-9:00</i>	Interviewed Teacher 1	Observed Teacher 5 Grade 6 Math	Interviewed Teacher 3	Observed Teacher 6 Grade 7 ELA
<i>9:00-9:30</i>	Observed Teacher 7 Grade 6 Math	Interviewed Teacher 2	Observed Teacher 8 Grade 5 Math	Interviewed Teacher 4
<i>9:30-10:00</i>	Interviewed Teacher 7	Interviewed Teacher 5	Observed Teacher 11 Grade 5 Math	Interviewed Teacher 6
<i>10:00-10:30</i>	Observed Teacher 9 Grade 8 Math	Observed Teacher 10 Grade 8 Math	Interviewed Teacher 8	Observed Teacher 12 Grade 5 Math
<i>10:30-11:00</i>	Interviewed Teacher 9	Interviewed Teacher 10	Interviewed Teacher 11	Interviewed 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.

2:00-3:00 p.m. Closing meeting with the principal.

3:00-5:00 p.m. Team members deliberated and formed conclusions.