

ELIZABETH  
2007 Curriculum Audit and  
Professional Development Review

By: Willa Spicer  
Executive Director  
NJ Performance Assessment Alliance

**Curriculum Audit Report**  
**Elizabeth School District**  
**January 16 – January 19, 2007**

**PART 1.**

**INTRODUCTION**

**Team Members:**

Walter Rusak  
Diane Pallitto

Patricia Schwartz, Arlene Pincus, Ann Small, Dan Skelton, Stanley Grajeswski, Tom Lawton, Willa Pryor, Chris Halpin, Valerie French, Peter Fland, Linda Gross, Bob Liput

**Audit of District Curriculum Materials and Professional Development Contracts**

January 16 and January 17, 2007 by Walter Rusak and Diane Pallitto

**School Visitations and Dates:**

School No. 26 Pk-8	Jan. 18
School No. 25 Pk-8	Jan. 18
School No. 14 ES	Jan. 18
School No. 20 ES	Jan. 18
Elizabeth HS	Jan. 18 & Jan. 19
School No. 1 ES	Jan. 18 & Jan. 19

**Focus and Questions:**

The focus of this report is to document evidence pertaining to the following overarching questions:

1. Is there a Board approved curriculum that is aligned to NJQSAC elements in existence for all of the subject content areas?
2. To what degree is the District's curriculum being implemented in the classrooms?
3. Is the academic program supported by staff development?
4. What staff development has the district had since September 2005 and what has it cost?

## **Curriculum Audit Report Process Used in all School Districts**

The charge for this project was to document the evidence in support of the above overarching questions and not to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction and / or curriculum resources. To achieve the aim, 57 retired superintendents, staff developers, principals and supervisors as well as university personnel were selected to visit the districts and record evidence available to an observer.

At the beginning of the process, two members of the district team examined the written curriculum in each content area required by the state and listed the materials outlined in the district documents. They noted the presence or absence of the following important curricular elements

- The curriculum is clear about what is taught to children.
- There are references of the NJCCCS to the curriculum.
- The curriculum includes grade-level benchmarks and / or interim assessments.
- The curriculum contains a pacing chart / scope and sequence.
- The curriculum contains references to technology.
- The curriculum identifies instructional resources.

The information from the written curriculum review was given to school visitors who used it in their visits to the classrooms in selected schools. (The schools in each district were selected by the process developed by the director of the QSAC research) The classroom observations served as evidence of the extent to which the written curriculum was being implemented. The observers looked for evidence that the teachers used the district curriculum to make decisions about what to teach. They noted teachers' expectations as expressed in their objectives, observed student work as displayed in the rooms and hallways and recorded what was happening in the classroom during the five minutes they were in the class. For this latter observation they used the protocols set forth in the book, The Three-minute Classroom Walk-through by Carolyn Downey, Betty Steffy, Fenwick English, Larry Frase and William Poston, JR.

The District's professional development contracts and staff surveys serve as evidence that staff development supports the instructional program and serves the needs of the system. While all staff development was examined, only contracts near or above \$100,000 are reported individually.

Finally, a short survey of teachers in each of the schools was distributed to the teachers and collected anonymously. The results give some sense of whether the staff values the district's staff development efforts and whether they report that they use the information in their practice.

All data collected for this project are called an Appendix and included in a file held in the Department of Education office. In addition to the completed forms, sample forms that were used in the whole project are also included in this appendix.

# Elizabeth Public Schools Curriculum Audit

## Overview

The Elizabeth curriculum documents vary across grade levels and content areas with a few guides dated in the late 1990's with some updates (Physical Education and Health 1996 update 2004; High School Arts Education 1999). World Languages the most recent curriculum guide was dated (2006). In general the curriculum guides are based on the scope and sequence in the textbooks or specific commercial programs used (for example, science kits). Curriculum guides are generally available on the district's website and just about every teacher has a copy. The guides include the NJCCCS references to topic areas. Pacing charts vary according to content area materials. Separate grade level benchmark documents are available in some areas. The emphasis on textbooks and gaps in content areas result in a lack of a coherent curriculum across all content standards. In some schools and at the high school, teaching objectives and lesson plans follow the same computer generated format and teachers do not vary to meet individual student needs. Programs for Gifted and Talented students are provided in a separate school that students must sign up for via lottery. There are some extended activities provided for gifted and talented students in physical education at the elementary schools. At the High School, Honors/AP classes generally use the same materials but provide more choice for the student and extended activities.

### **1. Is there a written curriculum in all content areas that include all elements cited in NJQSAC?**

Elizabeth's written curriculum for the elementary level integrates Career Education into Social Studies, Guidance and Family Life Skills. The Social Studies Curriculum is dated 2005 but the textbooks used varied throughout the elementary schools observed. Although the World Languages Curriculum was recently updated in 2006, the textbooks are dated 1997-1999.

The Arts Education Curriculum is dated 2003 and Music 2006. Instrumental music and band are available for 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. There is a K-5 Technology Curriculum Guide 2006 that is used for delivery of instruction in centers. (However, very few computers were observed in use for instructional purposes.) Elementary language arts and mathematics curriculum guides are dated 2003. No references for special education and English Language Learners were noted. The science curriculum varied from 2004 to 2006.

The middle school Language Arts, Science, and Physical Education guides were dated 2004. Math and Information Technology curriculum guides were dated 2003. The Middle School Social studies guide was dated 2005. Interdisciplinary references and technology integration through websites and computer programs were listed throughout the guides. All disciplines have frequent references to cross-content indicators and activities. Technology integration is addressed by the provision of website resources and the inclusion of specific software training (PowerPoint, Inspiration, etc.) that provides application experiences for students.

The High School Math curriculum is dated 2004, Language Arts 2005-06, Physical Education 2004, Arts 1999, Social Studies 2002 and Science 2006. However, there is variation among dates for individual course guides, i.e., Biology 1996. The correspondence of student learning objectives to standards and instructional activities among specific content areas and courses of study varied according to textbooks and programs used.

**School:** ES #1  
**Dates:** January 18-19, 2007  
**Observations:** 18 observations, K-5

Curriculum Materials			
LAL K-3	Open Court (2003)	K portfolios DIBLS	Paperback libraries
LAL 4-5	Nation's Choice	Unit tests	100 Book Challenge
Math 1-5	Everyday Math SRA McGraw-Hill	District benchmarks	
Science K-5	FOSS DELTA		

Across all observations, observers noted teachers had access to curriculum – either printed or on-line – as well as lesson plans and learning objectives. As well, in more than half of classrooms, relevant Core Curriculum Content Standards were displayed on wall posters. Where observers recorded the intended learning objectives, the general character of the learning objectives was descriptive, for example: students will be able to complete a worksheet; respond to questions (about the story); review math concepts (in preparation for test).

Teachers and students were engaged in learning activities; indeed, observers noted high levels of engagement although they encountered whole group instruction for the most part. Differentiated instruction attempts were observed in kindergarten and first grade classrooms and in inclusion classes. Inclusion classes, where there were cooperating teachers and aides, were more likely to show small group instruction. In the majority of classrooms observers noted teacher directed questioning, primarily, but not exclusively, factual recall and knowledge questions at all grades and in all content areas.

Observers noted student work on display in all classrooms. Examples ranged from students' unique responses to writing prompts to completed workbook pages, to life science displays. Every classroom displayed word walls for vocabulary development and lower grade classrooms also included displays for math concepts. There were appropriate materials in every classroom. In addition to required texts and science kits (see chart above), every classroom had at least 4 student computers, trade book libraries, math manipulatives (including calculators), and science kits. Computer use ranged from none to all computers in use. Kindergarten students were using all computers for writing practice (Wiggle Works). First graders' stories were written and edited on computers.

At 5<sup>th</sup> grade, observers noted instruction in core content areas including: language arts literacy, mathematics, science, visual arts, music, world language (Spanish), health/ physical education, and technology.

**School:** ES #14  
**Dates:** January 18, 2007  
**Observations:** 13 observations, K-5

Across all observations, observers noted teachers had access to curriculum – either printed or on-line – as well as to lesson plans and learning objectives. Where observers recorded the intended learning objectives, the general character of the learning objectives was based on student learning, for example: students will be able to identify currency; find degree of measured angles using relationships between angles and circles; identify rhyming words; identify and use cause-and-effect to write fiction review.

Teachers and students were engaged in learning activities; indeed, observers noted high levels of engagement. Observers described small group instruction in classrooms at all grades, particularly K-3, and described students working at learning centers for literacy, math, science and technology. Observers noted intentional use of higher order questioning in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms.

Examples of student work on display ranged from students' unique responses to writing prompts to completed workbook pages, to life science materials. Every classroom displayed word walls for vocabulary development and lower grade classrooms also included displays for math concepts. Classrooms at grades 3-5 also displayed student projects, for example, in a 5<sup>th</sup> grade science class, students created models of the school and playground, using cubes and sand, by following a graph that they created. In two of three 4<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms, observers noted student work displayed on clotheslines, suggesting a level of collaboration/ idea-sharing among these teachers.

There were appropriate materials in every classroom. In addition to required texts and science kits, every classroom had at least 4 student computers, trade book libraries, math manipulatives (including calculators), and science kits. Computers tended to be in use. Kindergarten students were using computers for writing practice (Wiggle Works). First grader classrooms had posted rotations, scheduling students' computer use every three days. Fifth graders were working on vocabulary exercises or math problems on computers.

At 5<sup>th</sup> grade, observers noted instruction in core content areas including: language arts literacy, mathematics, science, visual arts, music, world language (Spanish), health/ physical education, and technology. The technology teacher used a mobile lab and students shared four classroom computers to practice keyboarding.

**School:** ES #26  
**Dates:** January 18, 2007  
**Observations:** 20 observations, K-8

<b>Curriculum Materials</b>			
<b>LAL K-3</b>	<b>Open Court (2003)</b>	<b>K portfolios DIBLS</b>	<b>Paperback libraries</b>
<b>LAL 4-5</b>	<b>Nation's Choice</b>	<b>Unit tests</b>	<b>100 Book Challenge</b>
<b>Math 1-5</b>	<b>Everyday Math SRA McGraw-Hill</b>	<b>District benchmarks</b>	
<b>Science K-5</b>	<b>FOSS DELTA</b>		
<b>LAL 6-8</b>	<b>Timeless Voices and Timeless Themes</b>	<b>Themed Novels District benchmarks</b>	<b>100 Book Challenge</b>
<b>Math 6 Math 7-8</b>	<b>Everyday Math UCSMP Transition Math Algebraic Investigations</b>	<b>District Benchmarks</b>	<b>Graphing Calculator</b>
<b>Science</b>	<b>FOSS Science + Technology Concepts for Children (STC)</b>		
<b>Social Studies 7</b>	<b>Government in America</b>		

Across all observations of K-5 classrooms, observers noted teachers' had access to curriculum – either printed or on-line – as well as lesson plans and learning objectives. Where observers recorded the intended learning objectives, the general character of the learning objectives reflected higher order thinking skills, for example: [K] students will tell subtraction stories; [2<sup>nd</sup> grade] students will develop

meanings of addition/ subtraction; [3<sup>rd</sup> grade] students will write a number chart that contains parentheses; [5<sup>th</sup> grade] students will develop a rule for subtracting positive/ negative numbers.

Teachers and students were engaged in learning activities. Observers found teacher-student interactions at all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy of thinking skills. There was evidence of differentiated instruction. Activity centers were observed in many classrooms; students worked independently or in small groups at learning centers on writing, math and science projects.

Observers noted student work on display in all classrooms, such as students' unique responses to writing prompts, original number stories, and poetry. Every classroom displayed word walls for vocabulary development and some also included displays for math concepts.

There were appropriate materials in every classroom. In addition to required texts and kits (see chart above), every classroom had at least 4 student computers, trade book libraries, math manipulatives (including calculators), and science kits. Computer use ranged from none to all computers in use. At 5<sup>th</sup> grade, observers noted instruction in core content areas including: language arts literacy, mathematics, science, visual arts, music, world language (Spanish), health/ physical education, and technology. In the 5<sup>th</sup> grade technology class students were preparing Power Point presentations, based on Internet research, of "My Ideal Job", an example of content/ skill integration.

At grades 6-8, observers visited classrooms in language arts, mathematics, social studies and science. Although there is a curriculum for middle school Information Technology, no courses are offered. Across all observations of grade 6-8 classrooms, observers noted teachers' had access to curriculum – either printed or on-line – as well as lesson plans and learning objectives.

Across content areas and classrooms observed, observers found students working in small groups on collaborative, small group projects to 'discover', 'explore', or 'analyze and explain' concepts. In a 6th grade math class a volunteer math coach from Merck [Pharmaceuticals] worked along with the teachers. Where observers recorded the intended learning objectives, the general character reflected higher order thinking; students were expected to respond in writing to open-ended questions about literature, math, social studies, and science. Objectives called for students to explain [science concept] through experimentation, use manipulatives to build comprehension [of a science concept], use order of operations to evaluate numerical expressions, or identify major compromises of the Constitutional Convention. An observer noted that an assignment on immigrants had generated "so much evidence they are out of wall space!"

**School:** ES #20  
**Dates:** January 18, 2007  
**Observations:** 23 observations, K-6

<b>Curriculum Materials</b>			
<b>LAL K-3 Special education</b>	<b>Open Court (2003) Horizons Reading program</b>	<b>K portfolios DIBLS</b>	<b>Paperback libraries</b>
<b>LAL 4-6</b>	<b>Nation's Choice Houghton Mifflin 2003</b>	<b>Unit tests NJ Ask Books</b>	<b>100 Book Challenge Scholastic guided reading program</b>
<b>Math 1-6</b>	<b>Everyday Math 2002 SRA McGraw-Hill</b>	<b>District benchmarks</b>	
<b>Science K-6</b>	<b>FOSS DELTA</b>		
<b>Social Studies k-6</b>	<b>Glencoe Geography The world &amp; Its People 2004 National Geographic</b>	<b>Workbook quizzes</b>	<b>World geography word wall Political maps</b>
<b>World Language</b>	<b>Spanish SRA(Latin materials) 2003</b>	<b>Contest for all classes</b>	

Across all observations, observers noted teachers had access to curriculum – either printed or on-line – as well as lesson plans and learning objectives. Where observers recorded the intended learning objectives in more than half of the classrooms the objectives described were student centered, for example: students will be able to visualize different geometric shapes and visually manipulate them to complete a puzzle, rather than as noted in some classrooms: phonological awareness.

Teachers and students were engaged in learning activities. Teacher directed whole group instruction was the predominant form of instructional delivery observed. However, in some classes students worked in small groups as a continuation of the lesson and teacher student discussion was reciprocal. In some of the classrooms observers noted some use of higher order thinking skills, such as, representation and application of skills.

Observers noted student work on display in all classrooms. Examples ranged from students' unique responses to writing prompts to tests in content areas. Writing samples were also noted in the hallways. A school-wide writing contest was in process under the direction of the principal. Most classrooms displayed word walls for vocabulary development.

There were appropriate materials in every classroom. In addition to required texts and science kits (see chart above), every classroom had at least 4 student computers, trade book libraries, math manipulatives (including calculators). In some classrooms it seems that the science kits and additional libraries have not been used. Computer use was not observed in any of the classrooms. However, there is a rotation chart in every classroom indicating student use.

**School:** ES #25  
**Dates:** January 18, 2007  
**Observations:** 30 observations, K-8

<b>Curriculum Materials</b>			
<b>LAL K-3</b>	<b>Open Court (2003)</b>	<b>K portfolios DIBLS</b>	<b>Paperback libraries</b>
<b>LAL 4-5</b>	<b>Nation's Choice 2003</b>	<b>Unit tests</b>	<b>100 Book Challenge</b>
<b>Math 1-5</b>	<b>Everyday Math SRA McGraw-Hill 2002</b>	<b>District benchmarks</b>	
<b>Science K-5</b>	<b>FOSS DELTA</b>		
<b>Health</b>	<b>Teen Health Glencoe</b>		
<b>LAL 6-8</b>	<b>Timeless Voices and Timeless Themes</b>	<b>Themed Novels District benchmarks</b>	<b>100 Book Challenge</b>
<b>Math 6 Math 7-8</b>	<b>Everyday Math UCSMP Transition Math Algebraic Investigations</b>	<b>District Benchmarks</b>	<b>Graphing Calculator</b>
<b>Science</b>	<b>FOSS Science + Technology Concepts for Children (STC)</b>		
<b>Social Studies 7</b>	<b>Government in America</b>		
<b>Social Studies 8</b>	<b>World History McDougall</b>		

Across all observations of K-8 classrooms, observers noted teachers' had access to curriculum – either printed or on-line – as well as lesson plans and learning objectives.

Learning objectives are computer generated by the TVator program and not always visible in the classroom. Some classrooms displayed the objectives for all the day's lessons on the overhead TV screen as a rotating slide show. The general character of the learning objectives were teacher oriented, for example: writing a persuasive essay.

Teachers and students were engaged in learning activities. In grades K through 5 observers found some evidence of differentiated instruction in varying whole, group and individual instruction. Activity centers were observed in many classrooms; students worked independently or in small groups at learning centers on writing, math and science projects. Use of manipulatives and movement activities, i.e., having students break into two groups to demonstrate the concept of halves, were observed. For the most part, teacher directed questions were at the knowledge level.

Observers noted student work on display in all classrooms, such as students' unique responses to writing prompts and content tests. Every classroom displayed word walls for vocabulary development and some also included displays for math concepts.

There were appropriate materials in every classroom. In addition to required texts and kits (see chart above), every classroom had at least 4 student computers, trade book libraries, math manipulatives (including calculators), and science kits.

Gifted and talented youngsters in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades may receive extra research and/or physical education projects. 5<sup>th</sup> grade students may also join the band. At grades 6-8, observers visited classrooms in language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, health, performing arts and technology.

High student engagement was observed especially in science, math inclusion and health classes. Students in the science classes were actively engaged working with a partner on a science project. Conversation and movement throughout the class was permitted and the teacher was participating by assisting students.

In the math classes, observers noted student demonstrations at the board, higher order questions and wait time in assisting students. In the health class students had created a bingo game for the day's lesson. Most classrooms displayed some student work and the NJ State Rubrics for writing.

**School:** HS  
**Dates:** January 18-19, 2007  
**Observations:** 60 observations, 9-12

Curriculum Materials			
English (PAIDEA) 9-12-Public Speaking/Debate- Journalism- World Literature- Philosophy	English I Required Novels Research – Writing Strategies HSPA/SAT PREP	English III Required Novels	English IV Honors/AP Required Novels
Algebra I & Honors <u>Algebra – Integrated Math</u> University of Chicago	Geometry – & Honors  <u>Geometry: Integrated Mathematics</u>	Algebra II & Honors  <u>Advanced Algebra: Integrated Math</u>	Pre Calculus & AP Calculus  <u>Probability and Statistics</u>
Social Studies 9-12  <u>American Nation 2000</u> <u>American Issues 2002</u>	Free Nation 2000 American Issues II 2002  Honors Portrait of America 1999	<u>World History 2005</u> McDougall Littell	
Science 9-12	Biology <u>Dynamic of Life 2004</u> Glencoe	Physics <u>Physics 2002 Holt</u> <u>Conceptual Physics</u> Prentice Hall	<u>AP/College Physics</u> Brook/Cole/Thompson

In virtually all 9 - 12 classrooms observed, the teacher produced the curriculum/pacing guide and lesson plan, either a hard copy or computer file. A few times, a teacher tried to access the curriculum on line (district intranet) but could not. In the few instances where the teacher did not have the curriculum and/or lesson plan at hand, the teacher reported that the documents were in another room or at home.

In the classes observed, the lesson plan and instructional activities were derived from the pacing guide. In a few classes teacher-initiated adjustments in lesson plans to accommodate student needs were observed. However, most lesson plans reviewed across grades and content areas were generic in format and did not reflect individual student needs, varied materials or assessments used. SWBAT statements were generally phrased in terms of knowledge or low-level skills (e.g., will know, will recognize, make a list).

For the most part, whole-group instruction was observed with occasional directions for students to work with a partner or in a small group. Teacher-talk dominated. Questioning was mainly at recall level (who, what, when). Teachers accepted one-word answers and usually did not follow-up on students' efforts to go beyond recall of facts. There was no real provision for wait time or the use of planned questions designed to cause higher-level thinking. Cooperative learning and differentiated instruction were virtually

non-existent. Gifted & Talented classes were more likely than others to include structured/planned opportunities for student self-directed learning and assessment of learning.

Observers noted some student work on display in classrooms, such as quizzes and short writing assignments; some work was dated from the first marking period. With very few exceptions, assessments observed were commercial/ textbook based. Required textbooks observed were in use and all students had texts. In general, classes were quiet and calm. Students who were not engaged in class activity tended to have their heads down on their desks. In some classes teachers tolerated a high level of off task socializing. Computers were in use in no more than 4 classes observed.

## Professional Development Findings: Elizabeth

Elizabeth submitted documentation reporting 29 multi-school professional development activities in the period September 2005 to December 2006, at a total cost of \$872,109; the district reported no individual school-level activities. The 22 activities involving costs to the district (others were supported by grant funds) included contracts with Focus on Results (Amalia Cudiero) for \$208,160 in 2005-06 and \$335,400 in 2006-07, to work with instructional leadership teams on literacy and math. Review of the district's professional development contracts reveals no attempt to specify expected outcomes of activities, and the district cited no evidence that any activities had resulted in improved instructional practice or student achievement.

According to district administrator reports, district professional development in the period under review satisfied QSAC requirements that professional development address data driven instruction, classroom assessment practices, how to use assessments to adjust instruction and how to seek assistance for students who fall behind (QSAC C1d); address how staff can contribute to student achievement of the NJCCCS and support the intellectual, social, emotional and physical development of all students (QSAC C1e); address culturally responsive teaching and ways to address needs of diverse learners (QSAC C1g); include support and follow-up (QSAC C2); and address student subgroup performance and improving student achievement in areas of need (QSAC C3b).

Teacher Professional Development Survey results (see Appendix) indicate that respondents:

- tend to believe that they receive high-quality professional development that relates to improving student performance (QSAC C1b), but differ in this regard from school to school (ranging from 3.35 to 4.74 on a scale of 1 to 5);
- tend to report that their district or school provides follow-up training, such as coaching or classroom visitations, after professional development activities (QSAC C2), but differ in this regard from school to school (ranging from 2.87 to 4.69 on a scale of 1 to 5);
- are likely to report that their district or school sought their input about quality or results of professional development (QSAC C1h) at least once in the past two years (76.2%), but differ in this regard from school to school (range = 56.5% to 100%);
- are very likely to report that their district or school provided professional development about how to improve achievement of student subgroups (QSAC C3b) at least once in the past two years (84.3%), but differ in this regard from school to school (range = 70.0% to 100%); and
- are very likely to report that they have modified their classroom practice as a result of recent professional development activity (87.6%), but differ in this regard from school to school (range = 56.5% to 100%). However, only 58.1 percent of respondents provided a meaningful example of such modification, as requested,

Wide variations in some survey responses from school to school suggest that the district may need to conduct its own periodic professional development surveys and devote efforts to ensure that teachers in all schools have equal access to high quality professional development as defined by QSAC.

## Teacher Professional Development Survey Results: Elizabeth

1. My district or school provides me with high-quality professional development activities that relate to my needs in relation to improving student performance. [1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree]

<u>School</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Avg.</u>	<u>N</u>
School 1	1	2	8	13	2	3.50	26
School 14	4	1	6	9	5	3.40	26
School 20	5	2	3	6	7	3.35	23
School 25	0	0	3	3	29	4.74	35
School 26	0	3	2	20	10	4.06	35
EHS	3	14	12	21	12	3.40	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>207</b>

2. After professional development activities, my district or school provides follow-up training, such as coaching or classroom visitations. [1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree]

<u>School</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Avg.</u>	<u>N</u>
School 1	1	3	7	11	4	3.54	26
School 14	3	7	3	7	5	3.16	26
School 20	6	1	9	4	3	2.87	23
School 25	0	3	1	5	26	4.69	35
School 26	0	1	13	13	8	3.80	35
EHS	6	8	16	26	6	3.29	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>207</b>

3. In the past two years, my district or school has sought my input about the quality or the results of the professional development I have received.

<u>School</u>	<u>% Yes</u>
School 1	80.8
School 14	76.9
School 20	56.5
School 25	100.0
School 26	85.7
EHS	62.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>76.2</b>

4. In the past two years, my district or school has provided professional development about how to improve achievement of student subgroups.

<u>School</u>	<u>% Yes</u>
School 1	96.2
School 14	73.1
School 20	70.0
School 25	100.0
School 26	88.2
EHS	78.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>84.3</b>

5. I have modified my classroom practice as a direct or indirect result of professional development activity in the period September 2005 to December 2006. If yes, describe how your practice has changed.

<u>School</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% Providing Example</u>
School 1	100.0	60.0
School 14	83.3	75.0
School 20	56.5	39.1
School 25	100.0	37.1
School 26	94.1	67.6
EHS	85.0	63.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>87.6</b>	<b>58.1</b>

*Response Rate*

<u>School</u>	<u>% Faculty Responding</u>
School 1	21.7%
School 14	26.5%
School 20	71.9%
School 25	64.8%
School 26	68.6%
EHS	13.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.6%</b>