Evaluation Brief

Implementation of Middle School Reform: Lights, Camera, Literacy!

Rachel A. Hickson, M.A.[i]

Background

The Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) has begun a comprehensive reform initiative for its 38 middle schools. This reform effort is being launched as part of a phased series of ongoing educational improvements presented in *Our Call to Action: Pursuit of Excellence*, the MCPS strategic plan. In 2007–2008, five middle schools are implementing all of the recommended actions of Middle School Reform. These schools are Benjamin Banneker, Roberto Clemente, Montgomery Village, Sligo, and Earle B. Wood ("Phase I schools").

An evaluation of Middle School Reform is being conducted by the Department of Shared Accountability (DSA) in 2007–2008. The evaluation addresses the extent and fidelity of implementation of the recommended actions of Middle School Reform as experienced in the five Phase I schools.   This brief reports on the evaluation of Lights, Camera, Literacy! (LCL), a course designed as an extended learning opportunity under Middle School Reform.

LCL was offered for the first time during the summer of 2007.   The course features hands-on learning experiences and employs multiple instructional strategies designed to maximize student engagement. According to the course description, "LCL teaches students to transfer their skills as viewers of film to skills on the written page." LCL is a technology-rich course in which students learn how to create and edit films in a digital environment.

A detailed course guide with 20 days of lesson plans was prepared, along with equipment and technology support and course-specific training. LCL teachers from all five Phase I schools, plus media specialists from four of the Phase I schools, attended two days of LCL training in June 2007. LCL teachers attended an additional day of training in July 2007.

This brief addresses the following key questions:

- Was LCL implemented as designed?
- How did the student population enrolled in LCL compare with the Middle School Reform target population for extended learning opportunities?
- What additional needs or refinements are indicated?

Summary of Methodology

Classroom observations, a student survey, and MCPS data (student enrollment, attendance, and demographic characteristics) were used to determine whether LCL was implemented as designed.

Summary of Major Findings

Implementation of LCL in 2007 can best be summarized as moderately successful.

- Targeted groups of students were served, though enrollment was lower than planned.
- Student experience with the course was very positive, including successful use of technology, attendance at least as good as that of other 20-day summer courses, and a high level of student engagement during small group activities.
- Explicit connections between middle school written text literacy skills and LCL course content, materials, and activities are not yet fully realized.

Detailed Methodology

Summer school was a morning program (7:45 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.).   A full morning of instruction was observed in each of the nine LCL classes. Observation dates were July 12 (Day 4), July 17 (Day 7), July 18 (Day 8), July 19 (Day 9), and July 25 (Day 13). The field trip on July 11 to the American Film Institute (AFI) Silver Theater in Silver Spring was observed.

DSA evaluation specialists used an observation protocol developed specifically for LCL. Preparation of the observational items included a review of the LCL course guide for teachers, a review of MCPS curriculum look-fors for middle school courses (student engagement, level of discourse, grouping practices, critical thinking), a review of protocols used for other MCPS evaluations, and a review of educational literature on student engagement in the classroom.

Data on 2007 Maryland School Assessment (MSA) test results, student characteristics, enrollment, attendance, and eligibility for extracurricular activities were analyzed.

Summer coordinators provided information on recruiting activities for LCL at each school.

Students completed a survey questionnaire about their course experiences. A total of 109 students (90%) completed the survey. (Table B1)

Discussion of Findings

Class Resources and Materials

The LCL program design included on-site support for the technical components of the course. Supporting personnel were observed in some of the classes, including media services technicians (MSTs) in all schools.

The course guide included a list of daily outcomes (for example, "students will discuss literary conflict"). In eight out of nine classes observed, the daily outcomes were communicated by the teacher. In four classes this information was shared both orally and in writing; in four other classes, outcomes were conveyed only in writing.

Each lesson plan specified materials and technology to be used, such as writing journals, laptop computers with movie software, and movie cameras. The expected materials, based on the course guide for the day, were observed in all classes.

Handouts for classroom activities were included in the course guide. All classes using handouts on the day of observations used the handouts corresponding to the lesson in the guide.

Daily lessons included the introduction of specific vocabulary. In four of the observed classes, all of the day's vocabulary words were taught. In the other five classes, some of the day's words were taught.

The course guide included a word wall feature. A word wall was used in six of the nine classes, with an average of 37 words posted in each room.

Class Time and Lesson Components

The LCL lesson plans included the following four major daily components: a journal activity, a whole group (focus) lesson, a team (small group) activity, and an end-of-day reflection exercise. On some days, a second group lesson, a second team activity, or other lesson variations were indicated.

The journal activity was completed in all nine observed classes. Eight classes had a whole group lesson and eight classes had a team activity. Though the reflection was scheduled daily, it was observed in only seven classes.

A second whole group lesson was observed in seven classes. A second team activity was observed in four classes. In five classes, a group discussion was observed. (Table A1a)

Daily lesson plans included 3 hours 20 minutes (200 minutes) of LCL instruction. The course guide provided suggested time allowances for each lesson component. Teachers in observed LCL classes spent close to the suggested amount of time on whole group activities (94% of recommended time) and on team activities (93% of recommended time). However, they spent less time than recommended on journal writing (76%) and student reflection (54%). Total time observed in the nine classes was slightly less than programmed in the guide (181 minutes, or 89% of recommended time). (Table A1b)

Teacher Use of Technology

Technology is a critical part of LCL; technology demands varied by lesson and task. Observers looked for teacher comfort level with technology. Teachers in three classes demonstrated the use of equipment or software to students, and appeared "very comfortable" doing so. Teachers in four classes appeared "very comfortable" helping students troubleshoot equipment or software problems.

Computers or television sets were used during group instruction to show film clips. Teachers in three of the observed classes needed assistance, and called on MSTs to help them (this happened once on Day 7, once on Day 8, and once on Day 13). In two other observed instances, all technology skills were handled by the MST rather than by the teacher.

Student Engagement During Whole Group Instruction

All nine observed classes included at least one whole group lesson (Table A2). During the first (or only) group lesson, all or most students had their own supplies ready and appeared able to follow instructions.

In seven of the nine classes, all or most students were able to sustain their attention and involvement throughout the lesson period.

In a majority of classes, all or most students appeared curious, interested, and/or enthusiastic about the lesson (n = 5). It was less common to observe students making comments or asking questions relating to the purpose or vocabulary of the lesson. (In three classes, most students did this, and in four classes, some students did this.) Disruptive or off-task behaviors were not evident.

Student Engagement During Small Group Activities

All nine observed classes included at least one team activity (with students working in small groups) (Table A3). During the first or only such activity in all of the classes, all or most students appeared able to follow instructions and to work together (n = 9).

In eight of nine classes, all or most students prepared their materials, equipment and supplies, appeared curious, interested and/or enthusiastic, and treated team members with respect.

In a majority of classes, all or most students asked each other questions and sustained their attention throughout the activity (n = 6).

Students in just one class exhibited "risk-taking" such as being willing to try things with uncertain outcomes that they discussed in ways that were apparent to the observers.

Similar patterns of student engagement were evident in those classes that featured a second team activity on the same class day. Disruptive or off-task behaviors were not major problems.

Checking for Understanding During Whole Group Instruction

In eight of the observed classes, teachers asked questions requiring short answers throughout the lesson, and the teacher in the other class did this once or twice (Table A4).

Evidence of other ways of checking for understanding during the whole group lessons was more limited. There was some evidence of asking students to make connections to prior learning (throughout the lesson in three classes, once or twice in four others), and some evidence of teachers providing oral feedback to students (throughout the lesson in two classes, once or twice in six others). There was extremely limited evidence of dipsticking or written answers/exit cards, apart from student reflection exercises. There was no evidence of teachers providing written feedback to students during the observed lessons.

Other opportunities to check for understanding in LCL classes took place outside of group instruction and were not observed by DSA. These opportunities included teachers providing written feedback to students in journals, reading students' answers to reflection prompts, and reviewing students' films for connections to course content.

Encouraging Critical Thinking During Whole Group Instruction

There was a fair amount of evidence that teachers encouraged students to use critical thinking skills during the whole group lessons (Table A5). Most teachers invited students to explain or justify their thinking (throughout the lesson in five classes, once or twice in three classes). Most teachers encouraged students to judge or evaluate situations, problems or issues (throughout the lesson in four classes, once or twice in four other classes). Moreover, several teachers encouraged students to think at analytic, interpretive and abstract levels (throughout the lesson in four classes, once or twice in three classes).

There was less evidence that teachers solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas (throughout the lesson in only two classes, once or twice in four classes). There was almost no evidence that teachers encouraged students to synthesize or summarize information, or that they encouraged students to reframe ideas.

Teaching of Written Text Literacy Skills

Observers looked to see whether the literacy-related activities specified in the lessons were conducted. Observers also looked to see whether students were able to complete the activities that called for the use of written text literacy skills.

Evidence from observations shows a need for the curriculum to provide more explicit connections between middle school written text literacy skills and LCL course content. Table A6 addresses these observations. The notes on written text literacy skills teaching and reinforcement pertain to eight different classes. All classes used the same curriculum.

The curriculum for Day 4 (the first observed class day) featured activities with three different written text literacy skills. However, activities for the first two skills (inferencing; idiom/figurative versus literal language) were not taught. Students later attempted an activity comparing a film presentation with a text presentation about a spelling bee. The planned activity was the completion of a compare-and-contrast graphic

organizer, to be completed in small groups, followed by a whole group discussion. Both the small group and whole group activities in both classes were incomplete.

On Day 7, students attempted to compare and contrast the content of a script with the final film content (which differed from the script). In one class, checking for understanding during class was limited, and student reflections did not indicate whether or not students understood this lesson. In the other class, checking for understanding was even more limited and no student reflection was conducted.

On Day 9, students were to complete written critiques of certain aspects of their films. However, these critiques were not completed in either class.

On Day 13, students were learning about context clues to discover word meanings. In one class, students were not directed back to the context to help with guessing new word meanings. These same students were not directed back to the full passage to review newly learned word meanings in the context of the passage.

Student Experience with LCL

A summary of student survey findings is presented in Appendix B. Results indicate that students found the experience to be engaging and satisfying, and they would recommend it to others. Eight out of ten (80%) would recommend LCL to friends as a future summer course. Nearly as many (76%) would be interested in taking LCL at an advanced level during a future summer. (Table B2)

The class activities that were liked best by students were the hands-on filmmaking experiences: using the video camera (89% liked this best), filming their own movies (88%), using the computer to complete a film (87%), and having a festival of student films (79%). (Table B3)

With regard to critical thinking skills (Table B4), more than six in ten students said that "almost every day" their teacher asked them to explain their thinking (65%), encouraged them to explore different points of view (64%), and encouraged them to analyze what they learned (62%).

Student Targeting, Recruitment, and Enrollment

Targeting. One Middle School Reform recommended action is to target certain groups of students for extended learning opportunities. These groups are less likely to meet proficiency requirements for the MSA, according to "The Case for Reform" (see Weast, 2007, p. 8). Targets include African American and Hispanic students, students with disabilities, students receiving English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

services, students eligible for Free and Reduced-price Meal System (FARMS) services, and students who have not met academic eligibility requirements.

When compared with all students who could have taken LCL in summer 2007, targeting was successful with African American students (47% in LCL versus 33% in the total eligible pool), Hispanic students (31% versus 26% of all eligibles), and FARMS students (55% in LCL versus 37% of all eligibles). (Table C1)

Targeting was slightly less successful for academic eligibility (Table C2). Among LCL students with eligibility information in the fourth quarter of 2006–2007, 41% of students were not eligible for extracurricular activities compared with 36% of students in Phase I schools who were not eligible, and 34% of students in all other summer courses in Phase I schools who were not eligible.

Targeting for other demographic groups was less successful. A total of 10% of students participating in LCL were special education students, compared with 13% among all LCL eligible students. In addition, 6% of students enrolled in LCL were ESOL students, compared with 7% among all LCL eligible students.

While LCL was open to all students, Middle School Reform guidance suggests that students' academic performance data be considered. Data from the 2007 administration of MSA were not available in time to target students for the summer. However, MSA data can be useful in understanding the skill level of students taking the course. When compared with students in Phase I schools, LCL students were more likely to score Basic on the spring 2007 MSA in reading (36% of LCL students, compared with 24% of all students in Phase I schools).

Recruitment. While formal "recruitment plans" were not provided to DSA, coordinators reported that multiple recruitment efforts were undertaken by staff at each school. These included many of the activities suggested by the Middle School Reform plan, including mass mailings and flyers, morning announcements, Connect–ED messages, information on EdLine, information on school Web sites, phone calls to parents and students, and presentations by coordinators and principals at elementary schools. Middle school teachers were asked to promote the course.

Coordinators reported that specific groups of students invited to LCL included gifted and talented students, honor roll students, and Read 180 students. Recommendations from elementary and middle school teachers were considered.

Enrollment. MCPS staff planned for 40 students per school (20 per class), for each of the five schools offering LCL — a total of 200 places. Official enrollment was 136 students; according to teachers, 121 students completed the course. Information about the offering of LCL was not available for staff in schools to promote until after all other summer school courses had been announced. The late rollout date appeared to have had a negative effect on recruitment, as the number of students enrolled was lower than planned. Staff at wo schools moved students from other summer classes into LCL in order to boost enrollment.

Four Grade 6 classes, four Grade 7 and 8 combined classes, and one Grade 6, 7, and 8 combined class were formed.

Attendance

Attendance for LCL was comparable to that for other 20-day middle school courses in Phase I schools (an average of 16.53 days out of 20 for LCL, and an average of 15.82 days out of 20 for other courses). The difference between the two groups approaches statistical significance, with slightly better attendance indicated for LCL students.

Recommendations

Based on evaluation findings, the following refinements are indicated.

- Publicize the course early and frequently. LCL was announced in the spring and experienced lower-than-planned enrollment. Students are enthusiastic, and will generate good word-of-mouth. Use student "alumni" to publicize the course during daily announcements and in English, reading, ESOL, TV Production, and other classes.

- Publicize the course to feeder elementary schools by showing the LCL promotional video during third and fourth marking periods. The video feature, produced for *Cover to Cover* by MCPS Instructional Television, provides an engaging video report of the course and the experiences of students in summer 2007.

- Create pre- and post-assessments of written text literacy skills taught in LCL. Pre- and post-assessments are used in other middle school extended-day and extended-year courses.

- Post, repeat, and stress daily outcomes that pertain to written text literacy skills (e.g.

students will be able to analyze a new informational text using inferencing skills).

- Make the LCL guide more explicit in stressing written text literacy skills. Use larger print and other visual emphasis to direct the teacher to these moments in the day's curriculum.

- Consider that some students will not have the written text literacy skills to complete individual and small group literacy activities without teacher support. Build in additional exercises that reinforce written text literacy skills, such as having students review the steps they took in a particular film analysis exercise and then transferring the steps to new (unfamiliar) text.

- Emphasize checking for understanding and encouraging critical thinking during professional development for LCL. In the midst of the fun and excitement of making movies, students lose the connection to specific written text literacy skills that are portable for future language arts courses.

- Enforce the daily opportunity for student reflection. Prompts should reference specific written text literacy skills for both journal writing and end-of-day reflection. Review the content of student reflections to determine whether students are grasping the desired concepts and skills.

- Provide additional training in the use of computers and television equipment to show film clips during whole group lessons.

- Consider the content expertise of LCL teachers. Four of the ten LCL teachers do not teach English or reading during the school year; another is a special education teacher.

Reference

Weast, Jerry D., (2007). *Report on Middle School Reform,* Memorandum to the Board of Education, January 9, 2007.

---

[i] The author and DSA wish to thank the coordinators and LCL teachers at the five Phase I middle schools for assisting with the evaluation of LCL.

Implementation of Middle School Reform: Lights, Camera, Literacy!

Appendixes

Appendix A

Detailed Findings from Observations of LCL Classes

Table A1a
Lesson Components Observed

	Lesson Component	Number of Classes $N = 9$
Teacher-Led Components	Group discussion	5
	First focus lesson/whole group	8
	Second focus lesson/whole group	7
Student-Led Components	Journal activity	9
	First team activity/student groups	8
	Second team activity/student groups	4
	Reflection	7

Table A1b
Time Devoted to Lesson Components

Lesson Component	Mean (Average) Time Spent as a Percentage of Time Suggested by Course Guide (%)	Median (Middle Value) Time Observed in Nine LCL Classes
Whole Group Activities	94	74 minutes
Journal	76	12 minutes
Team Activities	93	80 minutes
Reflection	54	8 minutes
Total Instructional Time	89	181 minutes*

*Instructional time in the course guide was 200 minutes per day (3 hours and 20 minutes).

Table A2
Student Engagement During First Whole Group Lesson

Observed Items	First Whole Group Lesson* N = 9 classes			
	Extent of Student Engagement			
	All	Most	Some	Few or None
Students have their own supplies ready.	8	1	--	--
Students appear able to follow steps and/or instructions.	8	1	--	--
Students do not engage in disruptive behavior.	8	--	--	1
Students are able to sustain their attention and involvement throughout the lesson period.	4	3	2	--
Students do not engage in off-task behavior.	1	6	--	2
Students appear curious, interested, and/or enthusiastic.	1	4	2	2
Students make comments or ask questions that relate to the purpose or vocabulary of the lesson.	--	3	4	2

*Five classes had an additional whole group lesson on the day of observation.
Note. Dashes indicate no observations belong in this category.

Table A3
Student Engagement During Team Activities

Observed Items	First Team Activity N = 9 classes Extent of Student Engagement				Second Team Activity N = 7 classes Extent of Student Engagement			
	All	Most	Some	Few or None	All	Most	Some	Few or None
Students work together.	7	2	--	--	5	2	--	--
Students appear able to follow steps and/or instructions.	6	3	--	--	4	3	--	--
Students do not engage in disruptive behavior.	6	2	1	--	5	1	--	1
Students prepare their materials, equipment, and supplies.	5	3	--	1	6	1	--	--
Students appear to treat their team members with respect.	5	3	1	--	5	1	1	--
Students appear curious, interested, and/or enthusiastic.	3	5	1	--	4	2	--	1
Students ask each other questions.	5	1	--	3	6	--	--	1
Students are able to sustain their attention and involvement throughout team activity period.	4	2	2	1	3	2	1	1
Students do not engage in off-task behavior.	3	3	2	1	5	--	2	--
Students persist to get "the hard parts" to work.*	1	2	1	4	4	1	1	1
Students exhibit "risk-taking," such as being willing to try things when they are not sure what the outcome will be.†	1	--	1	7	3	--	1	3
If this team completes its activity ahead of other teams, team members engage in activities related to the curriculum.*	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	2

*Not applicable to one or more classes.
†Students discussed or presented this in a way that was apparent to the observers.
Note. Dashes indicate no observations belong in this category.

Table A4
Checking for Understanding During First Whole Group Lesson

Observed Items	Number of Classes N = 9		
	No Evidence	Once or Twice	Throughout
Teacher asks questions requiring short-answer responses, including those that elicit a unison response.	--	1	8
Teacher asks students to make connections to prior learning.	2	4	3
Teacher provides oral feedback to students.	1	6	2
Teacher dipsticks (has all students use hand signals, signal cards, or other indicators to show whether they understand a concept).	6	3	--
Teacher uses short written answer or exit card to check for understanding at the end of a lesson or segment.	7	2	--
Teacher provides written feedback to students.	9	--	--

Note. Dashes indicate no observations belong in this category.

Table A5
Encouraging Critical Thinking During First Whole Group Lesson

Observed Items	Number of Classes N = 9		
	No Evidence	Once or Twice	Throughout
Teacher invites students to "unpack" (explain, elaborate on, or justify) their thinking.	1	3	5
Teacher encourages students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues.	1	4	4
Teacher encourages students to think at analytic, interpretive, and abstract levels.	2	3	4
Teacher solicits many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas.	3	4	2
Teacher encourages students to synthesize or summarize information within or across disciplines.	8	1	--
Teacher engages students in the exploration of diverse points of view – reframes ideas.	8	1	--

Note. Dashes indicate no observations belong in this category.

Table A6

Observation of Teaching of LCL Written Text Literacy Skills

	Written Text Literacy Skill Activity Indicated by Course Guide	Grade 6	Grades 7 and 8
Day 4 Skills	Inference	Not taught	Not taught
	Idiom/Figurative vs. literal language	Not taught	Not taught
	Compare and contrast: Film vs. text presentation	Students were only able to complete graphic organizer with help – turned into teacher-led small groups. No follow-up discussion to reinforce skills from this exercise.	Focus was on students writing answers on board in complete sentences, rather than on giving every child a chance to generate examples of compare/contrast. No follow-up discussion to reinforce skills from this exercise.
Day 7 Skills	Compare and contrast script content with final film content	Student reflections did not indicate whether or not students absorbed the compare-and-contrast lesson.	Very limited checking for understanding and very limited encouragement of critical thinking. No student reflection was conducted; difficult to discern what students absorbed.
Day 9 Skills	Analyzing literary-dramatic-cinematic aspects of film and critiquing own films on these dimensions	Very low level discussion. No checking for understanding or encouraging critical thinking during the lesson. Students did not complete the analysis of their own film that would have reinforced the concepts being taught.	Very limited checking for understanding and very limited encouragement of critical thinking. Students did not complete written plans based on analysis of their own films.
Day 13 Skills	Context clues	Both paper and iMac dictionaries were used to help students find word meanings.	Students were not directed back to the context to help with guessing new word meanings, or to the back cover of the book after word meanings were determined.
	Inferencing	Most inferencing was provided by teacher while movie played, rather than by students.	Not taught. Film not stopped during the movie (as per guide) to provide moments for inferencing about what might be happening.

Appendix B

Student Experience

Table B1
Lights, Camera, Literacy! Student Survey Response Rate

School	Students Enrolled *† N = 121	Surveys Completed	Response Rate %
Benjamin Banneker MS	25	22	88
Roberto Clemente MS	33	31	94
Montgomery Village MS	12	12	100
Sligo MS	33	30	91
Earle B. Wood MS	18	14	78
Total		109†	90

*Registered as of end of course, as confirmed by teachers.
†105 of these were available for processing survey responses.

Table B2
Students' Recommendation of LCL

	LCL Students N = 105					
	All Students %	Benjamin Banneker %	Roberto Clemente %	Mont-gomery Village %	Sligo %	Earle B. Wood %
I would recommend this course to my friends [in the future as a summer course].	80	90	62	75	88	100
[If an advanced course in LCL is offered in the future as a summer course] I would be interested in taking the advanced course.	76	89	61	75	80	82

LCL Course Features Students Liked Best*

Survey Items	LCL Students N = 105			
	Liked Best About Course (1 on scale of 4) %	(2 on scale of 4) %	(3 on scale of 4) %	Liked Least About Course (4 on scale of 4) %
Using the video camera	89	7	1	2
Filming our own movies	88	7	4	2
Using the computer to complete a film	87	7	5	2
Having our own film festival at the end of the course	79	12	2	5
Going to AFI Silver Theater	73	15	8	1
Seeing *Akeelah and the Bee*	70	18	6	4
Playing chess	68	17	7	9
Seeing *Searching for Bobby Fischer*	59	16	7	14
Working with a team of students	57	26	9	8
Having our own spelling bee	50	17	7	18
Using movie scripts	39	20	18	16
Writing in our journals each day	25	21	17	33
Seeing *Spellbound*	20	9	17	49

*Students who chose "Don't know/Don't Remember," or who did not answer, are not shown in this table.

Table B4
Critical Thinking Skills

Survey Items	LCL Students N = 105			
	Almost every day %	Once or twice a week %	Once or twice during the course %	Not at all %
My teacher asked us to explain our thinking	65	22	6	3
My teacher encouraged us to explore different points of view	64	19	10	3
My teacher encouraged us to analyze what we learned	62	22	11	2
My teacher asked us probing questions	52	19	15	3
My teacher encouraged us to summarize information on different topics	47	21	17	10
My teacher asked us to evaluate what was taking place	38	42	9	2

*Students who chose "Don't know/Don't Remember," or who did not answer, are not shown in this table.

Appendix C

Student Demographic, Attendance, and MSA Information

Table C1
Student Demographics, Lights, Camera, Literacy! and Other Summer Courses at Phase I Schools 2007

| | Phase I School Students, by Course Summer 2007 | | Students Eligible To Take LCL* $N = 4{,}235$ % |
	Lights, Camera, Literacy! $N = 136$ %	Other Courses $N = 480$ %	
Gender			
Male	54	61	51
Female	46	39	49
Race			
African American	47	41	33
American Indian	--	--	N/A
Asian American	8	13	13
Hispanic	31	35	26
White	14	11	28
Special Education (current)	10	10	13
ESOL (current)	6	11	7
FARMS (current)	55	45	37

N/A Less than .5%.
*Grades 5, 6, and 7 students who took spring 2007 MSA at a Phase I middle school or feeder elementary school.
Note. Dashes indicate no students belong in this category.

Table C2
Academic Eligibility by Course Type, Phase I Schools

	Number of Students with Eligibility Information	Q4 Not Eligible, Spring 2007* %
All Students in Phase I Schools	448	36
LCL Students	82	41
All Other Summer Students in Phase I Schools	366	34

*The percent of students who were not eligible for extracurricular activities in the 4th quarter of 2006–2007.