



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Education

District Leadership Evaluation Report

District Name: Southbridge Public Schools
Report Prepared By: George Blaisdell & Matt George

June 10, 2005

I. Background

Any Massachusetts school district with persistently low student performance and/or improvement, as indicated by Performance and Improvement Ratings and AYP Determinations, must undergo a Tier III Review. This Review is conducted by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA), which is an independent audit and accountability group. In the School District Examination Report that emanates from the Review, EQA articulates findings in the domains of Assessment and Evaluation, Curriculum and Instruction, Student Academic Support Services, Leadership and Governance, and Business and Finance. If the findings reveal that the district is under-performing, EQA refers the district to the Commissioner and State Board of Education for consideration of a formal declaration of under-performance.

A district that is determined by the State Board of Education to be under-performing is assigned a review team by the Commissioner of Education. The review team spends time in the district to gain an understanding of the school district's capacity to make improvements and, with the help of a turn-around partner, change the direction of the district's education system. This understanding comes, in large part, by way of interviews, which are conducted according to a protocol and are undertaken with district leaders and governing bodies, such as the Superintendent, Key Central Office Staff, Principals, and School Committee, as well as teachers, parents, and others. Evidence gained during these interviews is summarized, along with data and observation evidence (see Annex A), in this Report and is used for determining next steps for state action.

II. Profile of District

The District of Southbridge in Worcester County serves 2,564 students in a total of five public schools. Of these schools, three are elementary, one is a middle school, and one is a secondary school. A total of 92% of children in the District attend public schools. In this population, 81% of students have regular status, 19% are disabled, and 4% have limited English proficiency; 2.5% are African American, 2.1% are Asian, 35.1% are Hispanic, 0% are Native American, and 60.3% are White.

Southbridge employs 245 teachers, 92.5% of whom are licensed in their assignments. The District's student/teacher ratio is 10.47 to 1. Per-pupil expenditures for day programs amounted to \$8,502 in 2004.

III. Executive Summary

The Southbridge Public School District Leadership Evaluation review was held on June 1-3, 2005 in the Town of Southbridge. The Leadership Evaluation Team consisted of two former Superintendents: George Blaisdell and Matt George. Both have served as consultants to the Department of Education in the past and their work has focused on underperforming schools and school districts. There were fifty-eight people participating in interviews, including:

- School Committee Members (6)
- Town Officials (3)
- School Administrators (8)
- Principals (5)
- Parents (12)
- Teachers (17)
- Business/Community Representatives (6)
- Southbridge Education Association President

The interview schedule is included in Annex B. The interview sessions were conducted using a protocol developed specifically for this purpose by the Department of Education. Most were interviewed individually but there were group sessions as well as telephone interviews.

It should be noted at the outset that after a long tenure the former Superintendent left the District in February 2005. Dr. Eugene Thayer was appointed Interim Superintendent of Schools by the Commissioner and continues in this capacity until the newly elected Superintendent takes office on August 1, 2005.

During his brief tenure, Dr. Thayer has begun the process of restoring credibility to the District. His leadership style has had an immediate and positive impact on the District and the community at large. He is currently preparing the District for a reduction in force of approximately sixty-five to seventy positions due to limited financial resources. The District, Town Officials and the community are aware of the impact of the fiscal limitations and the consequences to educational services within the system. Where others have failed to acknowledge or address the inadequacies in the District, Dr. Thayer has moved toward unifying the District, parents and community as they attempt to seek a Proposition 2 ½ override that would increase funding for the School District.

Absent what is stated regarding the brief tenure of the Interim Superintendent, we have learned through interviews and document reviews that the District has had deficient leadership and inadequate governance that has led to the underperformance of this School District. We learned of poor communication, mistrust among Town and School Officials, disjointed and inconsistent supervision of the academic disciplines, and of curriculum and assessment failings and omissions. The inability or failure to develop and successfully implement a comprehensive district improvement plan which would improve classroom instruction, using student and teacher performance assessments to identify specific areas in need of improvement, and provide professional training to achieve specific goals is another example of deficient leadership and inadequate governance.

The findings and recommendations by the Team substantiate the immediate and critical need for improvement in the management and operation of the Southbridge Public Schools. Key findings from our review include:

- Failure to establish and focus on accomplishing priority objectives.

- Failure to implement essential accountability and evaluation systems.
- Failure to develop a system-wide K-12 curriculum.
- Mismanagement and noncompliance with regulatory requirements in the Special Education program.
- Lack of solid planning skills at all levels which incorporate genuine identification of the root causes of student performance shortcomings.
- Absence of a professional development program directly connected to the needs and goals of the school system.
- Pupil performance levels significantly below state averages.
- Significant deficiencies at Southbridge High School resulting in probation by the Commission on Public Secondary Schools.

It is clear that funding has been a major issue for the District. It is equally clear that the issue is further exacerbated by the lack of communication and credibility between Town Officials and District leadership.

In view of the key findings that illustrate failed leadership, inadequate governance, and lack of accountability and evaluation systems, the Leadership Review Team recommends the Department of Education (DOE):

- Enter into Partnership/Memorandum of Understanding with the District identifying specific areas of necessary and expected improvement and with DOE oversight and assistance.
- Provide immediate assistance and oversight to the School Committee in completing contractual negotiations with the newly appointed Superintendent.
- Provide assistance/oversight in the selection of Senior Management for vacant positions (three Principals and Director of Special Education).
- Appoint a mentor to meet periodically with the Superintendent to assist in any needed way including being a sounding board and providing additional assistance from the Department of Education.
- Require the immediate development of a systemic curriculum, accountable and aligned with the State's academic frameworks and provide assistance to ensure successful completion.
- Assist the system in the elements of Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) so that comprehensive student performance improvement plans can be developed and implemented at all levels.
- Assist the District in establishing a comprehensive system for professional development directly connected to areas of need.

- Require an immediate review of the Special Education program to ensure that student services comply with state regulations and maintain prudent use of funding.
- Provide Professional Development training for the School Committee as it relates to the Educational Reform Act of 1993, with special emphasis on School Committee duties and responsibilities and those of the Superintendent.
- Provide fiscal Professional Development opportunities for the Business Manager in municipal and school accounting, and business practices.
- Provide a mini-grant to fund an independent auditor approved by the School Committee, Superintendent, Town Council and Town Manager to examine and report on fiscal issues related to spending and funding that led to District financial deficits.
- Examine the current elementary grade level organization as to its effectiveness for children, families and system goals.
- Provide technical assistance in the development of an effective performance evaluation program for all personnel in the District.
- Monitor the High School and the District's leadership in developing and implementing a plan that addresses the Commission on Public Secondary School's findings that placed Southbridge High School on probation.

In addition, the District must improve its knowledge of and response to the changing student demographics and the student support services available for students requiring them.

IV. Findings by Area

Based on document reviews, observations, and leadership interviews, the review team appointed by the Commissioner of Education presents the following:

1) Findings Related to the Superintendent

Following a long tenure, the former Superintendent left the District at the end of February 2005. The Review Team made no attempt to contact her. Dr. Eugene Thayer was appointed Interim Superintendent at that point and he continues in that capacity. A new superintendent has been selected and she and the School Committee are engaged in the process of resolving the terms and conditions of her contract. The Review Team met briefly with the Superintendent-elect to describe the purpose and process of the District Leadership Evaluation, encouraging her collaboration with the Department of Education to address issues identified by the Evaluation.

Given these circumstances, no assessment of the Superintendent's capacity to provide the necessary leadership to make improvements can be made. Many of those the Review Team met with, however, had judgments and comments about past leadership failings. Those comments, coupled with the Review Team's observation of District conditions and extensive review of the many reports about and performance indicators of the District are reflected in the Team's recommendations. Those recommendations are not intended to comment about the capacities of the Superintendent-elect. Rather, they are intended to identify issues of concern.

2) Findings Related to the Central Office

The Review Team met with the Interim Special Education Director, the Title 1 Director, the ELE/ELL Director, the Early Childhood Coordinator and the secondary Academic Coaches/Supervisors for ELA and Math. They did not have job descriptions, written instructions or “letters of charge” detailing position expectations or specific action plans requiring regular review and reporting of their activities and efforts. The absence of these basic documents has hampered their work and diminished their accountability. Based on conditions within the District, the Review Team focused on two areas of Central Office operations.

The first of these is Special Education. The Director was terminated last fall and a person from within the department currently has filled the position on an interim basis since March 14, 2005. Given that circumstance, it was not possible to assess or describe position leadership capacity. A simple review of program costs, however, is revealing about program management and its effect on the total District budget and operations.

<u>FY</u>	<u>SPED Costs</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>	<u>SPED Tuition</u>
2002	\$3,353,613	17.8%	\$1,652,284
2003	\$4,387,878	22.2%	\$2,436,409
2004	\$5,108,039	22.0%	\$2,558,324
2005	\$5,801,869 EST	28.4%	\$2,922,190

The percentage of the total budget has increased dramatically during the past three years due to program mismanagement and a lack of compliance with regulatory requirements.

The second area of Review Team focus was that of curriculum development and coordination. No one within the District has that responsibility on a K-12 basis. Elementary principals have been told that they are responsible for those functions within their buildings for grades K-5. The results of that approach have been a lack of curriculum cohesion, articulation and consistency as well as a lack of accountability. Pupil performance levels are significantly below state averages.

The academic coaching positions for grades 6-12 in ELA and Math lack the job descriptions and other items of purpose and direction mentioned above. Since the District eliminated the positions of Department Heads, the Academic Coaches have acted in some ways as ELA and Math Department Heads for grades 6-12, working on curriculum matters and assisting in classroom and teacher observations within their respective departments. The lack of clarity about the specific expectations of their positions, a common District shortcoming, has hampered their work and accountability for that work. Their considerable experience within their areas of assignment could be used to greater purpose and benefit.

3) Findings Related to the School Business Manager

Findings in this area are particularly significant due to the system’s recent, somewhat catastrophic financial history. Accountants hired by the Town Council reported in June 2004 that the District had over expended its budget by just over \$3 million. Factoring Circuit Breaker funds into the budget as required reduced that deficit to \$2.4 million. Significant action by the Town Council and a special act of the Legislature was necessary to deal with such a shortfall. The Business Manager was terminated in June 2004. The current Manager was appointed in August 2004.

During his brief tenure, the Business Manager has begun to restore some accuracy and credibility to financial controls and management of the District's budget. He now provides monthly reports to the Interim Superintendent and School Committee, a practice not followed by his predecessor. His description to the Review Team of the methods he uses to assure budget control and accuracy was extensive and detailed. Although he had not seen the Auditor's Report mentioned above until the Review Team gave him a copy, he indicated that he had already put in place all of the recommendations for financial control included in that report except one which deals with a method of budget control. He has provided a great amount of information to the Interim Superintendent about the details of the proposed FY 2006 budget.

The FY 2006 budget proposed for the Department of Education by the Town Manager would, in the budget estimates prepared by the Interim Superintendent, require the elimination of teacher positions and the termination of 65 teachers, approximately 30% of present staffing positions. A \$1.9 million Proposition 2 ½ override election to reduce this impact on the District is scheduled for June 28, 2005. This question is in addition to an increase in the Town Manager's original proposal for the District. These details are provided here both to describe the circumstances included in the Business Manager's current role responsibilities as well as the financial conditions facing the District.

4) Findings Related to Municipal Leadership and its Support for Education

The Review Team conducted individual meetings with the Chair, Vice-Chair of the Town Council and the Town Manager. Without exception, they were direct, well prepared, and responsive to the Team's questions.

These individuals clearly indicated that the School District had lacked leadership, credibility, accountability and sound fiscal and accounting practices. This led to annual deficits in the school budgets in fiscal years '03 and '04. An auditing/accounting firm was hired to review fiscal practices in the school/municipal departments and the recommendations were ignored or not implemented by the Superintendent and School Committee.

Communication is a major barrier between the school and municipal offices. In September 2004 additional circuit breaker funds were received by the School District. The Town Officials were not notified and were attempting to identify additional funds to meet the District needs.

The School Committee negotiated a three-year contract with the Teachers Association effective July 2003 and granted annual increases to the salary schedule of five percent while municipal departments were receiving two and one half to three percent. This action further strained the relationship between the departments given the fiscal constraints of the Community.

Credibility is a major area of concern. Annually the School District Leadership would indicate the need for additional funds and threatened substantial layoffs. When the budgets were finalized, the layoffs did not occur and, in fact, one official indicated there were additional positions in the School District.

The Town Officers also noted budgetary practices by the School Department revealed funds were not expended as intended in the approved budget. Funds were frequently transferred from one account to another in order to meet under-funded accounts. Town Officials stated they view

education as a high priority but must also meet the needs of the other municipal departments, not the least of which is the area of Public Safety.

It was noted the fiscal reporting has improved with the new School Business Manager.

5) Findings Related to the School Committee

The Review Team met individually with six members of the School Committee. There is a mix of experience levels among Committee members. None of them disagreed in any significant way about the information contained in such recent reports as the Tier III and High School Accreditation Reports. Most cited the absence of a coordinated curriculum, difficulties with finances and a lack of leadership as the primary causes of the District's under-performance. Most could not describe the District Improvement Plan or the various school plans.

Over the last several years, the Committee has evaluated the Superintendent only once, in June 2004. One member of the Committee, having served previously on the Committee for nine years and recently returned to the Committee, indicated that during his previous tenure the Committee had annually evaluated the Superintendent publicly and in writing. There is no record of any such evaluations in the Superintendent's personnel file, only the June 2004 evaluation. In that evaluation, the Committee listed various school goals and members assigned a rating of "good, fair, poor, etc." The Superintendent objected in writing to that unilaterally determined approach. Most Committee members acknowledged that they did not monitor the work of the Superintendent, indicating that they were operating in "crisis mode most of the time" and also indicating that they felt they had to trust what the system's administrators, beginning with the Superintendent, were telling them.

Data appears to play little if any part in guiding decisions about improvement initiatives. The Committee indicated that there was no current plan of regular reports about the system's various programs. Most disagree with the description given by the Town Manager and Town Council leaders about the sequence of events leading to the current financial condition.

The Committee appears to have a limited vision of their role and responsibilities, with a few indicating that they had little to do with "turning the school system around." Some perceive a significant leadership role for the Committee in that regard. It is clear that they need assistance and training in order to fully and effectively fulfill their responsibilities.

6) Findings Related to School Principals

This important component of district leadership evaluation was also hampered by the reality of the following circumstances. The High School principal resigned at the start of December 2004. An elementary principal who had recently retired from the District is temporarily filling in as the interim principal. The current Middle School principal will retire at the end of June 2005. One of the three elementary principals has resigned to accept a position in another district.

The Review Team met with all current principals to understand their perspectives if not to assess their leadership capacities. None of the principals were surprised by the information contained in recent reports. Some felt that the findings of those reports had been "denied" or "ignored" for some time. They appeared to welcome the reports. A few disagreed as to the report's description of the causes of under-performance. Most spoke about the lack of a written K-12 curriculum and

the lack of a District position responsible for the development, implementation and assessment of the curriculum as contributing factors for under-performance. Several noted a lack of resources to support the academic program. Most are aware of the issues faced when budgets have been frozen for each of the past three years. Budget decisions seemed to have been directed by the Superintendent without reference to student performance data to support those decisions.

The principals at the Middle and High schools commented about the changing demographics of their students, indicating that the system “does not have a real handle on the subgroups making up the population.” They are concerned about high rates of truancy, transience and poverty. Yet the District seems to be slow in directly addressing such concerns. A few believe that some teachers continue to have low expectations for many of their students.

Most acknowledged that both the District and the School Improvement Plans were quite general, “rich in philosophy but lacking substance.” In fact, the plans for the elementary schools are not only general; they are identical and not reflective of a carefully crafted plan to accomplish system goals within a specific building. No evaluations of plans have been done in any meaningful or systematic way.

Principals seemed to indicate that, with the exception of the Middle School, their regular monitoring of staff was not fully reflected in the teacher evaluation program currently in use within the District. That was borne out by review of all evaluations performed in the current year. As currently implemented, the teacher observation and evaluation system is not an effective tool at most schools to improve instruction or to advance system goals. Of the 60 elementary evaluations completed in the current school year, no teacher was noted as needing improvement in any way, an unlikely possibility. Those few comments that were made were benign with few, if any, references to student achievement. Review of 33 middle school evaluations completed for Middle School staff indicated a different, stronger approach. In a building which the principal reports as having a 50% turnover within the past two years, the principal and assistant principal, with some assistance from the system’s academic coaches, are more diverse in their ratings on the evaluation checklist and more direct in their suggestions and expectations regarding performance improvement. The 34 evaluations completed with High School faculty had a single teacher needing improvement. There were almost no comments relating to student achievement. The same was true for the Superintendent’s evaluations of their work

All claimed to have high expectations for their students, a claim they said is not fully supported by many of the staff. Some cited examples of the former Superintendent’s “reactive rather than proactive” style of response to issues facing the District, believing that a stronger approach would have yielded better results.

V. Recommendations

Working with the new Superintendent as the School District’s representative, the Department of Education should immediately develop and enter into a Memorandum of Agreement/Understanding with the District. That document should identify specific areas of necessary and expected improvement and the assistance to be provided by the Department of Education to help achieve that improvement.

The Department of Education should also immediately review and approve the elements of the Superintendent’s contract, currently being negotiated, to assure accountability and clear lines of

authority. Such accountability should include necessary monitoring and regular evaluations of the Superintendent by the School Committee as well as planned and consistent reporting about improvement efforts.

It will be necessary to fill several important school and program leadership positions as soon as possible. The positions of Special Education Director and the principal positions at the High School, Middle School and an Elementary School must be filled at a time not necessarily conducive to reasonable pools of applicants from which to choose. Further, as evidenced by the terminations of the former Business Manager and Special Education Director and the leadership deficiencies noted in the High School Accreditation Report, the District's selection, supervision and accountability practices have not been successful in recent years. In response, the Department of Education should offer both its assistance and oversight in the selection process for those management positions. The Superintendent should not appoint anyone to those positions without the approval of the Commissioner or his representative.

Without in any way commenting about the competencies or leadership capacity of the newly appointed Superintendent, the Department of Education should appoint an experienced mentor to assist her in any needed way. Such a mentor could also provide continuing insight as to the District's needs, seeking any necessary additional assistance from the Department of Education.

The approach taken by the system in the critical areas of curriculum development, implementation and assessment for the past several years has resulted in the lack of an adopted system-wide K-12 curriculum. As a consequence, the actual curriculum taught to students is not articulated vertically or horizontally, coordinated in its application or assessed in any accountable way. This failing is particularly exacerbated by the system's K-5 elementary grade-level organizational structure in which each school has been responsible for its own curriculum. The Department of Education should both require the immediate development of a systemic curriculum, accountable and aligned with the state's academic Frameworks, and provide assistance to the system for that requirement. It may seem unusual to have this recommendation made in 2005 since the Frameworks and their connection to the state's assessment program have been in existence for some time. The lack of a comprehensive district-wide curriculum will continue to hamper necessary improvement efforts.

The District lacks solid planning skills at all levels which incorporate genuine identification of the root causes of student performance shortcomings, the establishment of meaningful goals and strategies to deal with those shortcomings and the means to monitor and assess the strategies and plans implemented. Although a small group of system administrators took part in a session on root cause analysis offered by the Department of Education, there was no comprehensive follow-through to train others within the system in that concept and method. The Department of Education should assist the District in the elements of the Performance Improvement Mapping approach or the components included in that approach so that comprehensive student performance improvement plans can be developed and implemented at all levels. Such planning efforts should also be included in District and School Improvement Plans. Current plans, for the schools that have them, list the broad NCLB goals without any specific strategies to achieve such goals or any plans to measure progress made toward them. Stakeholders have not been involved in any real or significant way in planning discussions that may have occurred. The system's failure to regularly and critically assess its efforts in all major areas of school system operations contributes hugely to current shortcomings.

In the same sense, a comprehensive system of professional development directly connected to the needs and goals of the school system is also lacking. Clear and specific plans for the system do

not currently exist. As a component of the necessary plans for improvement, professional development efforts should be targeted at specific areas of need.

The Special Education Program is grossly out of control with a special education enrollment that has increased significantly in recent years to a point that it is well above state averages. That program now requires 28.4% of the current budget, up from 17.8% in FY2002 as reported by the District. That percentage of the total budget has increased dramatically during the past three years due to program mismanagement and a lack of compliance with regulatory requirements. A complete review of the entire program is immediately necessary. Failure to regain program and budgetary control of this program will continue to have a dramatic and disproportional effect on the total education budget and program.

The School Committee's approach to governance of the school system for the past several years reflects a poor or incomplete understanding of their role and important responsibilities. Operating in "crisis mode to deal with one thing after another" as they describe it, they have not required proper planning, reporting about district programs and accountability for district operations. Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, they continued to accept explanations and assurances from the Superintendent, Business Manager, Special Education Director and those with curriculum responsibilities that the system was making good progress in all areas. They require training in their responsibilities and assistance in and monitoring of their work. They demonstrate neither a clear understanding of their significant role of governance and oversight nor any sense of urgency in addressing that shortcoming. This need should be quickly addressed so that they can plan and work productively with the new Superintendent and team of administrators, several of whom are to be newly appointed. With current and projected vacancies to be filled for the principal positions at one Elementary and the High and Middle Schools along with the Special Education position, it will be important for the School Committee, the Superintendent and the rest of the system's leadership to have a full understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities.

Although the Business Manager, appointed in August 2004 following the termination of his predecessor, is gaining skill and credibility in managing the district's finances, significant distrust between Town and District officials and widely differing perceptions of the history and reasons for the District's financial condition continue. It is a significant and continuing barrier to progress and communication. Identification and clarification of the factual truth of the District's past over expenditures of budgets resulting in large deficits and the effect of those actions on the current financial status may be a necessary step to improved future working relationships between town and school officials. The joint selection of an auditor, reporting to both the School Committee and the Superintendent and the Town Council and the Town Manager, for this limited yet significant purpose could help to put these issues to rest, a condition not yet present. Further assistance to the Business Manager about the best way to structure, manage and report system finances within a coordinated computer system would also help reduce or eliminate future financial control issues.

As soon as practicable for the newly appointed Superintendent, the current elementary grade level organization should be assessed as to its effectiveness for children, families and system goals. If the current structure continues, it will be necessary to strengthen student transition planning, to agree on and coordinate the curriculum presented to students and to coordinate instructional approaches and professional development offerings and requirements to support those efforts.

The District must improve its knowledge of and response to its changing student demographics. As noted in the Tier III report, "The disproportionate rate of suspension and dropout for the

district's Hispanic-American students did not prompt attention by district and school administrators." Such students "were over represented in both in-school and out-of-school suspensions, chronic absences and retentions... There was no evidence that the district considered this to be a problem or was addressing it." Increased sensitivity coupled with a willingness to respond appropriately to fulfill the system mission for all students appears to be necessary. Students, families, faculty and staff must become more knowledgeable about student support services available for students requiring them.

The Department of Education should provide technical assistance in the development of an effective performance evaluation program for all personnel in the District. This should include the development of new instruments to assess the performance of those being evaluated and professional development for the evaluators.

The Department of Education should monitor the High School and District's leadership in developing and implementing a plan that addresses the Commission on Public Secondary School's findings that placed Southbridge High School on probation. These findings are based on significant deficiencies in its adherence to the Commission's Standards for Accreditation in Curriculum, Leadership & Organization, and Community Resources for Learning.

Annex A

Materials reviewed

- School District Examination Report, July 2004 (EQA Tier II)
- School District Examination Report, December 2004 (EQA Tier III)
- Southbridge High School's New England Association of Schools & Colleges Visiting Team Accreditation Report, 2004 and subsequent 2005 correspondence placing the school on probation
- The 2002 DOE Coordinated Program Review
- The current NCLB Coordinated District Plan
- The District Improvement Plan
- Each school's School Improvement Plan
- MCAS results for three years
- Auditors Reports for 2000-2004
- Special Auditor's June 30, 2004 report about School Department over expenditures (requested by Town Council)
- Minutes of multiple School Committee meetings
- Minutes of multiple Finance Sub-Committee meetings
- November, 2004 Curriculum coordination proposals prepared by the Superintendent (Not implemented)
- Multiple curriculum documents (Neither coordinated nor comprehensive)
- Benchmarks for Reading/Language Arts & Math, Grades K-5, 1999
- Policy for District Program Assessments, 1994 (None more current)
- 2003-2006 Contract with the Southbridge Education Association
- Staff Evaluation System (Reviewed 135 evaluations completed in February and March, 2005)
- 2000-2005 budget summaries
- Extensive 2005-2006 budget request and budget impact statements for the system and from each school and department

Annex B

**Leadership Evaluation Interview Schedule
June 1, 2005 – June 3, 2005**

JUNE 1, 2005

	George Blaisdell	Matt George
8:30am - 9:15am	Dr. Eugene Thayer Interim Superintendent of Schools	
9:15am – 10:00am	Bryant Montigny Principal, Southbridge HS (9-12)	Sandra Moriarty Principal, Eastford Road School (K-1)
10:00am – 10:45am	Lillian Talbot Principal, Wells Middle School (6-8)	Norman Yvon Principal, Charlton Street School (2-3)
10:45am – 11:30am	Judith Roy Principal, West Street School (4-5)	Joseph Cienciwa Business Manager
LUNCH		
1:15 pm – 2:30pm	Clayton Carlisle, Town Manager	
12:30 pm-3:15pm	Diana Fradera Assistant Director, ELE/ELL	Debbie Bell Interim Director, Special Education
3:15pm – 4:00pm	16 teachers representing Southbridge High School, Eastford Road School, Wells Middle School, Charlton Street School, West Street School	
DINNER		
6:30pm-7:15pm	12 parents representing Special Education, Parent Advisory Councils, PTA	

Annex B (continued)

**Leadership Evaluation Interview Schedule
June 1, 2005 – June 3, 2005**

JUNE 2, 2005

	George Blaisdell	Matt George
8:30am – 9:15am	John Jovan, Jr. School Committee	David DiGregorio School Committee
9:15am – 10:00am	Scott Lazo School Committee	Martena Shea President, SEA (+) Wells Middle School Librarian
10:00am – 10:45am	Terry Colognese Business Community Representative (Rotary President)	
10:45am – 11:30am	Ronald Cherinsky Vice Chair, Town Council	
LUNCH		
1:00pm – 1:45pm	David Yacavace ELA Academic Coach Academic Supervisor	Mary Ann Anderson Math Coach Supervisor (6-12)
1:45pm – 2:30 pm	Dennis Lataille, Title I Director and Grant Responsibilities	
2:30pm – 3:15 pm	Rene Tremblay, Chair, Town Council	
3:15pm – 4:00pm	Telephone Interview: Tim Dion, Family Choice Mortgage	Telephone Interview; Gabe McCarthy, Real Estate Developer
DINNER		
6:30pm-7:15pm	Richard Couture Vice Chair, School Committee	Rebecca Newell School Committee

JUNE 3, 2005

	George Blaisdell	Matt George
8:30am – 9:15am	Mary Ellen Prencipe Chair, School Committee	
9:15am – 10:00am	Ann Vesey Early Childhood Coordinator	Telephone Interview
10:00am – 10:45am	Telephone Interview Alan Teppell President, Dexter Russell	Telephone Interview Dan Charrette, Police Chief
10:45am – 11:30am	Telephone Interview Steven Brady, Commerce Insurance	Lillian Lind, ESL