

School Panel Review Report Laurel Lake Elementary School Fall River Public Schools

Introduction

The purpose of the School Panel Review Process is to assist the Commissioner of Education in determining whether State intervention is needed to guide improvement efforts in schools where students' MCAS performance is critically low and no trend toward improved student performance is evident from MCAS data. Laurel Lake Elementary School met this criterion at the 4th grade and was one of fourteen schools selected for panel review in spring, 2003. The Panel review was conducted on February 27–28, 2003.

The Review Panel's charge was to analyze data and written information on the school's performance and improvement efforts, visit the school, and meet with school and district officials in order to advise the Commissioner on the answers to the following two key questions:

1. Does the school have a sound plan for improving student performance?
2. Are the conditions in place for the successful implementation of the school's improvement plan(s)?

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

The Panel's findings and conclusions on the two key questions, as well as school performance data, will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education for consideration in determining whether Laurel Lake Elementary is deemed under-performing. The Panel was not asked to formulate a sound plan for school improvement where such a plan does not presently exist or to recommend a course of action to create the conditions for successful implementation of a sound plan where such conditions at present do not appear to exist. Diagnostic and/or prescriptive intervention, where needed to assist an under-performing school, occurs at the next stage of the school review process.

Laurel Lake Elementary School Profile

Laurel Lake Elementary School is one of 24 elementary schools in the Fall River Public School District that serves approximately 264 students in grades K through 5. Enrollment has fluctuated slightly since 1999, with a low of 277 in 1999, a peak of 291 in 2001. The distribution of students across subgroups has remained fairly constant, with 57 percent White, 16 percent Hispanic, 16 percent Black and 1 percent Asian.

There was a slight increase in the 2001 enrollment of students eligible for free and reduced lunch to 77 percent (from 71 percent in 1999). There is a School Wide Title I program. Attendance

rates have declined at Laurel Lake over the past four years, from 95.3 in 1998 to 92.8 in 2001. The average number of days absent has risen from 8.5 in 1998 to 13 percent in 2001. In 2001, 27 of the 58 4th graders tested missed more than 10 days of school; 11 of those missed more than 20 days. The average retention rate at the school has declined significantly from 13.4 percent in 1999 to 4.8 percent in 2001. This trend is not reflected in the district rates at grades K-5, or the state rate, which has stayed at approximately 2.5 percent during the same four years.

The Programs & Services Report submitted by the school indicates that 28 students are receiving Special Education Services. The school has no students designated as Limited English Proficient, but reports that English is not the first language (FLNE) for 30 percent of its students.

Staffing

In addition to the Principal of three years, there are 21 full-time teachers serving the 264 students. Eight of the teachers have less than five years teaching experience. All of the teachers are certified in the areas in which they are teaching.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Laurel Lake Elementary School are tested in grade 3 in English Language Arts (ELA) and in grade 4 in ELA and mathematics. Participation rates at this school were 100 percent in both years of Cycle II in both content areas. The school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in any of the past four years (1990-2000).

Student Performance in ELA

In Cycle II (2001-2002), the Laurel Lake Elementary School received a performance rating of Very Low in ELA. No improvement rating was issued because of the small number of students tested.

Over the last four years, the performance of Regular Education students at the school has fluctuated widely. In 1999, 18 percent of students in grade 4 were found to be proficient in ELA. Half of them scored at the Needs Improvement level, while 33 percent were at Warning. In 2000, the percentage of proficient students fell by about 75 percent to just 5 percent of students tested. That year, 60 percent of students scored at the Needs Improvement level, and 35 percent at Warning. In 2001, there were no proficient students, only 37 percent were at Needs Improvement and 63 percent at warning. In the second year of Cycle II, 13 percent of students were proficient, 55 percent were in need of improvement and 33 percent in Warning.

Fewer than 10 Special Education and no Limited English Proficient students were tested in all four years.

Student Performance in Mathematics

In Cycle II the Laurel Lake Elementary School received a performance rating of Very Low in mathematics. No improvement rating was issued because of the small number of students tested.

The performance of Regular Education students at the Laurel Lake Elementary School over the last four years has fluctuated and shows no clear trends. In 1999, three percent of students

scored at the Advanced level, while 18 percent were at Proficient, 55 percent at the Needs Improvement level and 25 percent at Warning. In 2000, there were no Advanced students, 11 percent of students were proficient, 68 percent of scores fell in the Needs Improvement category, and 21 percent in Warning. In the first year of Cycle II, only two percent of students were proficient, the percentage of Needs Improvement students fell to 41 percent, while those in Warning increased to 57 percent. In the 2002, the distribution of student scored at this school once again fluctuated. Ten percent of students scored at Proficient, 50 percent at the Needs improvement level, and 40 percentage Warning.

Fewer than 10 Special Education and no Limited English Proficient students were tested in all four years.

PANEL REPOSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

KEY QUESTION 1: DOES THE SCHOOL HAVE A SOUND PLAN FOR IMPROVING STUDENT PERFORMANCE?

It is the judgment of the Panel Review Team that the Laurel Lake School lacks a sound 2002-2003 plan for improving student performance. Until recently, the school did not have any systematic process for improvement planning or for teacher input. As a result, the current plan was generated under time constraints by the Principals with the former Superintendent's approval. The plan outlines district-level goals, and lacks:

- data analysis to accurately identify gaps in student performance,
- identification and prioritization of weaknesses based on reasons for poor student performance.
- clear and specific goals and objectives for improving student performance,
- specific strategies likely to lead to improved student achievement, and
- a solid method for implementation and monitoring improvement efforts.

The 2002-2003 plan submitted for the Panel's review was acknowledged by the Superintendent, the Principal and staff members at the school to be inadequate.

A. Has the school analyzed appropriate data and program information to accurately identify the gaps in student performance and determined why those gaps exist?

The plan included a presentation only of the Grade 3 and Grade 4 MCAS results for 2000-2001. Interpretation of findings, comparison of trends from past MCAS data, and an in-depth item analysis of test results were not evident. In addition, the plan does not reflect any of the following considerations: current instructional practices, quality of the curriculum and its alignment with state learning standards, the quality and appropriateness of the school's programs and services, staff qualifications, previous school improvement planning efforts, staffing placement patterns, or other measures of student performance.

The plan contained a cursory listing of MCAS data. Other sources of data which were available but not analyzed within the plan include student results on the Terra Nova, and individual student results on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) used in grades K-2 as part of the Literacy Collaborative Initiative.

The Laurel Lake School Improvement Plan for 2002-2003 does not adequately identify specific weaknesses in student performance, and did not prioritize performance areas in need of attention. The School Leadership Report identifies a weakness in students' ability to answer open-response questions as a priority in ELA and math. In addition, Standards 8 and 13 of the ELA Frameworks (understanding fiction and non-fiction text) were identified as areas of weakness. In the School Leadership Report, the Principal indicated that the school would soon become engaged with training from the district Student Support Specialist in the Department's Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process, which would enable the staff to "continue to improve our ability to identify critical weaknesses and set priorities."

The Principal and a Leadership Team of teachers has been meeting to prepare to go through training in the PIM process for improvement planning that is focused on needed changes in teaching and learning to improve student performance. A district level School Support Specialist has begun working with the school. As of the Panel's visit, two working meetings were planned to begin to look at and learn to analyze student performance data from a variety of sources. The Panel saw the notebooks of data and results compiled for this purpose. The school is in the early stages of this process. The earliest that this effort would effect planning would be in 2003-2004 during the preparation of the plan for 2004-2005.

The School Improvement Plan did not include a clearly articulated understanding of identified problems and failed to explain causes for low performance. Interviews with district and school administrators and teachers, and responses from the faculty on the Instructional Staff Survey overwhelmingly cited environmental and socioeconomic factors outside of the school's control are key reasons for poor student performance. Other causes for low performance cited by the faculty include high absenteeism and tardiness, class size, and a high number of children whose first language is not English.

B. Does the plan set out specific improvement objectives that are grounded in the school's analysis of the reasons for poor student performance?

The 2002-2003 Improvement Plan fails to include important performance goals and specific objectives that are connected to identified weaknesses based on the school's analysis of student performance, but rather presents a general discussion of broad areas for future implementation. The plan is two-pages long, listing five broad district-level goals and several indicators for those goals.

In his School Leadership Report, the Principal acknowledged the inadequacy of the School Improvement Plan, and suggested that the PIM process in the future would become a tool for developing improvement goals and objectives that are grounded in the analysis of reasons for poor student performance.

An update to the 2001-2002 plan included some information related to identified weaknesses in student performance. Based on an attempt to analyze MCAS items, specific skills in need of improvement in the area of English Language Arts were identified. Strategies cited for improvement of these skills, however, were selected from what appeared to be district mandate rather than from any specific solutions proposed by the school to meet identified students' learning needs. Specific strategies to address students' needs in the area of math were not addressed. The 2002-2003 plan under review did not include this feature from the previous plan.

C. In order to accomplish each improvement objective, does the plan specify strategies that appear likely to lead to improved student results?

The School Improvement Plan for 2002-2003 did not specify strategies specifically related to the needs of the students at Laurel Lake School. There is a lack of connection to a demonstrated analysis of needs and causes for low performance.

In the Leadership Report, the Principal cites three initiatives already underway to improve student performance that could have some positive effect: 1.) improving open response questions, 2.) the district's grant-funded Literacy Collaborative in grades K-2, and 3.) full inclusion of special education students, beginning this year in grade 3. It is not clearly stated whether these initiatives were school or district driven, or what particular gaps these initiatives are addressing.

The Literacy Collaborative was introduced by the district in 2000, with the first 5 day training. Funded by a 639B grant, the program is in its third year at the school at grades K-2. Improved student performance was evidenced in the third grade MCAS scores in the 2002 school year; the number of students in the Warning category decreased from 14 percent to 3 percent, and the number of students in the proficient category increased from 33 percent to 39 percent. This year teachers will participate in twenty two hour training workshops at the school and receive in-class coaching.

The inclusion of four special education students into each of the two third-grade classrooms this year, with in-class support from a Special Education teacher and an aide, have no apparent connection with any needs assessment for the school. It is unclear why this initiative was undertaken now, or what model of inclusion is being followed.

D. Are the school's written improvement planning document (s) clear and specific enough to guide their implementation of planned improvement initiatives?

No. Because the 2002-2003 School Improvement Plan lacked clear statements of the school's problems based on causal factors, measurable goals, and specific objectives, it cannot be considered as a vehicle for guiding implementation of planned improvement initiatives. As stated in the interview with members of the School Leadership Team, "the plan is not adequate as a tool for improvement of student performance."

Likewise, detailed action plans, benchmarks to check for periodic progress, and specific methods of evaluation for the three initiatives that are underway (improving open response questions, implementing the Literacy Collaborative, and full inclusion of special education students) have not been articulated in a plan.

The plan does contain a matrix consisting of five major district goals, along with very general related objectives or indicators for each. For example, under Goal 1, Standards Based Instruction and Teaching for Understanding, 1d states that “Literacy Collaborative will be established in every school.” Under Goal 5 Ongoing Assessment, 5a states “District and school staff will implement an ongoing comprehensive assessment system that will include both formative and summative assessments.” The matrix includes an evaluation rubric that specifies a year/date for completion of these goals and objectives, and a scale depicting levels of implementation. Of the 17 objectives within the five goals, all but four are rated as Exemplary or Accomplished. During an interview, the Principal explained that this matrix was developed by and for use of principals for the purpose of reporting to the district, that he had rated the school, and that the Leadership Team was not in agreement with the ratings. Based on observations in the school and from the interviews with the teachers, the validity of these ratings is questionable.

E. Was the School Improvement Plan developed through a process that will support its successful implementation?

No. The Principal, currently in his third year and retiring in June 2003, was forthright in reporting that he was the sole author of both the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 School Improvement Plans. The plan was not developed through a process likely to support its successful implementation.

In the School Leadership Report, the Principal reported that the staff has begun to work together over the last two years, and he acknowledged that the plan “has not reflected the significant role the staff has played in identifying and implementing many of our school initiatives.” The school has not had a School Council, as defined in Education Reform, that includes teachers, parents and a community representative in place to play a role in planning or decision-making at the school. There is an active Parent Council in the school that meets monthly. According to members, the Principal elicited input from them, but their specific recommendations were focused on safety and facility needs. They also described several activities aimed at bringing more parents to the school such as a Family Olympic Day, which had a very high turnout.

The interviews with the Superintendent and the Title I Director, and with the Curriculum Coordinators indicated training for all principals is planned for this summer on how to analyze and utilize data, as part of the training for the PIM process to be carried out by the School Support Specialist.

The Curriculum Coordinators indicated to panel members that in the past their efforts were focused to a greater degree on the middle school level, but that through the PIM process they hope to become more involved at the elementary level.

Although not specified in the School Improvement Plan, professional development to support the goal of implementing the Literacy Collaborative initiative was evident. In year 1 of the initiative, the Principal and staff attended five days of training; in year two, the Literacy Coordinator engaged in a full year of extensive training; and in this current year, teachers in grades K-2 are participating in 20 two hour workshops. Evidence of other professional development opportunities, however, and the process of identifying and implementing such opportunities specific to the needs of Laurel Lake were unclear. Teacher responses on the Instructional Staff Survey, which asks staff to identify the three most important areas of need, indicated that inclusion of students with disabilities, improving student writing skills, and improving student reading comprehension were the top choices for professional development training. Teacher interviews and focus group discussions revealed that professional development in these areas of need had not yet been offered.

KEY QUESTION 2: ARE THE CONDITIONS IN PLACE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN(S)?

It is the judgment of the Panel Review Team that some important conditions are not yet in place for implementation of plans to improve student performance at Laurel Lake Elementary. The district is hopeful that the training provided in the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process in the next few months will help enable Laurel Lake School to develop and implement a viable School Improvement Plan. As of the Panel's visit, there was no systematic process in place in the district or at the school for improvement planning. The Principal's retirement in June 2003, along with three classroom teachers, leave the question of effective leadership open. There is a relatively new School Leadership Team in place that appears ready to move forward with the PIM training. It is impossible to determine whether the addition of three new staff members in Fall of 2003 will facilitate or complicate the improvement efforts that will still be in the early stages when they arrive.

A. Does the school have effective leadership and sound management?

Confidence in the Principal's ability to provide effective leadership and sound management was revealed on the Instructional Staff Survey, where 74 percent of teachers indicated that the Principal does provide effective leadership. In the teacher and focus group interviews, staff reported that during his three years of service, the Principal has created a positive school climate. Teachers described the Principal as caring and sensitive, as approachable and supportive, and as one who values the children, providing "lots of rewards and recognition" for students. As one teacher put it, "although we have been going in several directions, the Principal has helped staff focus on our problems." Teachers explained that the current Principal has been more involved than previous principals, that he has provided a safe place for children to learn, and that he has instituted good disciplinary measures. Staff also reports that this Principal has attempted to build parent confidence and to increase parent involvement, including hiring two parent liaisons (one of whom has since left the school).

The Principal has been part of an MCAS Study Group over the past two years, and has established a School Leadership Team with the hope that they can carry the improvement efforts forward, along with the new principal.

However, the impending retirement of the current Principal in June, 2003 raises serious concerns about the school's ability to stay on track toward beginning to develop plans to improve student performance and to continue to build the necessary conditions for their successful implementation.

The Superintendent indicated that the Principal vacancy would be posted by March 1, and filled by June 1, 2003. He cited a strong curriculum background as a major qualification for providing leadership at the Laurel Lake School. Qualifications needed in a new principal that were cited by staff in the teacher, focus groups, and Leadership Team interviews included an ability to build a collaborative unit, a strong background in elementary education, openness to suggestions from staff, and an ability to guide the planning process. Both the staff and the Parent Council expressed the desire to be included in the selection of a new principal.

Other important conditions do not appear to be in place for the continued development and implementation of viable improvement plans. A particular area of concern is the need for the new Principal and staff to begin to look systematically at the existing curriculum materials, and instructional and assessment practices rather than outside the school for factors beyond their control as the causes for low student performance and slow improvement. For example, the Principal reported that the formal teacher evaluation process "does not lend itself to improvement of instruction; the process itself is an impediment to the improvement of instruction."

The process of evaluating instructional practices and reviewing curriculum guides and materials would enable teachers and the Principal to identify and prioritize areas for professional development directly related to teaching and learning. The need for this process was evidenced in the responses given on the staff survey, where less than half of the faculty indicated areas for training that are related to the learning needs of the students.

B. Is there evidence that the school's faculty supports the planned improvement efforts?

Faculty support for needed improvement efforts was evident. Many teachers cited the Literacy Collaborative and the training included for teachers as a positive step. The level of understanding among staff about what those efforts include was somewhat split. Despite acknowledgment by the staff and the Leadership Team that the plan was not detailed and specific, and that it is not an adequate tool for improvement, 94 percent of the staff on the Instructional Staff Survey agreed that the school has a well-defined plan for reaching student performance goals. On Question 12 in the anonymous staff survey, teachers were asked if they know their roles and responsibilities in implementing improvement plans. Six of the 31 respondents simply answered "Yes", and three simply "No". Another half of the respondents provide more substantive descriptions, such as collaborate with other staff members, literacy-based instruction, and small group activities.

On the Instructional Staff Survey, the need to improve parent involvement was the most agreed upon cause for low student performance, and in staff and Parent Council interviews, initiatives to improve parent involvement were cited as an area in which the school has made progress. In response to the need to improve students' performance on MCAS open response questions in both math and ELA, an MCAS after-school program and an MCAS study group have been established to support this need. Another initiative underway is the Literacy Collaborative, now in its first year of implementation in grades K-2. Staff interviews revealed an understanding for the need to continue literacy initiatives in grades 3-5, and to engage all faculty members, K-5, in preparing students for the grade 3 and grade 4 MCAS.

The Leadership Team acknowledges what the staff survey suggests, that "some of the staff do not yet believe that improvement in student performance is really possible." The training to be conducted by the School Support Specialist should involve all staff in the process of identifying root causes and planning initiatives. As they begin to meet more frequently as a collaborative team, the faculty will develop a greater awareness of students' needs, of the necessary resources and materials to support instruction, and of the need to create a process for regular review and assessment of instructional practices.

C. Is the school receiving adequate guidance and support from the district leadership?

It is the consensus of the Panel Review Team that the school has received minimal support and guidance from the district for planning and implementing a school improvement plan. The Superintendent has been in the position since last year. He was appointed to the position following the resignation after two years of the previous Superintendent. The new Superintendent had previously occupied the role of Assistant Superintendent of Operations in the district for a number of years. The Superintendent stated that he did not understand why MCAS scores at Laurel Lake School had declined during the 1999-2002 time period. The Superintendent also acknowledged that the School Improvement Plan at Laurel Lake is not a clear guide for making needed improvements, and he explained that analysis and interpretation of data is a need district-wide. In addition, The Title I Director (of 30 years) indicated that there was no connection between the Title I plan for the district and planning at the school level in Fall River. He also acknowledged that planning at Laurel Lake School has been deficient. He suggested a real need for a district team to support planning at the school level. The Superintendent is planning training for principals in the summer of 2003 on how to analyze and utilize data, as part of the PIM process. The Superintendent explained that the district wants to train all of its principals in the PIM process because "we don't know which schools will be under-performing in the future."

Although the interview with the Superintendent revealed a lack of awareness of the reasons for the decline in student performance, and a lack of district involvement in the process of developing a school improvement plan, he did discuss the need to hire a principal with a strong background in curriculum development to replace the Principal who is retiring this June.

During his interview, the Principal explained that the process of writing the School Improvement Plan involved the use of a template developed by and for fellow principals. Although the former

Superintendent reviewed and approved the School Improvement Plans, no feedback was provided. The Review Panel found no School Council in place, but the active Parent Council that currently exists plans for various activities, which include fundraising events. The establishment of an elected, working School Council, whose composition is outlined in the Education Reform Act, is an important condition for planning and successful implementation of improvement initiatives with buy-in of a broad range of stakeholders.

The district has hired a former teacher-leader and trainer from within the district as the School Support Specialist for 2002-2003. They are relying heavily on this individual to initiate training and support for the Department of Education's Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process, beginning with schools in need of improvement in the district. The Superintendent plans to hire an additional specialist for 2003-2004.

The Superintendent indicated that Fall River currently employs four Curriculum Coordinators, and that the district buys local courses for professional development. The Coordinators reported that to date they have mainly been involved at the middle school level. District financial support for teacher supplies and resources at Laurel Lake School for the 2002-2003 academic year is reportedly limited to \$2,000 from Title I resources. Teachers voiced concerns in the interviews and focus groups that they use their own money to purchase materials for the classroom, and discussed the need for district support for a school library, for improved technology, and for equity of financial support within the district's schools.

CONCLUSION

It is the judgment of the Panel Review Team that the 2002-2003 School Improvement Plan for Laurel Lake School is not a viable plan for guiding the implementation of any initiatives to improve student performance. The plan lacks analysis of relevant data, identification of particular learning needs, specific goals and/or student learning objectives, detailed action plans, or benchmarks for ongoing monitoring. The plan was generated without input from staff or any other stakeholders. Key conditions that would support the successful implementation of a viable improvement plan, if such a plan is developed, are not presently in place.

The district's primary investment in improvement at the school is the plan to initiate training and support for the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process in order to develop a more meaningful, effective plan for improving teaching and learning at the school. The PIM process and the Support Specialist were referred to frequently during the Panel's visit, and in discussions with school and district administrators and with the School Support Specialist, as the starting point for a new process for planning for improvement. This initiative shows promise for institutionalizing a planning process at the school that could very well lead to improvements in student achievement. The placement of a strong instructional leader in time to be part of the PIM process and help staff make the transition to new leadership, and would also increase the likelihood of successful implementation of improvement plans developed through that process.

In addition, the impetus of the new Leadership Team, along with strategic hiring of replacements for the three teachers leaving the school at the end of this year, and for several more positions which will open as a result of planned retirements over the next two years, could be pivotal to the success of initiatives planned next year. As of the Panel's Review, however, these crucial questions remain open.

APPENDIX A
Panel Review Team Members

Terry VanDeCarr, Panel Chair, ClassMeasures, Malden, MA
Denise Delorey, Program Coordinator, Department of Education, Malden, MA
Patricia Clancy, Title I Head Teacher, Worcester Public Schools, Worcester, MA
Kim Marshall, Graduate Support Consultant, New Leaders for New Schools, Brookline, MA
Emile Rosenberg, Assistant Superintendent, Waltham Public Schools, Waltham, MA

APPENDIX B
UNDER-PERFORMING PANEL REVIEW SCHEDULE
Detailed Schedule for Review Panel School Site Visit

The times specified on the following schedule may be adjusted slightly to align with the daily schedule and practices in each of the schools being reviewed.

Day 1

- 10:30—12:00* Panel chairperson and panel coordinator meet to discuss and clarify roles, prepare for the first team meeting, and review general logistics/schedule for the review. [location: hotel]
- 12:00—2:00 p.m.* **Team meeting # 1:** team meets for the first time to discuss each panelist’s individual analysis; team forms preliminary judgements on key questions. [location: hotel]
- 2:00—3:00 p.m.* Panelists meet with the district Superintendent (and Assistant Superintendent, if appropriate). [location: hotel]
- 3:30—4:30 p.m.* Panelists meet with Principal (and one other school-based individual, if appropriate). [location: the school]
- 6:00—8:00 p.m.* **Team meeting # 2:** panelists synthesize interview information, further define findings, prepare questions, and develop a team strategy for Day 2 of the review. [location: hotel]

Day 2

All activities take place in the school

- 7:30—8:00 a.m.* Panelists meet with the Principal
- 8:00—8:30 a.m.* Panelists meet with the School Council
- 8:30—9:00 a.m.* Panelists meet with Focus Groups. The Panel Review Coordinator and the Principal will identify participants for each Focus Group. The groups will be organized, as appropriate, to include groups of individuals who can respond to questions designed for parents, students, classroom teachers, curriculum facilitators, content-area specialists, grade-level instructors, or other specific inquiry groups.

Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
Focus Group	Focus Group	Focus Group	Focus Group	Focus Group

9:00—11:00 a.m. Classroom observations and teacher interviews

	Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
9-10 a.m.	Observe teacher 1 and teacher 2	Observe teacher 3 and teacher 4	Observe teacher 5 and teacher 6	Observe teacher 7 and teacher 8	Observe teacher 9 and teacher 10
10-11 a.m.	Interview teacher 1 and teacher 2 individually	Interview teacher 3 and teacher 4 individually	Interview teacher 5 and teacher 6 individually	Interview teacher 7 and teacher 8 individually	Interview teacher 9 and teacher 10 individually

11 a.m.—12:30 p.m. **Team meeting # 3:** panelists meet to discuss findings so far and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch)

12:30—1:00 p.m. Panelists use time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information; panelists are encouraged to roam the entire school and visit classrooms not yet seen.

1:00—2:00 p.m. Panelists meet with teachers in groups; consultant co-chair is free to work on report

	Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
1:00-1:30	Teacher	Focus Group 1	Teacher	Focus Group 3	Prepare report
1:30-2:00	Teacher	Focus Group 2	Teacher	Focus Group 4	

2:00—2:30 p.m. Closing meeting with the Principal to discuss next steps (all panelists are present)

2:30—5:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 4:** panelists deliberate and form conclusions