

School Panel Review Report Maurice A. Donahue Elementary School Holyoke 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. Donahue Elementary met this criterion at the fourth grade and was one of nine elementary schools selected for panel review in spring, 2003. The Panel review was conducted on February 11–12, 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 the Maurice A. Donahue Elementary School 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.

Maurice A. Donahue Elementary School Profile

Enrollment

The Maurice A. Donahue Elementary School is one of 14 schools in Holyoke, and 8 elementary schools in the district. Enrollment at the Donahue Elementary School during 1999-2002 fluctuated between 506 to 549 students. During this time period, the student population was made up of 80 percent Hispanics, 16 percent Whites, and three percent Blacks and Asians. An average of 55 percent of students was non-native English speakers. In 2000, there were no Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at the Donahue School, but the average of LEP

students between 1999 and 2002 was 38 percent. With 85 percent of its students from low-income families, the school is a designated Title I institution.

Between 1998 and 2001, attendance at the Donahue Elementary School averaged 94 percent. Retention rates during this period (1998-2001) averaged six percent. There were no in-school suspensions recorded at the Donahue for those years. Exclusions for every year, but 2000 when the rate was 3.6, were also 0 at this school. Out-of-school suspensions fluctuated between 6.1 percent and 8.9 percent.

In 2003, the school reported that: 93 students were receiving Special Education; 76 students were enrolled in Transitional Bilingual Education; 68 students were receiving English as Second Language instruction.

Staffing

The Donahue School has a staff of 56 people that includes two administrators, one guidance counselor, one librarian, one psychologist, and 51 teachers. Thirty percent of the school's staff (17) has been at the school for five or fewer years. All but two of the teachers at this school are certified to teach in their respective subjects.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Donahue Elementary School are tested in the MCAS in grade 3 in English language arts (ELA), in grade 4 in ELA and mathematics. The school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress in ELA in both years covered in Cycle II (2001-2002). Its participation rate in the mathematics testing also declined from 98 percent in 2001 to 93 percent in 2002.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

In Cycle II (2001-2002), the school's performance in the grade 4 ELA test was rated "Very Low," having achieved a Proficiency Index of only 47.4. Its performance was found to have remained the same compared to the previous cycle, meriting an Improvement rating of "No Change" in Cycle II in ELA.

The performance of Regular Education students at the Donahue School in the grade 4 ELA test has fluctuated over the last two cycles and shows no clear pattern. In Cycle I (1999-2000), 26 percent of students performed at the Proficient and Advanced levels. Sixty percent of Regular Education students scored at the Needs Improvement level, while 15 percent scored in Warning in Cycle I. In Cycle II, an average of 29 percent of Regular Education students scored at the Proficient and Advanced levels, 50 percent of students scored at the Needs Improvement level, while 22 percent of scores fell in the Warning category.

Special Education students in the grade 4 ELA tested group experienced modest gains over the two cycles. In Cycle I, three percent of Special Education students scored Proficient or Advanced. Eighteen percent scored at the Needs Improvement level, and 79 percent in the Warning category. In Cycle II, an average of nine percent of students in this subgroup were found to be Proficient. While 21 percent of Special Education students tested at the Needs Improvement level, 71 percent performed at the Warning level in Cycle II.

The performance of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at the Donahue Elementary School declined in Cycle II. In Cycle I, 2 percent of LEP students scored at the Proficient and Needs Improvement levels, while 19 percent of scores fell in the Warning category. The majority of LEP students, 78 percent, scored at the Warning level in Cycle I. In Cycle II, 12 percent of students in this subgroup scored at the Needs Improvement level, while the majority (88 percent) scored in the Warning performance level.

Student Performance in Mathematics

In Mathematics, in Cycle II, the Donahue School scored a Proficiency Index of 39.9, which translated into a performance rating of “Critically Low.” Its improvement was rated “No Change.” The school also failed to make AYP in Cycle II. Participation rates in the MCAS testing program in ELA in Cycle II declined from 92 percent in 2001 to 78 percent in 2002.

In Cycle I, 13 percent of Regular Education students scored at the Proficient and Advanced levels. Fifty percent of Regular Education student scores in that cycle fell in the Needs Improvement category, while the remaining 37 percent were in Warning. In Cycle II, 20 percent of Regular Education student scores were found at the Proficient and Advanced levels, 48 percent in the Needs Improvement category, and 33 percent in the Warning.

The results of the scores of Special Education students in grade 4 mathematics over the two cycles show a movement of scores out of the Warning category and into the Proficient and Advanced and the Needs Improvement categories. In Cycle I, 18 percent of the scores of Special Education students fell in the Needs Improvement category, while most (82 percent) were found in the Warning category. In Cycle II, an average of five percent of the scores of students in this sub-group fell in the Proficient and Advanced categories. Twenty percent of scores, in Cycle II, were found in the Needs Improvement category, while 75 of students performed at the Warning level.

In both cycles, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at the Donahue School performed below all other subgroups. In both cycles, there were no Proficient or Advanced students. In Cycle I, 15 percent of LEP students scored at the Needs Improvement level, with the remaining scoring at Warning. In Cycle II, five percent of this subgroup scored in the Needs Improvement category while 95 percent of those tested performed at the Warning level.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

Based on the evidence reviewed, the Panel review team found that the Maurice A. Donahue Elementary School does not have a sound plan for improving student performance. In its current form the School Improvement Plan lacks focus and coherence as well as key elements, such as clear goals, measurable objectives, meaningful benchmarks for teaching and learning and definitive timetables.

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 Panel found that the school has not fully examined appropriate data and program information to identify gaps in student performance and, hence, has not determined why explicitly identified gaps exist. A thorough analysis of student performance data was not completed as part of the plan. The analysis of MCAS data was insufficient in disaggregating results for student sub-groups such as Special Education students and students for whom English is a second language. Panel members found neither evidence of an item analysis of MCAS results by *Framework* Strand and Learning Standards nor a breakdown of content area knowledge and skills by grade level within the school improvement plan.

The Donahue School Improvement Plan (SIP) for 2002-2003 included a surface review of MCAS and Terra Nova test data, but did not provide an analysis of results beyond identifying percentages of students at each performance level. The documentation of critically low student performance within the plan's "Needs Assessment" has merit. Nevertheless, the school's data analysis did not include consideration of comparisons of school and district MCAS results or focus on the achievement gaps of Special Education students and those who are Limited English Proficient (LEP). A further indication that the school has not thoroughly analyzed MCAS beyond referencing aggregate MCAS results is the lack of review of both math and ELA results in terms of Strands and Learning Standards in order to inform the current plan.

The examination of performance data, therefore, has not moved to the level of identifying the particular learning needs of Donahue students to account for the chronic under-performance in ELA and math. The failure to accurately identify or prioritize gaps in student learning hindered the school's ability to complete the rest of the planning process. As a result of the lack of specificity in identifying key weaknesses in student learning, the school was not able to determine why these problems exist or to articulate effective instructional strategies and school practices that would address identified causes or contributing factors.

The effectiveness of prior school improvement efforts was negligible, as acknowledged by both the Superintendent and the Principal. Similarly, both school and district administrators cited uneven implementation of district-mandated programmatic and curricular initiatives as a reason for low student performance. Both the literacy program, the Literacy Collaborative Model set

forth by Leslie University, and the “Math Investigations” text and program were not fully or consistently implemented within the school.

A review of the effectiveness of implementing prior planning efforts is an essential first step; nevertheless the Panel remained concerned that gaps in curricular and instructional practice were not sufficiently considered in these analyses. It was unclear to panel members how and when district curricular guides are reviewed to align with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. The availability and use of grade-level curricular documents by Donahue faculty members in their instructional planning was also unclear. While there was little analysis of the impact of school-based factors on student achievement, during this school year fourth and fifth grade ESL students were mainstreamed and provided with bilingual support in an effort to meet the needs of second language learners.

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

No. The Panel review team determined that goals lack clarity and are not focused on teaching and learning. Within the curriculum and instruction goal area, the plan states two strategic objectives, both of which emphasize meeting the needs of diverse learners through instructional practices that align with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and district learning standards. The 2002-2003 SIP goals and resultant improvement objectives are not sufficiently specific, are largely unmeasurable, and fail to articulate content area student learning objectives. The strategic objectives represent the school’s response to the Superintendent’s directive to implement the district-wide literacy program and math curriculum across grades K-5. The Panel feels that they alone are not sufficient to lead to sustained improvement. The planning mechanisms for the goals as broadly stated and implementation of mandated programs are unspecific and fail to articulate instructional strategies and practices on a school-wide basis or by grade level.

Again, there was little evidence of data analysis in an effort to understand the instructional needs of various sub-groups of the school’s population including, as previously noted, students whose primary language is not English and Special Education students. In addition, assessments of curriculum, instructional practice and programs were not evident in the school’s planning. Thus, the plan does not communicate that the school has a comprehensive understanding of student learning gaps or how gaps in curricular and instructional practices may be related to those needs. A thorough analysis of important school-based factors is required in order to make the plan a working document that addresses the underlying reasons for poor student achievement.

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

While the primary focus of improvement efforts this year at the Donahue School has been the implementation of district-adopted programs, the SIP does convey general strategies that may lead to improved performance. An increased emphasis on open response questions and explicit

attention to teaching test taking strategies and improving students' test-taking vocabulary might lead to minimally increased student achievement. Because the SIP does not clearly identify and prioritize problems and concerns beyond the need for improvement on open response type questions, the outlined strategies do not effectively target content area knowledge and skills in the *Frameworks* that students need to know and be able to accomplish by grade level.

Interviews with school leaders and focus groups with the school planning team and faculty members provided evidence that the process of implementing strategies tied to the Literacy Collaborative Model has begun. The Principal has effectively communicated the district expectation that this balanced literacy model be consistently implemented in grades K-2. One of the school's literacy coordinators is currently being trained in the program to lead implementation in grades 3-5. Base-line needs assessments of students in these grades are being conducted prior to implementing the model in the upper grades. The timetables for training faculty members and new staff in the Literacy Collaborative were less clear.

Certain identified programs such as Reading Recovery and the LINKS writing program are research-based but specifics on implementation, progress indicators and intended outcomes were weak. To address the low levels of student performance in math and literacy, the Superintendent has mandated a daily two and a half-hour literacy block, as well as three additional hours of ELA MCAS preparation and two additional hours of math instruction per week. Interviews with school and district leaders as well as teacher focus groups documented that these scheduling guidelines have been implemented within Donahue classrooms. However, there are no regular measurement tools in order to illustrate what improvements pursuant to the Frameworks and MCAS are being realized during increased math and literacy times.

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

No. The plan does not provide credible links between student needs, district objectives and strategies to be implemented at the school level, intended outcomes and mechanisms for evaluation. The school's written improvement planning documents included the 2002-2003 School Improvement Plan submitted to the District Review Team and the Superintendent in the Fall of 2002 and an "Addendum" to "The Plan to Improve Student Achievement," which was prepared by the Principal and a panel of five teachers during this past winter. Both the original SIP and its addendum, in the opinion of the Panel, lack sufficient clarity and specificity to effectively guide implementation of planned improvement initiatives.

The school's planning documents contained a number of inconsistencies such as inaccurate calculations for percentages of students scoring at each performance level in a multiple year review of MCAS results in math. There was evidence of confusion in the definition and categorization of terminology. In some cases, strategies to be undertaken were listed as "Root Cause" or "Key Problem." Within different sections of the SIP, curriculum and instruction goals are defined differently. Each of the plans contain a myriad of different strategies that are not clearly connected or prioritized making it difficult to determine how the many action steps listed will impact student performance.

Planning documents do not contain benchmarks for assessing student performance, established benchmarks to check for periodic progress for implementation of strategies, nor do they articulate specific methods of evaluation for overall results. The SIP is lacking timelines that are sufficiently specific and measurable. It also lacks attainable goals and objectives.

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

No. The school's written planning documents were not developed through a process that will support successful implementation. The planning process was fragmented and did not involve a representative group of staff members and stakeholders. Mechanisms to incorporate input and feedback in an organized and systematic manner from a broader base of faculty were not evident.

The SIP was developed during the summer of 2002 by the Principal and five teachers, who were paid stipends for ten hours of work on improvement planning. The district provided a template for school improvement plans, and a rubric developed at the district level was used to review and evaluate the SIP when it was submitted in the fall. However, the school improvement planning team acknowledged that they had received little district guidance for their initial plan and were unaware of the main elements of the rubric, how it was used to evaluate the plan, and by whom.

After the district's initial review and acceptance of the original plan, the newly appointed principal involved a small group of teachers in writing an addendum that would expand upon and clarify the original plan. Teacher interviews and focus groups, as well as meetings with school administrators, show clearly that the faculty as a whole was not involved in and did not receive periodic updates regarding the planning process and initiatives. Faculty members indicated that the Addendum to the 2002-2003 SIP had only been distributed during the prior school week. However, under the new principal's guidance, grade level and faculty meetings now involve some on-going discussion about implementing and refining strategies within the math and ELA action plans.

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

No. Successful implementation is predicated upon a reasonably sound plan. The current plan does not provide credible links between students' needs and intended outcomes, district objectives and strategies to be implemented at the school level, and mechanisms for oversight and evaluation of initiatives.

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

The school suffered from a lack of leadership caused by the failure to appoint a permanent principal for three years. In July 2002, the Superintendent appointed the current principal, who had served as an assistant principal for two years at another elementary school within the district.

Staff rated the Principal's effectiveness high in supporting and guiding improvement efforts. Panel interviews with individual teachers and focus groups corroborated expressions of strong support for the Principal in the staff survey. Staff members described the Principal as energetic, positive as well as caring and sensitive. The Principal's school-wide motto of "Dare To Be the Best" appears in all classrooms and hallways. In interviews with Panel members, the Principal repeatedly stressed the importance of high expectations for students in order to raise achievement. Faculty members in interviews and focus groups embraced the school motto and the message to motivate students to higher academic achievement.

It is important to note that strong school pride and concern for all students were evident during the Panel site visit. The atmosphere at the school was pleasant, and teachers and administrators seemed to be mutually supportive. During the site visit, the Principal was observed showing a strong in-school presence by participating in bus duties, monitoring the cafeteria, and visiting classrooms. To increase communication with the larger school community, the Principal has developed a parent newsletter. She demonstrated her ability to rally formerly disconnected constituents by getting over one hundred parents to attend a school committee meeting to win support for a voluntary school uniform initiative.

In addition to improving the school climate through her accessibility, the current principal has done a credible job of galvanizing the school staff to appropriately adhere to district mandates to implement the Literacy Collaborative and extended literacy block. Teachers cited the Principal's leadership in support of reading initiatives by including topics such as grade level assessments and balanced literacy in faculty meetings.

While the Principal is clearly respected, there is a critical gap in instructional leadership and strategic planning at the school. Her concern for improving student performance was obvious. Nevertheless, the Principal has been unable to effectively communicate a clear vision for school improvement and teaching and learning to support improved achievement. In large part, school leadership has yet to prioritize improvement strategies and realistically assess action steps for implementation. The genuine efforts to motivate students and teachers to raise MCAS scores do not provide adequate direction for instructional practice in order to sustain improved student performance.

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

The faculty generally supports the school's planned improvement efforts, having recognized serious problems in student performance through reviewing MCAS data in grade-level and faculty meetings. As previously noted, the faculty received the SIP and its Addendum only recently, thereby limiting faculty awareness of planned improvement efforts. However, the Principal, school leadership team and faculty focus groups noted an increased interest and willingness on the part of staff to work on the revision process of SIP strategies.

Staff members across grades K-5 expressed a firm belief that the district-adopted Literacy Collaborative Model, when fully implemented, will help improve student MCAS scores. Comments were less apparent on the effectiveness of math initiatives connected to the "Math Investigations" guided inquiry approach, and scope and sequence.

It was not apparent that there is a common understanding of the district's systemic objectives and their connection to the school's challenges and relevance to classroom instruction. School leadership team members and faculty made few references as to how the mandated programs, for which they have expressed strong support, are tied to the district objectives to meet the needs of diverse learners and to align instruction with state Frameworks and local standards. An analysis of staff survey results shows that 50% of teachers did not express interest in professional development that relates to meeting the needs of diverse learners; an even larger percentage (80 percent) did not indicate a need for training related to the curriculum frameworks or the inclusion of students with disabilities. Although the lack of training in "Math Investigations" was listed as a reason for chronic under-performance in math, and content specific training was not selected by 74 percent of faculty respondents.

There was a range of responses when teachers were asked their roles in plan implementation. Foremost among the responses was to implement the balanced literacy model in K-2 and to incorporate increased time within literacy blocks and math instruction throughout all grade levels. Many responses centered on incorporating test enhancement strategies within the classroom to improve student performance on MCAS open response type questions. As previously noted, the availability and use of the Frameworks and/or grade level curriculum guides for instructional planning was not consistent, based on teacher observations and teacher interviews.

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

The current Superintendent is aware of the chronic under-performance of students within both the Donahue Elementary School and the district. He is well informed of the needs and challenges the school faces in that prior school improvement plans were inadequate and not implemented effectively. During the Panel's interview, the Superintendent expressed both an understanding and a commitment to address the whole district's chronic underperformance.

The Superintendent stressed that school improvement planning is now conducted within a structure of intentional systemic district reforms. He also expressed that with consistent articulation of the district's mission, vision and objectives, strategic planning at the school-level, including the evolving Donahue planning documents, will improve in meeting the needs of students in a comprehensive manner. Additionally, the district has increased the number of professional development days in order to address concerns regarding lack of training for mandated programs. When asked to assess the 2002-2003 Donahue SIP, the Superintendent acknowledged that this plan was an important "first step" in that it was the first opportunity for administrators and faculty to work together to draft a plan in accordance with clear district expectations.

The district has provided some technical support and guidance for the school improvement plan. As noted previously, the district developed templates for the SIP, and a district review team evaluated the plan with a district rubric instrument. District personnel assisted in data analysis and met with the SIP team and the incoming principal during the summer. The Superintendent

personally has taken on an active role in setting directives to increase time on learning in literacy and math; he moved to break the inertia that prevented effective use of the Literacy Collaborative by mandating its thorough implementation during the current year in grades K-2. School administrators and teachers acknowledged his regular presence in schools and the expectation to adhere to the balanced literacy model.

In the judgement of the Panel, the alignment between district plans and the school's improvement efforts was not effectively established. Although district personnel were involved in the planning process, this support thus far has been insufficient in terms of articulating a clear, coherent statement of student learning objectives, improvement strategies, and expectations for enhanced teaching and learning. Furthermore, this lack of alignment raises concerns regarding the district's ability to provide sufficient continued oversight in the further articulation and implementation of the Donahue plan.

CONCLUSION

Based on the evidence reviewed, the Panel review team found that the Maurice A. Donahue Elementary School does not have a sound plan for improving student performance. In its current form, the School Improvement Plan lacks focus and coherence as well as key elements, such as clear goals, measurable objectives, and meaningful benchmarks for teaching and learning with definitive timetables. The school has conducted an insufficient analysis of student performance data to identify both student learning gaps and factors that contribute to student needs. A thorough review of curricular and instructional practice was not evident in the improvement planning process.

Successful implementation is predicated upon a reasonably sound school improvement plan. The current planning documents do not provide credible links between students' needs and intended outcomes, district objectives and strategies to be implemented at the school level, and mechanisms for oversight and evaluation.

**APPENDIX A
Team Members**

Michael Coppolino, Review Team Chairperson, ClassMeasures, Ltd.
Geri Lyn Ajemian, Ed. D, Review Team Coordinator, MA Dept of Education
Tim Babcock, Principal, Kensington Avenue Elementary School, Springfield
Anne Marie Carr-Reardon, Title I Director, Waltham Public Schools
Maureen Scala-Freeman, Teacher/Administrative Intern, Andrews Middle School. Medford

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