

School Panel Review Report Hayden-McFadden Elementary School New Bedford 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. Hayden-McFadden Elementary School met this criterion at the 4th grade and was one of 14 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 the Hayden-McFadden 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.

Hayden-McFadden School Profile

Enrollment

The Hayden-McFadden Elementary School is one of 28 schools in New Bedford. Enrollment at the school during 1999-2002 fluctuated between 810 and 925. During the period 1999-2002, 58 percent of the school's student population consisted of White students, while Hispanics accounted for 30 percent and Blacks slightly more than 10 percent. Twenty percent of students were non-native English speakers, while 14 percent were designated as Limited English

Proficient. An average of 90 percent of students came from low-income families during 1999-2002. There is a School Wide Title I program in place at the Hayden-McFadden School.

Attendance at the Hayden-McFadden School between 1998 and 2001 averaged 93 percent. Retention rates averaged three percent. There were no in-school suspensions or exclusions recorded during those four years (1998-2001). No clear patterns emerge for Out-of-School suspensions, which fluctuated between 2.9 and 8.3 percent between 1998 and 2001.

In 2003, the school reported: 191 students receiving Special Education; 115 students receiving Transitional Bilingual instruction; 27 students receiving DOE-funded Academic Support Services; 256 students receiving non-DOE funded Academic Support services; and 109 students participating in Extended Time Enrichment/Recreational activities.

Staffing

The school has a staff of 92 that includes two administrators, two long-term substitutes, two nurses, 58 teachers, and 28 teacher aides. Nearly half of the school's staff (45) has been at the school for five years or fewer. Only two of the teachers are not certified in the subjects they teach.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Hayden-McFadden Elementary School are tested in the MCAS in grade 3 in English language arts (ELA), in grade 4 in ELA and mathematics, and in grade 6 in mathematics. The school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for grade 4 in both Cycle I (1999-2000) and Cycle II (2001-2002) and in both content areas.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

In Cycle II, the school received a performance rating of "Very Low" in ELA based on its Proficiency Index of 44.5. The school was also found to have made "No Change" in terms of its improvement from the first cycle.

Regular Education student performance varied slightly in the two cycles (1999-2002) in the grade 4 ELA test. In Cycle II (2001-2002), seven percent of students scored at the Proficient level, compared to eight percent in Cycle I (1999-2000). In Cycle II, 56 percent of students scored in the Needs Improvement category, compared to 47.5 in the previous cycle. Thirty-eight percent of student performance in Cycle II fell in the Warning category, as opposed to 43 percent in Cycle I.

The performance of Special Education students remained relatively the same in both cycles in terms of students achieving proficiency. There were no proficient SPED students were identified at the school in any of the four years. In Cycle II, 16 percent of students scored at the Needs Improvement level, compared to 27 percent in Cycle I. Eighty-four percent of students

performed at the Warning level in Cycle II, a slight change from the 73 percent in the previous cycle.

Student Performance in Mathematics

With a Proficiency Index of 33.3 in mathematics, the school's performance was rated "Critically Low" in Cycle II, while it registered an improvement rating of "Declined." The school's proficiency index declined by 10.6 points in Cycle II compared to Cycle I.

In Cycle II, the performance of Regular Education students in the mathematics test declined compared to the first cycle. In Cycle I, 11 percent of Regular Education students tested performed at the proficient level, 41 percent at Needs Improvement, and 48 percent in Warning. In Cycle II, only one percent scored proficient, while 41 percent scored at the Needs Improvement level. The remaining 61 percent scored in the Warning category.

In Cycle II, four percent of Special Education students were found to be proficient in mathematics in grade 4. Eight percent of Special Education students performed at the Needs Improvement, with the majority (90 percent) performing at the Warning level. In Cycle I, there were no students performing in the Proficient category. Sixteen percent of Special Education students in the first cycle scored at the Needs Improvement level and 84 percent fell in the Warning category.

Student performance trends in grade 6 mathematics in both years in Cycle II resemble those of grade 4 with high percentages of students scoring in the Warning category. In both years of Cycle II, 75 percent of students scored in the Warning category.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

Yes. The 2002 - 2003 Improvement Plan for the Hayden-McFadden Elementary School is an adequate instrument for raising levels of achievement. The current plan includes goals for mathematics, ELA and student mobility that, in the opinion of the Panel review team, targeted critical areas needing improvement. It includes action steps that are sufficiently detailed in terms of objective setting, allocation of responsibility and timeframe. In addition, strategies for reviewing and measuring the implementation of each action step were evident. However, the plan does have some shortcomings. In particular, it is over-ambitious in terms of some of the established goals. While most objectives were assessed to be achievable, the achievement of improvement objectives in some cases would not in sum result in achieving the stated goal. In some areas, the plan lacks sufficient detail.

Since September 2002, school administrators and staff have worked with impressive dedication to implement the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process. The on-going improvement planning has successfully supplemented the broader objectives of the original plan

with a highly detailed, data driven instrument clearly focused on raising student achievement in ELA and math.

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

In its improvement planning process, the school has used a variety of standardized test results, school and district assessments, and other data to determine need. An analysis was conducted of MCAS results, Stanford Sat 9, and District Benchmarking tools including Developmental Reading Assessments on a regular basis. Other tests analyzed to determine need include DIBELS reading assessments, assessment through Star Math, and accelerated math programs. The PIM process in which 90 percent of the faculty takes part on a weekly basis and to which there is strong professional commitment, has driven much of this detailed analysis of performance. It would be wrong to suggest, however, that detailed data analysis was *not* part of the school's prior planning procedure. The "Mobility" goal in the 2002 - 2003 Improvement Plan requires, for example, a baseline assessment in the form of a learning profile on each incoming student.

There is substantial evidence of reviewing and analyzing data at the school. This includes notes in teachers' planning books and item analysis of MCAS data undertaken by individual teachers and grade level teams. The level of analysis presented to the team was in itself impressive and resulting strategies for curriculum and instruction were clear and focused on specific student learning needs. This analysis has already led to an increase in time spent on tasks devoted to math skills and the restructuring of the literacy block. While recognizing variance in MCAS performance for different student sub-groups, the Leadership team has articulated content area learning objectives for the student population as a whole as a result of the MCAS item analyses. Panel review team members acknowledged that this was an appropriate first step on the path to making AYP given the pressing need to address overall levels of poor student performance, yet noted the lack of disaggregation by sub-groups as a limitation of otherwise very good planning. Item analyses for LEP and Special Education students would be valuable next steps for a school now so clearly committed to the detailed analysis of student content area knowledge and skills in determining further strategies for improvement.

The Leadership team within the school is aware of the need for a varied repertoire of instructional practices to appropriately meet the diverse needs of the student population. Classroom observations conducted by the Principal and assistant principal are used to monitor instruction and teacher planning books. Similarly, minutes of common planning time discussions are regularly reviewed. Teachers referred to the benefits of these strategies in both individual interviews and in a focus group discussion with panel review team members. They cited, moreover, the tighter structuring and re-scheduling of the Literacy Block as examples of successful mid-course adjustments to instructional strategies as the result of continuous monitoring and review.

In the kindergarten and 1st grade, the Leadership team noted that reading performance has improved considerably over this academic year as indicated in a review of SAT 9 test results. The phoneme segmentation fluency at Kindergarten level, revealed by the DIBELS assessment, for example, has increased by 15 percentage points and now exceeds the District average. This

improvement in reading performance has led to the appointment of literacy coaches at 3rd grade to support the development of the RIGBY approach and is a good example of the school using data analysis to build on demonstrated programmatic strengths to grade-level needs. Conversely, a review of the school's multi-year involvement with Project Co-nect was found to be unmanageable given current staffing and was adjusted.

The school has been able to make much less use of the curriculum as part of any comprehensive analysis of how they are meeting student learning needs. This is largely because the district office has only just begun to review the effectiveness of their curriculum guides as instructional planning tools aligned to the state Frameworks. The Superintendent is well aware of the urgent need to address curriculum issues at district level and steps are being taken so to do.

Suspension rates are kept under review at the school. As a result of a teachers survey and the realization that suspension rates were escalating, grant funding was sought to hire social workers to support students with challenging behaviors. Assessment tools have also been reviewed; adjustments were made, for example, to the DRA benchmark testing because of issues with test administration and inaccurate reporting of test results. Also evident were examples of developing procedures and programs based on the analysis of successful practice. For instance, the value of bilingual testing within the bilingual program had been noted and incorporated within the "mobility" goal area. Bilingual testing is now available to all new students upon registration. Pre- and post-testing of students attending a six-week summer support program indicated to the school the success of such programs, and these are now being further developed.

The school also uses analysis of performance in conjunction with staff data. For example, it arranges mentoring to meet the needs of incoming new staff and extra RIGBY training to meet in-service training needs where the staff turnover is as high as 50 percent (last year). Project Co-nect reports on teaching effectiveness were analyzed, and the need to increase teacher knowledge in instructional strategies for teaching math was identified. The team configuration in Grades 4 through 6 was the result of a mid-course decision to solidify content area instruction in the upper grades by shifting from instruction within self-contained homerooms to grade level teacher teams. Title 1 teachers were utilized to reduce class size in 1st grade and literacy coaches support small group instruction to meet the needs of 'at risk' students. It is important to note that an increasing openness to professional review of all types was reported by both teachers and building administrators. Observations of panel review team members on-site found extensive evidence of a school culture focused on data driven decision-making and the use of assessment data to inform instruction. For example, the PIM process has led some teachers to express their discomfort with teaching math. This is to be addressed by specific professional development, which will provide video examples of good practice in relevant aspects of math instruction.

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 School Improvement Plan has clear goals that focus on teaching, and learning improvement objectives are linked to analyses of need, particularly in math, ELA and regarding student mobility. However, this plan lacks the detailed causal analysis of gaps in student

knowledge and skills, which has been and continues to be embraced by the school's commitment to the PIM process. Moreover, while the 2002 - 2003 Improvement Plan contains action plans that have appropriate objectives that are generally measurable and achievable, it should be noted that previous plans contained similar action targets that were not necessarily met. Curriculum mapping in ELA and math, for example, was set forth in the 2001 - 2002 Improvement Plan but was not achieved. Again, the Panel review team was satisfied that the additional work being achieved through PIM would ensure that objectives are not only measurable and achievable but also achieved.

The PIM analysis has led to sharper, needs-centered, improvement planning practices. More specific student performance goals have been set, such as the goal to decrease the number of 4th graders scoring within the Warning Performance Level on the 2003 Math MCAS by 25 percent. The item analysis of MCAS data has resulted in the identification of gaps in student content area knowledge and skills by Strand and Learning Standards to account for chronic under-performance. The analysis has extended to the identification of the "root" causes or contributing factors to under performance, and specific instructional strategies have been established. Identified gaps in ELA knowledge and skills include: "Reading comprehension and reading longer passages for comprehension and non - fiction." Clarity in instructional change objectives was evident in an instance involving math manipulatives which emphasized modeling the use of manipulatives prior to engaging students in converting and demonstrating their computations and reasoning in charts and other graphic representations. Similarly, though adequate in the 2002-2003 plan, PIM planning efforts have yielded more focused and specific student learning objectives. Examples of revised math objectives state that "students will independently analyze and complete patterns, interpret and read charts, and successfully compute all processes incorporating fractions."

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

Both school and district leaders acknowledged that, in the past, selection of curricular programs, projects and materials in the effort to meet student needs had been uncoordinated, not research-based, or without detailed reference to needs identified by data analysis at the building level.

As noted earlier, Hayden-McFadden has made substantial progress in accurately diagnosing student learning needs. The strategies listed in the Hayden-McFadden plan are now directly linked through the PIM action steps to address student weaknesses identified by comprehensive data analysis. Strategies have not yet been articulated with reference to specific student sub-groups, instead they are aimed at raising achievement by targeting specific prioritized gaps in skills and knowledge for the student population as a whole, which were identified as a result of causal analysis of the overall under-achievement.

The school as well as the district is pursuing research-based solutions to ameliorate chronic under-performance. For example, several math programs and resources are being piloted within the district and the Leadership team at this school expects to have input in decisions about which programs should be adopted in order to marry their own identified needs with the results of the

district pilots. This relationship between the school's detailed analysis of need and district's policies on adopting curriculum programs will be important in future planning. The school is not wasting time during the current academic year by supplementing math texts with teacher-generated materials to close the performance gap between school and state scores on the 6th Grade MCAS.

In individual interviews and focus group discussions with the Panel review team, faculty and administration emphasized many staffing and organizational changes that are part of improvement efforts underway at Hayden-McFadden. In particular the multi-faceted work of the literacy coaches and the efforts of the building administrators to arrange room assignments and common planning time in grade level 'suites' were noted as pertinent to raising student achievement. Student success plans for retained students are now a part of established procedures. Additionally, on a regular basis, faculty members are asked to identify successes and needs in their professional work. This all contributes to the consistently high morale and climate of shared decision-making the Panel review team noted in the school.

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

As previously stated, panel review team members found the 2002-2003 SIP in itself to be adequate to guide the implementation of planned improvement objectives. The current School Improvement Plan is considerably enhanced when read in conjunction with the continuing PIM planning efforts with which it articulates well. For example, the plan included benchmarks to determine progress in the sections of the plan dealing with Literacy and Mobility, but the Literacy benchmarks have been sharpened in the ELA analysis undertaken by the PIM group. Timelines are well articulated and calendar date specific in both the 2002 - 2003 plan and in the PIM planning documents.

There are clear action steps outlined in the 2002 - 2003 plan. It notes, in the majority of instances, to whom specific responsibilities are allocated and what required resources are identified in order to achieve the plan. In a small number of cases, this detail is lacking. Where this was the case, the review team was satisfied that this had been fully addressed through the PIM work and now constitutes a supplement to the 2002 -2003 plan.

The 2002 - 2003 SIP is summarized in a useful single page Statement of Need which highlights and prioritizes school improvement efforts, under five themes: Mobility; Literacy; Math; School Safety and Discipline; Professional Development and Family Involvement.

In the 2002 - 2003 SIP, there is insufficient linkage between identified improvement objectives and planned solutions, but this has and is being systematically addressed through the PIM planning process. Similarly, where the style of school improvement planning at Hayden-McFadden in the past has been to identify programmatic rather than specific strategies, the espousal of the PIM process has effectively addressed this issue.

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

The improvement planning process at Hayden-McFadden involves the whole faculty who meet every Wednesday for two hours after school and outside contractual time. The Principal's previously noted statements that more than 90 percent of staff attended these sessions was borne out in interviews with individual teachers and in focus groups with faculty members as well as the school leadership team. A review of session agendas substantiated claims that not more than 15% of meeting time is devoted to the inevitable critical management issues that arise in any school. Thus the very design of the PIM sessions reflects highly effective strategic planning. There is opportunity to introduce new dimensions of planning in a plenary session with the whole staff who then break into "suite groups" to undertake detailed planning with representation from every grade level suite.

The Performance Improvement Mapping process was developed by the Department of Education as targeted assistance with school improvement planning offered to under-performing schools and selected districts. New Bedford adopted the PIM guidelines as a district objective for Grades K-12 for the current school year. The Assistant Superintendent modeled the process groups of principals at the outset of the school year and reviews the structure and progress of school-based PIM workshops.

School improvement planning at Hayden-McFadden had historically involved a breadth of stakeholders in its development. However, the Panel review team noted some omissions in drawing up the 2002-2003 Plan. In particular there was no fourth grade representative, math expert or parents enlisted. Again, historically, the process was reviewed by the central office, but the direct involvement of a senior central office administrator is a new and positive development, likely to support the school's efforts and the successful implementation of the plan.

Despite the failure to complete targeted curriculum mapping projects, the review team did find historical evidence of the school's adopted planning process leading to implementation. The 2001 - 2002 Improvement Plan refers to the implementation of the Rigby reading instructional model, which the Panel review team was able to observe in practice during the site visit. Similarly, the Project Co-nect planning is increasingly detailed across the 2001 - 2002 and the 2002 - 2003 Improvement Plans. There is ample evidence as well of midcourse changes as a result of reviewing current plans in the light of classroom practice. Both the Principal and faculty members confirmed that teacher planning books and student writing assignments were regularly used to review and modify planning. The PIM process will help systematize the existing mid course accommodations and revisions.

On site Professional Development is embedded in daily practice and is exemplified in the work of the Principal's mentor and the Literacy Coaches. On-site professional development has tended hitherto to be reactive to inadequate staffing rather than linked to change objectives identified through a needs analysis of instructional practice. The implications for professional development are, however, being comprehensively identified through the PIM process to support the implementation of evolving plans. Concomitantly, the District is espousing the need for student-focused, data-driven professional development.

Finally, Hayden-McFadden has a web site written with the parent readership in mind; correspondence from the school is translated into other community languages as corroborated by students in a focus group. The school also plans to communicate aspects of its planning in such ways. If achieved, this will further support the implementation of the Hayden-McFadden plan.

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

Yes. There is widespread understanding of and support for the 2002 - 2003 Improvement Plan throughout the Hayden-McFadden school community. The PIM planning process, which is enhancing the quality of the existing Improvement Plan, has been seamlessly incorporated into the professional work of the school. School leadership has set clear objectives for achieving the steps of the 2002 - 2003 Improvement Plan and they are realistic about the constraints within which they are operating. The District is conscious of these constraints as well, and is providing support for Hayden-McFadden both in terms of removing some obstacles to achievement and in supporting the planning and professional development within the school.

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

The school is very well managed and there is strong leadership. The Panel review team found an orderly school community, clearly focused on teaching and learning. Students appeared actively engaged, enthusiastic, and well behaved. Staff morale was very high. Panel review team members had the opportunity to interview a large majority of staff (46 out of 58 faculty members) who demonstrated a detailed knowledge of and enthusiasm for the "new style" planning process.

The school community as a whole expressed unequivocal support for school leaders. All teachers interviewed held the Principal in high regard. In the opinion of the Panel review team, the Principal of the school provides a positive role model for staff and students and has a warm relationship with staff, students and parents. The Principal delegates responsibilities effectively to the assistant principal and faculty members, yet effectively monitors and reviews performance. She does this, for example, by requiring that minutes of suite based common planning time decisions be communicated to her and by reviewing examples of the math "Problem of the Day." Roles within the school are clearly understood. For example, there was clear communication of redefined roles and the assignment of new roles as a result of the mid course review of implementation of this year's plan.

Planning goals are communicated with the School Council and feedback is actively sought. In a focus group with the School Council, high regard for the school leadership was once again voiced. The School Police Officer, for example, said "I've done more in two years in this school than fourteen years on the street." Other School Council members stated the school was successful in outreach work, communicating available programs effectively. A Social Services delegate, a middle school principal and parents all confirmed this view. Pre-kindergarten parents

felt a sense of engagement with the school as a result of the way the Principal communicated her plans and the school's vision. Moreover, the Panel review team found the composition of the School Council itself to be reflective of a commitment to community outreach. A strong interface between the School Council and the PIM planning team reflects a similar commitment to shared decision-making as well as the established practice of submitting prior SIPs for School Council review.

The school has a vision statement that stresses care for the individual and academic achievement. In both the teacher survey and in interviews, teachers repeatedly spoke of "high expectations." Students told the Panel review team that they and their parents felt welcomed by the school "whether they spoke English or not." There is a climate of good teaching and learning which was evident in a range of instructional settings. Also evident were high expectations for student behavior, which were met without exception on the day of the on-site review. Students know and follow classroom routines with respect for their underlying rationale and the manner in which their teachers utilized them. The teachers observed indeed made classroom and student management look easy. A parent referred to the personal letters and phone calls she received from teachers following a family bereavement, and the school has a "Care for a Colleague" initiative. Finally, the school's espousal of its vision was borne out in the positive and professional treatment of the Panel review team itself.

The Principal is directly involved in the teacher induction program, is a regular visitor to classrooms, and encourages peer support. One teacher said: "Before we used to teach with doors closed, but now we can go into each other's classrooms." The review team observed how the quality and use of teacher planning books has increased this year since whole-scale involvement in the PIM process.

The Panel review team found staff to have negative perceptions that their positions were more insecure than in fact appeared to be the case based on interviews with administrators. This is regrettable given the high morale and dedication of the faculty.

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

As has been stated, the staff has been directly and almost universally involved in analyzing performance gaps and identifying student needs. Throughout teacher interviews explicit examples were given of this active engagement and how the planning process informs their classroom practice. Not only do teachers at Hayden-McFadden support this process, but they are driven by it and determined for success.

The review team observed that the orderly atmosphere in classrooms was grounded in good instructional practices that ensured student engagement, and sensed through teacher interviews an enhanced staff confidence that things will improve. Teachers use continuous assessment in classrooms to review their own instructional planning. However, an aspect of practice which warrants review and further planning relates to the number of students within the school identified as Special Education students, and the referral processes for Special Education services.

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

Both teachers and school administrators reported that the District has provided abundant support to the Hayden-McFadden School during the past academic year. The Superintendent provided clear evidence that he understood the issues faced by this school as the largest elementary school in an urban setting with complex needs. A principal mentor has been assigned to the school this year, and the district has agreed to add a position for a second assistant principal for the next school year. In interviews, district leaders were particularly sensitive to mobility and overcrowding issues at Hayden-McFadden and explained specific strategies to ease the overcrowding. The District also recognizes the need to attract and retain qualified teachers, especially math teachers.

Funds have been committed to the school this year to extend the work of literacy coaches and provisions for full day kindergarten. The District has been successful in attracting considerable external grant funding for professional development, so that the school might expect continuing support in this respect.

As previously stated, School Improvement Plans historically have been reviewed by the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education. This year, however, the Assistant Superintendent has personally coached all principals district-wide and other central office administrators in the PIM process. This has been particularly welcomed at Hayden-McFadden as an indication of the District's commitment to student centered, data driven decision-making to advance academic achievement.

CONCLUSION

The Hayden-McFadden School administration and staff have developed a sound School Improvement Plan to meet the extensive needs of its students, particularly when used in conjunction with the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process. When viewed as an integrated blueprint for change, the current School Improvement Plan and PIM Action Steps have all the key elements required to guide the school in continuing to identify contributing factors to chronic under-performance and associated strategies for improvement. In addition, the plan draws on clearly evident commitment at the district level and the realistic promise of financial support for necessary professional development.

APPENDIX A
Team Members

Geri Lyn Ajemian, Ed.D, DOE Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Education.

Peter Davies, Panel Chair, ClassMeasures, Malden, MA.

Nancy Sprague, Team Member, Director of Instructional Services, Franklin, MA.

Chuck Pretti, Team Member, Principal, Briggs Elementary School, Ashburnham-Westminster, MA.

Kathleen Eossoian, Team Member, Title I Teacher, Haverhill, 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