

School Panel Review Report John J. Duggan Middle School Springfield 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. Duggan Middle School met this criterion at the sixth and eighth grades and was one of 14 schools selected for panel review in spring, 2003. The Panel review was conducted on February 12–13, 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 John J. Duggan Middle 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.

John Duggan Middle School Profile

Enrollment

The John Duggan Middle School is one of 49 schools in Springfield and 6 middle schools in the district. Duggan Middle School is a large middle school whose enrollment for the period between 1999 and 2002 averaged more than 900 students. About half of the school's population during this period was Hispanic. Black and white students each accounted for 25 percent of the school population. A designated School Wide Title I school, the percentage of low-income

students at Duggan Middle School was around 80 percent. The percentage of students at the school for whom English is not the first language has fluctuated over the last four years. In 1999, they accounted for 36 percent of the school's total population, then 39 percent in 2000, followed by 40 percent in 2001, and dropped to 22 percent in 2002. The school's Limited English Proficient student population averaged about 13 percent over the last four years.

During the period of 1998-2001, the attendance rate at Duggan averaged about 90 percent. The Duggan Middle School's in-school suspension rate between those years averaged 41.1. Similarly, the school's exclusion rate average was 30 percent. Out-of-School Suspensions, during that time, fluctuated between 17 and 21 percent.

In 2003, the school reported that: 224 students receive special education services; 111 students receive Transitional Bilingual Education services; 56 students receive DOE-funded Academic Support Services; 15 students receive non DOE-funded Academic Support Services; and 114 students participate in Extended Time Enrichment/Recreational activities.

Staffing

The Duggan Middle School has a full-time staff of 83 that includes 74 teachers, four administrators, two guidance counselors, one mediator, one non-violence resource person, one attendance officer, and three teacher leaders/ curriculum facilitators. Sixty-nine percent (51) of the teaching staff has been at the school for five or fewer years, and 14 are not certified in the subjects they teach.

MCAS Overview

As a middle school, Duggan students are tested in the MCAS grade 6 mathematics, grade 7 English language arts (ELA), and grades 8 mathematics. The school failed to make adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both ELA and mathematics in any of the last four years.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

In Cycle II (2001-2002), the Duggan Middle School received a performance rating of "Very Low," based on its proficiency index of 57.6 in ELA. The school received an improvement rating of "No Change," having shown no progress from its Cycle I (1999-2000) performance. Participation rates in the MCAS ELA test in Cycle II were 84 percent in 2001 and 92 percent in 2002.

In Cycle II, Regular Education student performance in ELA at the Duggan School in grade 7 ELA was centered in the Needs Improvement category. In 2001, 19 percent of students scored at the Proficient level, 57 percent at Needs Improvement, and 23 percent at Warning. In 2002, the school has one percent of its Regular Education students scoring at the Advanced level, 26 percent were Proficient, 53 percent in need of improvement, and 21 percent at Warning.

In 2001, there were no proficient Special Education students in ELA at the Duggan School. Fourteen percent were at the Needs Improvement level, and 86 percent in Warning. In 2002, only two percent of students in this subgroup were proficient, 34 percent were in the Needs Improvement category, and 64 percent in Warning.

In 2001, there were no proficient Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in ELA at the school. Seven percent of students were at the Needs Improvement level, while 93 percent were in Warning. In 2002, 33 percent of LEP students scored in the Needs Improvement category, and 67 percent in Warning.

Student Performance in Mathematics

In Cycle II, the Duggan Middle School received a proficiency index of 28.4 that translated into a performance rating of “Critically Low”. Its improvement from Cycle I was rated “No Change.” Participation rates in the mathematics portion of the MCAS tests in Cycle II were 94 percent in 2001 and 98 percent in 2002.

Regular Education student performance in mathematics at the Duggan over the last four years has been characterized by high percentages of students scoring at the Warning level and extremely low proportions of proficient students. In 1999, only two percent of Regular Education students tested at the Duggan School were proficient, 19 percent were in need of improvement, while 80 percent scored at the Warning level. In 2000, one percent of students was advanced, five percent proficient, 18 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 76 percent at Warning. In 2001, one percent of Regular Education student scores fell in the Advanced category, four percent in Proficient, 26 percent in Needs Improvement and 70 percent at Warning. The distribution of student scores in 2002 mirrored that of 2001, less the one percent in Advanced. The performance trends of grade 6 Regular Education students in Cycle II mirror those in observed for Regular Education students in Cycle II in grade 8.

The performance of Special Education and Limited English Proficient students in mathematics at the Duggan Middle School over the last four years has been characterized by an extremely high (ranging between 92-100) percentage of students performing at the Warning level. Similar trends are observed in these subgroups’ performance in mathematics at the grade 6 level in Cycle II.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

The recently drafted Action Plan makes note of present improvement strategies, sets some objectives and is being developed in an inclusive process. However, the Action Plan is not based on a comprehensive analysis of the data.

The new Principal informed the Team that she initiated the process of developing an Action Plan in December 2002 with a small group of staff volunteers. This group of volunteers developed a draft Action Plan which was presented to the staff in January for review and discussion. Staff members have volunteered to work on different parts of the plan. The staff does this at school meetings during team time dedicated to this purpose. The Action Plan is not based on a comprehensive analysis of data and does not articulate causal factors for poor student performance nor does it include corresponding problem statements and strategies.

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 school has data from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills administered to students last year. While some teachers have reviewed the results, there has not been a systematic analysis of this data. The data has not been disaggregated, compared to other data points, or used in the school Action Plan. The results from the Stanford 9 test administered in the fall of 2002 have not yet been returned to the School. The results of mid - year district subject area tests were not available for review by the Panel. Recently the Scholastic Reading Inventory was administered to Grade 6 students. That data is not yet available for review. Other data available to the school includes the 2001 and 2002 MCAS results, student attendance and student suspensions and exclusions. A staff survey was also administered in December 2002. There is no evidence that any of the available data has been reviewed by the staff in a comprehensive manner. This was confirmed through interviews with school administrators and staff, as well as the absence of documents from the school. The Principal informed the Team that she had opted to forego an initial comprehensive data analysis in order to provide immediate direction to the school. The Principal stated that she recognized that going forward with any improvement cycle must begin with data analysis.

Interviews with staff members did reveal some overall familiarity with the MCAS results from presentations made at recent staff meetings by the school administration. For example several staff members articulated that students did not do well on MCAS open ended and short response questions. Several staff members related this to student's reading and writing skills and thought that the recently implemented LINKS program would help improve student performance in the future.

One area that the administration has analyzed is student attendance. While there are no specific goals listed in the Action Plan to increase overall learning time, positive changes in student attendance have taken place this year. Student attendance year to date is averaging 89- 90 percent, compared to 86 percent for the 2001 – 2002 school year. The school recently hired an Attendance Officer to help address the school's overall attendance problem. There have been no exclusions this year to date, which is a significant improvement over last year. Last year the school's exclusion rate was 46.5 percent. The State average last year was 1.7 percent. (Percentages are based on students per thousand.)

The school has not conducted a formal assessment of instructional practices. The administration does review staff plan books. Teachers are required to include in the plan books the learning standards from the MA Curriculum frameworks that they are teaching. When the team asked for

copies of the mathematics plan, the school offered a series of district documents referred to as “pupil progression plans.” While these plans are not curriculum guides these are helpful in understanding the expectations for student proficiency at each grade level that the district has articulated for all schools.

The district has provided the school with these plans for mathematics and science, reading and social studies. These plans articulate targeted pupil progression by subject area and level as well as district initiatives that are designed to improve student performance. There is some correlation between these plans and the school’s Action Plan. For example, the school proposes to increase instructional time in mathematics from 45 minutes a day to 55 minutes a day as stated in the district plan. However, there is no data analysis around mathematics in the school’s Action Plan to show what areas of weakness will be targeted so that all students are prepared to successfully achieve the district goal of completing Algebra 1 no later than Grade 9.

Classroom observations indicated that the staff is teaching to an agreed upon plan within the school’s grade level team / department structure. The topics taught are based on the MA Curriculum Frameworks. The district uses subject matter exams to measure student achievement. In interviews teachers noted that there is not enough time to teach all of the material and that they change units around to try to match up with what is assessed on the MCAS.

Teacher, parent and administrative interviews indicate that the process for transitioning students from bilingual education to regular education has yet to be addressed in a comprehensive needs assessment. The process of transition requires over one month and multiple sign offs both in the school and at the central office. Only a few students have made the transition during this school year. Bilingual parents did not feel well informed about the transition process. Given MCAS scores for LEP students at Duggan, this transition policy will be a factor in any comprehensive needs assessment and data analysis.

The Principal stated that greater integration of bilingual and regular education was required to improve educational opportunities and school climate. She has worked to bring regular education and bilingual students together in appropriate classroom settings.

Finally the school’s class schedule has not been fully analyzed to determine whether or not time is allocated to instructional priorities. At present, scheduling is done by each grade cluster. It is not clear if having multiple scheduling approaches helps or hinders student progress, but this is an important question given the school’s large population of LEP students and LEP students who must be bridged across bilingual and cluster schedules as they transition into regular education.

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 proposed Action Plan does include some specific objectives but these objectives are not grounded in a comprehensive data analysis that identifies likely causes of past student performance and key programmatic changes needed to address these causes.

Of the present objectives, some are measurable and some are not. The school provided a new copy of the Action Plan on site which set some specific objectives, adjusted others from the draft provided for the pre – site review and left some objectives incomplete. The school itself recognizes that the plan is still under development. For example:

“Objective 1 a. Implement and adopt rigorous literacy practices in grades 6-8 based on State Frameworks.

“Objective 1 b. Implement the district’s English Language Arts working curriculum guide that are aligned to the Massachusetts Frameworks to achieve an increase percentage on the MCAS.

“Objective 2a. Implement and adopt rigorous mathematics practices in grades 6-8 based on State Mathematics Frameworks.”

While these statements describe broad strategies that may be helpful, the plan is not explicit about which “rigorous practices” are to be used or how teachers will be trained in new practices.

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

The plan includes a number of programs such as LINKS and the Connected Mathematics Program. However, these selected programs and strategies are not based on an analysis of student performance data at Duggan Middle School. They may or may not lead to improved achievement.

The Team asked staff and administration how the strategies in the Action Plan had been selected. The Team was informed by staff and administration that the strategies were selected by the core group of volunteers and the Principal based on their experience with these programs. The Team concluded that while many of the strategies noted in the Action Plan may be sound, the lack of an analysis of the data leading to a reliable determination of the root causes of poor student performance, followed by the selection of programs based on this analysis raises questions about whether these worthwhile strategies will be effective. The establishment of clear benchmarks for improved student achievement has not been completed to allow the school to monitor its own progress. This is not to say that the strategies will be ineffective. Rather, it is not possible to determine whether or not the strategies being selected match student needs because those needs have not been thoroughly investigated.

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

The draft Action Plan is one month old. This plan is being developed with a template that includes objectives, activities, person (s) responsible, timelines and resources. The school has completed sections of the template to varying degrees. The plan does not yet have a complete statement of the problem, analysis of causal factors, measurable goals and objectives in all instances and specific strategies for each objective. In the absence of a completed plan the Team could not judge whether timelines and resources were adequate.

The School's Action Plan template includes the following sections:

1. Curriculum and Instruction.
2. Professional Development
3. Assessment and Accountability
4. Student Support Services
5. Parent and Community Involvement

In the absence of an analysis of student performance data, the plan relies on general statements without measurable outcomes. For example under Curriculum and Instruction the following is stated:

“Goal: Maximize the performance of all students' learning in *Springfield Public Schools*.

“Strategic Objective: 1 a. Implement and adopt rigorous literacy practices in grades 6-8 based on State Frameworks.

“Activities: Provide training and support to all staff for successful implementation of the LINKS writing program.

“Target Population: All students in grades 6-8

“When: January 2003 – June 2004

“Responsible: Administrators, Teachers and LINKS Consultants.

“Measurable Outcomes: Improved student assessment scores as evidenced by MCAS, Stanford 9 and SRI.

During the site visit the Team learned more about this goal. Although the LINKS program was not selected on the basis of data analysis, the strategies to support the LINKS program appeared to the Team to be the most developed part of the Action Plan as evidenced by the staff's knowledge, classroom observations and staff and administrator interviews.

The LINKS program was presented to the School Centered Decision Making Team (SCDM) by the Principal in the fall before development of the Action Plan had begun. The Principal then presented the program to the staff as a way to improve student achievement by helping students to better organize material for writing purposes. The staff voted to adopt the program. Staff members have received training in the program and it is used throughout the school. A LINKS consultant works with the staff. In the near future a full time staff member will become the LINKS support person. (This position has been filled by a full time staff member as of the school's response to the draft report on 3/3/03). There is no measurable outcome specified for the LINKS program.

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

Based on interviews with school administrators and staff the Team learned that the plan was developed in early December by several school volunteers. The plan was presented to the staff in January. In February a mission/ vision statement was added. While there is staff support for the emerging Action Plan and its objectives, this support is not based on an analysis of data and

agreement on the root causes of poor student performance. The planning process currently underway is more inclusive. The staff stated that they appreciate the increase in involvement, and most teachers interviewed believe that the process is positive for the school. However, the lack of initial broad based involvement, data analysis and a monitoring plan undermine the quality of the Action Plan in its current iteration.

Staff members have a general sense of the school's direction but articulate varying interpretations of that vision. In a survey of the staff in December only 24 out of 74 staff members (32 percent) indicated that they knew the school's vision. Of these 24 their description fell into three subgroups:

- The Links program
- Making connections across the curriculum
- Standards based education

It is important to note that the survey was given before the recent increase in staff involvement in the planning process and may not reflect the full staff's current understanding of the school's vision and mission. In interviews and focus groups conducted during the Panel review, teachers were generally positive about what they knew about the plan. Many mentioned LINKS as the key to the school's direction. The Team observed the LINKS program being implemented in many classrooms. Since the final plan is not yet available, it is not possible to gauge the faculty's support of any final plan.

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

There is evidence that the district and the staff are supportive of the emerging Action Plan. During interviews with the Team, administrators, teachers and the SCDM all voiced their support for the current planning process. The Team also notes the allocation of additional professional development time for plan development and the implementation of the LINKS program as evidence that the emerging plan is being supported. However, responsibility for approval of the plan and the allocation of resources within the school to support it lie with the SCDM. The SCDM has not yet been presented with a final plan to consider for approval.

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

The current Principal of Duggan Middle School assumed the position in July 2002. She replaced a long serving Principal called to active duty in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001.

The Team noted a number of changes at the school this year. Most importantly there is a new Principal. The Principal has a sense of purpose and articulates high expectations for the school. There is one new Assistant Principal joining the two Assistant Principals already on staff. The Assistant Principals appear to work well as a team with the Principal. Overall the school and classrooms were orderly throughout the day the Team was on site. There have been a number of

changes made at the school which the Team concluded are evidence of the district's, Principal's and staff's commitment to improving student performance.

The changes at the school this year mentioned to the Panel team include:

- The school has introduced the Read 180 program for grade 6 students. Read 180 is a district wide initiative designed to improve the reading skills of students who are below grade level. The program includes a diagnostic test that provides staff with specific information about each student's skill level.
- The administrative team reviews plan books on a weekly basis. Plan books include notations on the learning standards from the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks that are being covered.
- The Principal eliminated the separate entrance that bilingual students were required to use in the morning when they arrived at school.
- The Principal introduced the LINKS program which is now being implemented across the School.
- The Principal adopted a new attendance record keeping system.
- The Principal has moved and reconfigured some special education classes to better meet the needs of the students.

In interviews, the Superintendent, the Assistant Principals, and the staff expressed confidence in the Principal's ability to lead the school through the school improvement planning process. All agree that the Principal has set high expectations for the school.

Overall school climate appears to have improved from last year as evidenced by improved student attendance and a decrease in student exclusions. However, there are some areas of concern. There is a great amount of learning time lost as a result of student and staff absence. As noted above the student attendance rate is below the State average. There have been 122 suspensions at the school year to date. Staff has averaged 5 days of absence year to date with 14 staff members absent for 10 or more days.

Communication is a significant area for improvement. The faculty is still developing a common understanding of the school's new direction. The short timeline between the beginning of the new planning process and the visit by the Panel Review team left little opportunity for broader discussion of the school's plans among the staff.

Other concerns were voiced by parents. The Team met with approximately 20 parents on site visit day. Parents expressed concern about the lack of communication from the school. Parents noted the long time it takes the school to return phone calls and a decrease in the number of newsletters sent home. Parents expressed concern about security in the school as they cannot walk into the building and go to a classroom without impedance. Some parents expressed

concern about fighting in the lavatories that resulted in their children not wanting to use these facilities. Finally parents expressed a lack of clarity about the process for exiting the bilingual program. Parents felt that the process that involves a request from the school to the district was cumbersome and time consuming and resulted in their children having to remain in the program longer than necessary. The Principal also shared concerns with the Team about this process.

It is important to note that under the collective bargaining agreement, the SCDM plays a significant role in determining the school's direction. Both the SCDM and the Principal report that this body determines by a consensus process some operational decisions, such as the allocation of financial resources through the budget approval process and approval and implementation of the final school improvement plan. For example both the Principal and the SCDM stated that the Principal needed to seek approval from the SCDM to introduce the LINKS program to the staff. The Principal also needed the SCDM's approval to schedule the professional development time for implementation of the program. The Team concluded that under these circumstances the SCDM, not the Principal, has the ultimate responsibility for the school's future direction. In an interview with the Team, the SCDM members present indicated general approval of the emerging Action Plan.

When asked about monitoring the plan that will be presented to them, the SCDM team members present were able to mention a few student performance data points that they review, but these points did not address the overall effectiveness of the program. Thus as the decision making body in the school, the SCDM lacks a comprehensive system to monitor the effectiveness of its decisions.

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

The Action Plan as known to the staff is supported. The staff does agree with the analysis of identified needs as presented. However the staff's knowledge is not based on a review of data, but rather information presented by the administration at faculty meetings. As stated above there has not been a complete analysis of the student assessment data.

Although a process for regular review of student data may emerge from this process, there is not yet one in place. There is the beginning of a process for review of instructional practices in the implementation of the LINKS program, plan book reviews and the weekly professional development time that has begun to focus on the causes of gaps in student achievement. Of all the initiatives in the plan only LINKS is being implemented school wide with the support of the staff.

Overall, the staff has confidence in the Principal but there are concerns about her style. The staff articulated two issues in interviews. One was decision making without process and the other was the perceived change in how the discipline code is administered.

The staff expressed some concern about the Principal's decision making style which sometimes leads to change without input. In the Principal's own words, "Some things cannot wait." For example, the Principal wanted to restructure special education resource rooms and did so without

a great deal of input. While this change has been well received, it is indicative of a leadership style that concerns some faculty members. In another example, the Principal has decided without staff input to schedule professional development on the Dunn and Dunn Learning Style Inventory next year.

The issue of discipline is intertwined with the issue of increased learning time for students. The SCDM informed the Team that the district has not yet approved a new discipline policy, and that the school is using the one in last year's handbook. According to the staff and the assistant principals, the administration now mitigates the suspension days that the current handbook requires for an offense. The administration refers to this as a "leniency" when other factors are considered. For instance a student suspended for fighting may have the number of days reduced by agreeing to enroll in an anger management class. One staff member noted that this year students can use unacceptable language with a staff member and be back in class the next day. The staff member reported that last year this would have resulted in an out of school suspension. A faculty focus group noted that the administration moves students from team to team so that the student can get a 'fresh start' during the course of the year. The teachers did not see this as helpful to overall student discipline. The challenge for the school is how to decrease out of school suspensions while maintaining order in the school.

Also related to learning time the staff and the SCDM expressed concern about the district's new attendance policy which results in a failing grade if the student has more than 12 unexcused absences in a year. This consequence may lead to students not attending classes that they have already "failed." Staff and the SCDM do not believe that the policy has been communicated to parents in an effective manner.

In summary, there is general support for the improvement efforts now underway and emerging. Most notably, there is evidence of LINKS use throughout the school and the time has been reallocated by the SCDM to allow for more staff involvement in the planning process. This general support is sometimes hampered by the lack of clarity about how decisions are being made and a lack of data review to inform decisions.

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

Overall the district is informed and supportive of changes in the school improvement plan. The Superintendent has a high level of knowledge about the school and the overall student performance issues. The Central Office has provided the new Principal with a mentor, human resources support and curriculum and administrative support. The Superintendent has reviewed the Action Plan and is aware that the plan is incomplete. The Superintendent is seeking to provide more professional development time to the school to support the school improvement planning process. The Principal acknowledged these supports as reasonable within the current limit on district resources.

Overall staffing at the school appears adequate, although the grade 6 class size is high – 28 -31 students. It was not determined whether this is a school staff allocation decision, a scheduling issue or a lack of staff assigned to the school. The Superintendent informed the Team that the staff allocation to the school was consistent with the district's staffing formula.

There was concern voiced by the staff at the school about the district's data management system. It was noted that each year students at the school who receive perfect attendance awards based on school records have been recorded as being absent from school in the district system. The Team also noted that the results from the Stanford 9 test administered last fall have not yet been returned to the school. The staff reports that district mid-year content exams, while scored at the building level before being sent to the district, are often not returned by the district until the end of the year. The Superintendent in his interview stated that he was aware of data management challenges and is seeking to address these.

CONCLUSION

The school is developing a plan, but does not presently have a sound plan for improving student performance. Most importantly, the plan lacks an analysis of student performance data, the determination of the root causes of poor student performance, the subsequent selection of programs based on this analysis, and the establishment of clear benchmarks for improved student achievement. It is important to note that the plan is being developed under new leadership. Its final form may or may not meet the Panel review standards. The Team's comments are limited to the existing draft.

The Team believes that the conditions for successful implementation of the Action Plan are emerging. The Principal is enthusiastic and has set high expectations for the school. While there are some concerns about her leadership style, the staff has expressed confidence in her. While not grounded in an analysis of student performance data, the implementation of the LINKS program is a good example of the changes possible once the staff buys into a program. This speaks well for leadership and the professional staff at the school. The Superintendent is supportive of the Principal's efforts and the district is seeking to align resources to support the Principal's initiatives.

The Team believes that with support from the district the data analysis issue can be addressed. Once the data is analyzed then the plan can be completed and submitted to the SCDM for approval.

APPENDIX A
Team Members

Michael B. Ronan Chief Operating Officer, SchoolWorks, Panel Chair
Ledyard McFadden President, SchoolWorks, Panel Coordinator
Pat Costa Principal, Stoughton Middle School, Panel Member
Alan Benson Director of Grants, Lynn Public Schools, Panel Member
Susan Cote Asst. Superintendent, Swansea Public Schools, Panel Member

APPENDIX B
UNDER-PERFORMING PANEL REVIEW SCHEDULE
JOHN J. DUGGAN MIDDLE SCHOOL
Springfield Public Schools
February 12 and 13, 2003

Day 1—February 12, 2003

All activities take place at the Sheraton, Monarch Place, Springfield

- 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.
- 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 judgments on key questions.
- 2:00—3:00 p.m.* Panelists meet with the district Superintendent
- 3:30—4:30 p.m.* Panelists meet with Principal
- 4:30 —6:00 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.

Day 2—February 13, 2003

All activities take place at the school

- 7:30-8:00 **Panelists meet with Principal**
- 8:05 – 8:50 **Classroom observations (8:05 – 8:30) (8:30 – 8:50)**

- 8:50 -9:35 **Teachers interviews**
- 9:35 -10:25 **Teacher Focus Groups**
 Group A
 Group B
 Group C
- 10:25 – 11:05 **Teacher Focus Group D**
 Student Focus Group
- 11:05 - 1:00 **Team Meeting #3 - Working lunch**
- 1:20 – 2:00 **Panelist meet with the School Centered Decision Making Team members**
 (School Council)
- 2:00 – 2:30 **Parent Focus Group**
- 2:30 **Closing Meeting with the Principal**
- 3:00 – 5:00 **Team Meeting #4: panelists deliberate and form conclusions**