

School Panel Review Report Elihu Greenwood Elementary School Boston 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 not at a level that reaches the school's Adequate Yearly Progress targets in English language arts or mathematics or both. The Elihu Greenwood School met these criteria and was one of sixteen schools selected for panel review in winter, 2004. The panel review was conducted on Feb. 2-3, 2004.

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 will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education for consideration, together with school performance data, in determining whether the Elihu Greenwood 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 sound improvement strategies 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.

Elihu Greenwood Elementary School Profile

Enrollment

The Elihu Greenwood School is one of 83 elementary schools in Boston. The school serves students in kindergarten through grade 5. Preliminary tabulations show 429 students enrolled at the school as of October 1 of this academic year. Between 2001 and 2003, enrollment fluctuated between 415 and 480 students. Over 70 percent of the student body in the last four years have been Black. Hispanics comprised nearly 20 percent; Whites between five and nine percent.

Over the last four years, the majority of students at the Greenwood School (between 79 and 89 percent) have been from low-income families. The school has a School-Wide Title I program and reported that 20 percent of students receive Special Education services. The percentage of students who speak a first language other than English has fluctuated between 14 and 24 percent; one to eight percent of students have been Limited English Proficient (LEP).

Attendance rates at this school have fluctuated since 2001. The attendance rate in 2003 was 94.7; the average number of days students were absent was 8.1. In 2003, the school reported a retention rate of 7 percent and an out-of-school suspension rate of 6.5, an increase from 0.2 percent in 2002.

Staffing

This year, the Greenwood School reported having a staff of 41 that includes one administrator, five specialists, five teacher aides, one curriculum facilitator, and 30 teachers. Thirty-four percent of the staff has been at the school for fewer than five years. The school reported that all of its full-time teachers, except one, were certified to teach in their current positions.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Greenwood School are assessed in English language arts (ELA) in grades 3 and 4, and in mathematics in grade 4. In 2003, the school was found to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA in the aggregate and for all its subgroups except for Hispanics.¹ This year was the only time in the last five MCAS administrations that the school made AYP in ELA. In mathematics, the school failed to make AYP in the aggregate and for all its subgroups in 2003. In the last five years, the school has not made AYP in mathematics.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

GRADE 3

Regular Education

The performance of grade 3 students in ELA has shown improvement over the last three years. In 2001, 46 percent of students were proficient, 45 performed at the Needs Improvement level, and eight percent at Warning. The following year, 51 percent of students performed at the Proficient level, 42 % scored at Needs Improvement, and 8 percent were at Warning. In 2003, the percentage of proficient students rose to 59 percent, 36 percent of students scored at Needs Improvement, and five percent were at the Warning level.

¹ In accordance with the federal No Child Left Behind Act passed in 2001, student performance is disaggregated by the following subgroups: Limited English Proficient, Special Education, Free/Reduced Lunch, African-American/Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, and White. A minimum of 20 students per subgroup is required to issue a statistically sound rating or determination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The subgroups meeting the minimum sample size at the Greenwood School in 2003 were Free/Reduced Lunch, Special Education, African-American/Black, and Hispanic in ELA. In mathematics, Free/Reduced Lunch, Special Education, and African-American/Black.

Special Education

The performance of special education students also experienced sustained improvement over the last three years. In 2001, six percent of special education students performed in the Needs Improvement level, and 94 percent in Warning. In 2002, the percentage in need of improvement rose to 12, while those at warning declined to 88 percent. In 2003, 13 percent of special education students in grade 3 were proficient, 13 percent performed at Needs Improvement, and 73 percent scored in Warning.

Limited English Proficient

Fewer than 10 LEP students have enrolled in grade 3 ELA.

GRADE 4

Regular Education

The distribution of regular education students' scores in grade 4 ELA has varied over the last four years and shows no discernible trend of sustained improvement. In 2000, 66 percent of students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 34 percent scored at Warning. The following year, 20 percent were found proficient; 62 percent in need of improvement; and 18 percent in Warning. In 2002, the percentage of proficient students fell to eight percent; 68 percent scored at the Needs Improvement level, and 24 percent at Warning. In 2003, 13 percent of students assessed performed at the Proficient level. Fifty three percent of scores were in the Needs Improvement category, and the remaining 34 percent in Warning.

Special Education

Over three-quarters of special education students continue to perform at the Warning level and very few or none have reached proficiency in the last four years. In 2000, 20 percent of students performed at the Needs Improvement level, and the remaining 80 were at Warning. In 2001, 23 percent were in need of improvement and 77 in Warning. The next year, the proportion of those in need of improvement fell to 14 while those in Warning rose to 86 percent. In 2003, three percent reached proficiency, 21 percent performed in the needs Improvement category, and 76 percent in Warning.

Limited English Proficient

Fewer than 10 LEP students have enrolled in grade 4 ELA.

Student Performance in Mathematics

GRADE 4

Regular Education

Except for 2001 when the school saw some marginal improvement, the performance of regular education students in mathematics has been static over the last four years. In 2000, five percent of students were proficient in mathematics. Thirty-five percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 59 percent at Warning. In 2001, the percentage of proficient students rose by three percentage points; 55 percent were in need of improvement, and 36 percent in Warning. Student performance in 2002 and 2003 mirrored that of 2000.

Special Education

The performance of grade 4 special education students for the last four years shows no pattern of sustained improvement. In 2000, nine percent of students performed at the Needs Improvement level and the remaining 91 percent in Warning. In 2001, nine percent of students reached proficiency, 23 percent were in need of improvement, and 68 percent scored at the Warning level. The following year, the percentage of those proficient fell to five percent, 23 percent performed at Needs Improvement, and 73 percent at Warning. In 2003, there were no proficient students. Thirty-four percent were in need of improvement, and 66 percent performed at Warning.

Limited English Proficient

Fewer than 10 LEP students have enrolled in grade 4 mathematics.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

No. The panel concluded that the Elihu Greenwood School has made progress in its school improvement planning process relative to past efforts, but has not yet developed a sound plan to guide improvement efforts. The Whole School Improvement Plan (WSIP) identifies general areas of student weakness in literacy and math and identifies general strategies to address those weaknesses. However, the panel found that the analysis of student performance results lacked quality and depth, and data concerning the effectiveness of existing programs and current instructional practices was not adequately considered. The failure to define specific student learning needs and insufficient evaluation of school programs and practices results in a plan that does not demonstrate clear linkages between the analysis of student data, improvement strategies and district-mandated initiatives.

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

No. Both the principal and teachers reported that the school's data team, with the support of the district-assigned change coach, conducted an extensive item analysis of students' MCAS and district wide assessment scores as the primary basis for drafting the school's improvement plan. However, in the panel's judgement, the school did not conduct a sufficient analysis of all the student performance data that is available to the school in order to determine the nature and causes for poor student performance.

The review of MCAS performance data did not establish patterns in student performance over time despite the fact that the school has not made AYP in Math for the last five years. The review of results in mathematics focused exclusively on the 2002 MCAS administration, while the item analysis in ELA involved a review of 2002 and 2003 data. Furthermore, the analysis of MCAS results focused on student performance in the aggregate, although the data analysis template included in the WSIP format calls for the disaggregation of student results by sub-group. The school's analysis of the performance of Special Education students cited achievement gaps in Grade 3 and 4 ELA results and Grade 4 mathematics without further specification of learning weaknesses for this student sub-group.

The item analysis in English language arts consisted of a review by question type and *Learning Standards*. Students were found to have difficulty in responding to Open Response questions. *Learning Standards* #4, #8 and #10, which involve the understanding of basic facts from text, vocabulary development, and identification of genre, were identified as significant learning gaps for students. The item analysis in mathematics lacked this level of detail. The analysis referenced only student performance on Open Response questions and omitted explicit reference to any of the *Framework Strands* or *Learning Standards* in mathematics.

The data team and Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) reviewed student performance data on internal assessments such as the DRA, SRI and QRI. However, they did not effectively integrate this information with the findings from their item analysis of the MCAS item analysis and district wide assessments, thereby limiting further definition of areas of weakness in students' math and literacy skills that might be negatively impacting their performance on state and district-wide assessments.

The WSIP format contains a required section labeled, "Instructional Priorities Implementation Worksheet," which, in the panel's judgement was not effectively utilized to capture the academic and programmatic reality of the school. The WSIP worksheet and the School Leadership Report cited recurring issues regarding incomplete and/or inconsistent implementation of the district-mandated *Readers' and Writers' Workshop* and the *TERC Investigations* math units and pacing guides. Although the ILT went on to identify weaknesses in instructional practice as primary reasons for low student achievement, panel members expressed concern that the root cause analysis did not sufficiently address underlying reasons for the lack of adherence within the school's classroom learning environments to key district curricular and instructional programs.

In interviews with panel members, the Principal acknowledged that teachers lack the content-area knowledge and skills to successfully implement district-wide curricula in math and ELA. The school has outlined a professional development plan that includes participation in the Collaborative Coaching Leadership (CCL) model, attending in house workshops on literacy and math, and meeting within and across grade level to share ideas and strategies on how to implement *Readers' and Writers' Workshop* and the district wide *Investigations* math curriculum.

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 goals and priority areas that are outlined in the WSIP, in the panel's judgement, are not adequate to significantly raise students' overall performance in the two subject areas. The lack of a thorough analysis of assessment data has hindered the school's ability to consistently identify student learning needs that reflect gaps in content area knowledge and skills in specific *Learning Standards* and, in turn, to develop specific student performance goals and objectives for the student population as a whole and for student sub-groups.

The ILT identified two priority areas—helping students use information from a text to support their opinions and building students' vocabulary—for improving student performance in English Language Arts. As a result of the school's findings regarding students' inability to demonstrate their problem-solving on open response questions, the ILT identified a single over-arching priority in math, namely "Students have difficulty communicating their mathematical thinking."

The panel concurred that the schools identification of priority areas or student learning objectives in ELA aligned with MCAS item analyses that targeted specific Learning Standards. However, the panel raised concerns regarding the abstract and general nature of the math priority in that the focus on "mathematical thinking, problem-solving or discourse" in the WSIP is not connected to key concepts or content area knowledge in any of the math *Frameworks Strands*.

The student performance targets ("Smart Goals") are not clearly articulated in terms that align with state AYP expectations. For example, the ILT wrote that "50 % of the 4th graders will score a "2" or above on the 2004 MCAS math test," rather than developing goals that clearly reflect MCAS Performance levels, i.e. Advanced, Proficient, Needs Improvement and Warning. Although the focus on helping "students score a '2' on Open Response questions" stems from the school's item analysis, these goals do not identify what content and skills need to be addressed in order to help students demonstrate satisfactory gains in math and English language arts.

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

No. In the view of panel members, many of the outlined improvement strategies and corresponding action plans show promise but need further refinement, prioritization, and clearer connections to district mandated programs.

Strategies listed for ELA in the WSIP included “Develop routines and an environment that support word study, including opportunities for sharing and word walls that are based on themes, subject area disciplines, word structure, and phonics; provide teachers professional development opportunities that enable them to teach students to identify basic facts and essential ideas in a text and use the facts for interpretations; and confer individually with students and work in small flexible groups to reinforce the vocabulary learning and use.”

Strategies in both subject areas emphasize LASW (Looking at Student Work), conferencing, and an individualized approach to MCAS item analyses to address individual student learning needs. During its lesson observations, the Panel noted word walls in many classrooms, students working in groups and using new vocabulary words in their writings and oral communication, and participating in one-on-one conferencing with teachers.

The main thrust of math strategies is through the TERC *Investigations* approach, which emphasizes students being able to conceptualize key math ideas thereby supporting the broad emphasis in the WSIP that students “construct” their own math knowledge. Lesson observations and teacher interviews demonstrated that teachers were adjusting their strategies to accord with the district’s *Investigations* curriculum.

Greenwood teachers reported that participation in professional development has resulted in a paradigm shift for teachers, particularly in their thinking about math instruction. In describing this change one teacher said, “Before, we would teach the math but essentially all we were doing was expecting students to adhere to the algorithms. Now, [the] expectations we, as teachers, have is that students are to communicate their understanding of math and their reasoning using words, numbers, and pictures.”

There was ample evidence that teachers, with support from the ILT and the content area coaches, are actively involved in looking at student work within and across grade levels during their common planning time. Teachers use the information from these meetings to adjust their lesson plans and instructional practice. Teachers noted that the use of common planning time to reflect on their practice has been instrumental in helping them to become a community of learners. They are optimistic that this change in the professional culture at the school will enable them to raise student achievement.

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

No. The WSIP format for presenting student performance data can serve as an effective tool in furthering an understanding of the analysis of assessment data. The columns for preliminary observations, weaknesses identified from data, and highest priority weaknesses follow a logical sequence for the identification of targeted learning needs. However, as the panel concluded in

Section 1A above, the school did not make effective use of this format, to derive learning objectives and strategies grounded in a thorough analysis of student learning gaps.

The general layout of the Greenwood WSIP makes it difficult to read. Key components of the plan—timeline, persons responsible, root causes, strategies to address root causes—are all on different pages in the document compromising the clarity and cohesive nature of the improvement efforts described.

Strategies within the professional development component of the WSIP are confusing and also compromise the effectiveness of the plan. With regard to professional development in math, the plan states that the leadership will: “provide professional development opportunities that deepen their understanding of mathematics and increase their knowledge and use of mathematics vocabulary” and to “learn how to facilitate mathematics discourse in the classroom.” The next professional development strategy calls for engagement “in the elementary math model for CCL focusing in the facilitation of math discourse.”

The literacy and math coaches at the Greenwood use the district wide Collaborative Coaching Leadership (CCL) model to design job-embedded professional development opportunities for teachers at the Greenwood. By modeling the effective instructional practices in math and ELA, the math and literacy coaches are able to help the faculty to be more effective in their implementation of *Readers’ and Writers’ Workshop* and math *Investigations*. The CCL for math is new at Greenwood this year, while the CCL for literacy was introduced last year. These strategies hold promise for leading to improved instruction, but their effectiveness is uncertain at this point in their adoption.

While school and district leadership agreed on the value of expanding the CCL model on-site, differing views were expressed regarding the comparative value of in-house and district based workshops and presentations. Both the math coach and Deputy Superintendent expressed a desire to see more Greenwood teachers participate in district math content training. The Deputy Superintendent pointed out that Greenwood teachers more often participate in training led by the principal at the school site. In the School Leadership Report, the principal questioned the value of removing teachers from the school site for in-service work. The emphasis in the WSIP that “allows teachers to substitute BPS Elementary Math department workshops for in-house workshops” and hence the confusing nature of the PD component of the WSIP, is indicative, in the panel’s opinion, of these differing philosophies regarding professional development.

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

Yes. In interviews with school and district leaders as well as teacher focus groups, the panel found clear evidence that the school’s Instructional Leadership team, as well as important sub-committees such as the data team and math leadership team, have made great strides in collaborating to develop the current WSIP.

The ILT is made up of volunteer teacher representative from each grade level and specialty area in the school. The principal and teachers reported that members of the ILT meet with their grade level colleagues during their weekly common planning meetings to discuss the work that is taking place in their classrooms as well as the implementation of the strategies outlined in the improvement plan. This information is then shared and used at the monthly ILT meetings to identify next steps for the further implementation of the WSIP. In interviews with panel members, teachers clearly articulated that by participating in weekly meetings with their ILT representative they are informed about the decisions that are being made about the school as well as are given the opportunity to provide feedback about the implementation of the WSIP. This was reflected on the teacher survey where 96 percent of them the teachers stated that they are well informed about the school's efforts to raise student achievement.

Members of the School Site Council reported that, while they do not play an active role in the development of the school improvement plan, they have opportunities to review it and provide the principal and the school's ILT with feedback about it. In addition, they receive regular updates about the implementation of the plan during their monthly meetings. While it was clear to panel members that the school is making a concerted effort to keep teachers and school site council members informed about the WSIP, there is very little evidence to show that it is making the same effort to inform parents about the plan.

The school's development of the WSIP received district support and guidance. The involvement of the district change coach was instrumental in transforming the ILT into a collaborative decision-making body. The Deputy Superintendent as well as the Principal, in the School Leadership Report and interviews with Panel members, described prior planning efforts as primarily principal directed.

This year, the district assigned change coach provided training to the school's data team on how to analyze students' MCAS scores to identify root causes and set goals and priority areas for the school's improvement plan. A district School Support Specialist, assigned to the Greenwood School, also provided the Principal and ILT feedback on the WSIP during its development. The Deputy Superintendent stated that since the Greenwood is in its two-year evaluation cycle, she visits the school about four to five times during the school year and uses these times to provide the principal with feedback and guidance about the WSIP.

In the panel's judgement, the plan lacks a systematic process of monitoring implementation of strategies outlined in the WSIP as well as benchmarks to evaluate the effectiveness of improvement initiatives and measurable indicators of student academic progress. In on-site interviews, the Panel was not provided adequate information as to the status or use of the literacy units, curricular mapping in math, or word study curriculum called for in the plan. The grade level LASW sessions, student conferencing and review of open response questions are key improvement strategies that, in the panel's view, are not guided by clear rubrics or measurable expectations for student progress.

The leadership at the school has instituted an informal process for monitoring the efficacy of the plan. The principal conducts regular classroom visits to make sure that teachers are practicing the strategies that are outlined in the WSIP. Teachers have said that the principal uses these

visits as opportunities to provide them with feed back on how they can strengthen the teaching and learning that is taking place in their classrooms. The literacy and math coaches also give teachers ideas and suggestions as to how they can be more effective in delivering instruction in the content areas. While it is clear that the school community is actively engaged in conversations and activities that are designed to strengthen teaching and learning at the individual grade and classroom level, ILT has not been able to use the information from the school's collective learning to systematically evaluate the impact of the WSIP on student achievement on an ongoing basis.

In interviews with panel members, teachers reported that with guidance from the coaches they meet during their weekly planning time to review student performance on district and internal assessments and discuss adjustments to their lesson plans and instructional practices. This is significant in that it creates an informal accountability system for classroom instruction, but neither the teachers nor the ILT could clearly describe how the school uses the lessons learned at the individual grade and classroom level to further drive the whole school improvement initiatives.

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

No. Although there is widespread support for the current WSIP and evidence of more consistent implementation of district-mandated curricular and instructional programs, conditions for successfully implementing the improvement initiatives do not appear to be in place. The refinement and implementation of the plan will require extensive, sustained collaboration and communication between school and district leaders, which in the panel's judgement is not present.

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

No. During her tenure at the school, the principal has articulated a commitment to create a professional learning culture at the school through the development and institution of in-house workshops. However, school improvement planning has failed to result in cohesive initiatives linked to targeted professional development to address identified student learning needs.

In both the leadership report and WSIP, the principal attributed students' poor test scores to teachers' lack of content and pedagogical knowledge. Panel members noted that the principal has not evaluated the usefulness of the content and structure of the workshops that she has delivered to her staff. Both the math coach and deputy superintendent expressed a desire to see Greenwood teachers participate in more math training in TERC *Investigations*. Teachers reported that they find participation in district wide trainings and in-house CCL with the math and literacy coaches to be invaluable because it helps them to better understand Boston Public School's requirements for students.

While the workshops that are provided by the principal are intended to help teachers improve instructional practice, there is not a clear alignment to district wide expectations for teaching and

learning. Although the principal has been called upon to lead specific professional development sessions for other principals, the panel concurred with the viewpoint expressed by the deputy superintendent that principal has yet to articulate a vision for improving the academic and programmatic design of the school aligned to the larger BPS improvement initiatives.

In previous years, the Greenwood had not had active teacher participation in school improvement planning. The Deputy Superintendent cited the lack of shared decision-making on the ILT and expressed concern regarding the level of staff involvement in the planning and implementation of improvement initiatives. In interviews with panel members, teachers at the Greenwood clearly stated that they are supportive of the school's newest improvement plan because they have had some input in its development and that this was not the case in previous years at the school.

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

Yes. Teachers support the school's improvement efforts because they believe that it addresses the leaning needs of their students. This was confirmed by the information on the teacher survey in which 89 percent responded that the school's improvement plan is well-defined. They reported that by being required to use their common planning time to meet within and across grade levels they have the opportunity to reflect on their practice and share ideas and strategies with each other. This has resulted in the school taking the first step to create a professional learning culture. Although the team considers the plan to be limited in the depth of its identification of student learning gaps, teachers have adopted the plan as their own guide for change and have embraced many of the strategies defined in the plan.

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

No. The Panel concluded that the district has not provided adequate support and guidance to address the lack of direction and focus that has characterized school improving planning at the Greenwood School.

The Deputy Superintendent was well informed of both the school's past and current issues and needs. The district provides curricular and instructional support through the district-mandated TERC Investigations and *Readers' and Writers' Workshop* with professional development opportunities and on-site coaching for these programs.

The Boston Public School District (BPS) has provided support to Greenwood's improvement planning efforts, including a comprehensive template for the WSIP, involvement of a district change coach and school support specialist in the planning process, and feedback and review of the WSIP by the Deputy Superintendent. Given the inadequacies of the WSIP discussed in response to Key Question #1, it does not appear that sufficient guidance and feedback on the contents of the school's improvement plan has been provided.

The multiple forms of support in term of programmatic guidance, human resources and coaching, as well as professional development have to date not proven effective in developing an

improvement plan that targets the needs of faculty in order to consistently implement mandated instructional programs or to raise the level of student academic achievement by addressing specified learning needs.

CONCLUSION

The panel concluded that the Elihu Greenwood School has made progress in its school improvement planning process relative to past efforts, but has not yet developed a sound plan to guide improvement efforts. The failure to define specific student learning needs and insufficient evaluation of school programs and practices results in a plan that does not demonstrate clear linkages between the analysis of student data, improvement strategies and district-mandated initiatives.

Although there is widespread support for the current WSIP and evidence of more consistent implementation of district-mandated curricular and instructional programs, conditions for successfully implementing the improvement initiatives do not appear to be in place. The refinement and implementation of the plan will require extensive, sustained collaboration and communication between school and district leaders.

APPENDIX A
Team Members

Aretha Miller, Panel Chairperson, Project Manager, SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA.

Geri Lyn Ajemian, Ed.D., Panel Coordinator, Department of Education, Malden, MA.

Kathleen Esoian, Title I—Reading Teacher, Haverhill Public Schools, Haverhill, MA

Erin Furey, House Coordinator, Newburyport Public Schools, Newburyport, MA.

Jeffrey Wolff, Compass Principal, Millis Public Schools, Millis, 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