

School Panel Review Report William S. Greene Elementary School Fall River Public Schools

Introduction

The purpose of the School Panel Review Process is to assist the Commissioner of Education in determining whether State intervention is needed to guide improvement efforts in schools where students' MCAS performance is not at a level that reaches the school's Adequate Yearly Progress targets in English language arts or mathematics or both. The Greene Elementary School met these criteria and was one of sixteen schools selected for panel review in winter, 2004. The panel review was conducted on January 26-27, 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 Greene Elementary School is deemed under-performing. The panel was not asked to formulate a sound plan for school improvement where such a plan does not presently exist or to recommend a course of action to create the conditions for successful implementation of 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.

William Greene Elementary School Profile

Enrollment

The Greene School is one of 25 elementary schools in Fall River. The school serves 616 students this academic year within a pre-kindergarten to grade 5 configuration. The school's enrollment increased from 208 students in 2003 with the construction of a newly built school facility which merged the staff and student populations from three feeder elementary schools in addition to the former Greene Elementary School. According to the most recent enrollment figures, the school identified 72% of its students as white, 13% as Hispanic, 9% as African American, and 5% as Asian. Between 2001 and 2004 the proportion of Asian students at this

school fluctuated between five and nine percent. Black students accounted for nine to 15 percent of the total population; Hispanics between 13 and 17 percent; and whites between 59 and 72 percent. Native Americans comprised one to two percent.

The school has a School-Wide Title I program and reported that approximately two thirds (64%) of its students are low income. Between 2001 and 2004, the proportion of students for whom English is not the first language rose from approximately one-third (31%) to one-half (49%) of the student body. This academic year 23 percent of students were Limited English Proficient compared to none in the previous three years. In 2003, 21 percent of students received special education services. This year, 15 percent are enrolled in special education programs.

In 2003, the school's attendance rate was 92.4, down from 93.4 in 2000. On average, students were absent 12.5 days in 2003. Retention rates have risen to 4.8 percent in 2003 since 2000 when there were no retentions. Out-of-school suspensions between 2000 and 2003 fluctuated between 1.8 and 12.2 percent.

Staff

This academic year the Greene School reported having a staff of 48 that includes one administrator, three guidance counselors, one nurse, and 44 teachers. All teachers at the Greene School are certified. Approximately one-half of faculty members (19) hold master's degrees and 21 teachers have over twenty years teaching experience.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Greene School are assessed in English language arts (ELA) in grades 3 and 4 and in mathematics in grade 4. In mid-Cycle III (2003), the school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for all its qualifying subgroups.¹ In the last five years, the school has been found to make AYP twice in ELA. In mathematics, the school has not made AYP since 1999.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

GRADE 3

Regular Education

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 Greene School in 2003 were Free/Reduced and White.

No improvement patterns emerge from the performance of regular education students at the grade 3 level in ELA in the last four years. In 2001, 29 percent of students were proficient; 67 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and five percent were at Warning. In 2002, the percentage of students scoring at the Proficient level rose to 56 percent. The percentage of those in need of improvement fell to 30 percent, while those in Warning increased to 15 percent. Last year, 31 percent reached proficiency; 61 percent were in need of improvement, and the remaining eight percent performed at Warning.

Special Education

Fewer than 10 special education students were assessed in 2001 and 2002. In 2003, one third of students were proficient; 58 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and eight percent at Warning.

Limited English Proficient

No Limited English Proficient (LEP) students have been assessed at this grade level.

GRADE 4

Regular Education

Grade 4 MCAS results in English/Language Arts fluctuated from 2000 – 2003. In 2000, approximately three-quarters of students performed at the Needs Improvement level and the remaining quarter at Warning. The following year, seven percent reached the Proficient level; 89 percent scored at Needs Improvement, and four percent at Warning. Results from the 2003 MCAS administration saw an increase in the number of 4th graders in the Warning performance level to 22% from 6% in 2002. Students scoring in Needs Improvement decreased to 55% from 78%. Students scoring in Proficient increased from 17% to 22%.

Special Education

Fewer than 10 special education students were assessed in 2000 through 2002. In 2003, 10 percent of students were proficient; 45 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and another 45 percent at Warning.

Limited English Proficient

Until 2003, there were no LEP students enrolled at this grade level at the Greene School. In 2003, 20 percent of LEP students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 80 percent at Warning.

Student Performance in Mathematics

Regular Education

Low proportions of students reaching proficiency, and high percentages performing at the Warning level have characterized the performance of regular education students over the last four years at the Greene School. In 2000, five percent of grade 4 students assessed in mathematics were proficient. Forty-five percent were in need of improvement, and 50 percent performed at the Warning level. Student performance the following year mirrored that of 2001. In 2002, the percentage of students at Proficient increased to 11 percent; 28 percent were in need of improvement, and 61 percent scored at Warning. Last year, eight percent reached proficiency; 46 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and another 46 percent at Warning.

Special Education

Fewer than 10 special education students were assessed in 2000 through 2002. In 2003, 36 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 64 percent at Warning.

Limited English Proficient

Until 2003, there were no LEP students enrolled at this grade level at the Greene School. In 2003, 8 percent of LEP students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 92 percent at Warning in mathematics.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

Yes. As a result of a year long school improvement process, the William S. Greene Elementary School, following the planning process modeled on that offered by the Massachusetts Department of Education and with the assistance of the local school district, has produced a sound plan. It is focused on three priority areas with performance and learning objectives, strategies, benchmarks and timelines for implementation.

The William S. Greene School, as presently constituted, is one year old and is a newly built facility on the site of the former Greene School. The newly constituted school combines the staff and student populations from three feeder elementary schools in addition to the Greene Elementary School. This improvement plan, begun shortly after moving into the new building was completed in the fall of 2003. It is important to note that this is a two-year plan in its third month of implementation.

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

Yes. School leaders, teachers, staff and parents of Greene Elementary used data analysis and program information to identify student academic weaknesses.

The school looked at MCAS performance data for the past three years in ELA and math while engaged in the Performance Improvement Mapping process. This analysis showed consistently low scores but positive trends in ELA scores and an insufficient change in any category in math. The school was not able to analyze Terra Nova data because the three schools were merged in the middle of the school year and data for the students combined in the new school has not been collated. ELA data from school assessments and Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA) results confirmed the team's conclusions from its MCAS analysis.

In the leadership report, the principal stated, "In reviewing subgroup performance, only free lunch students had a statistically reliable sample to analyze and as a result there is no disaggregated test data by subgroups." While the principal's statement is accurate for state reporting purposes, as a school-wide Title 1 school, Greene Elementary is required to disaggregate and analyze achievement data by several subgroups including race, English language learners, special education and low income status in order to be in compliance with the NCLB law. If the school were to conduct a review by even its small subgroups, it would be better able to meet individual student's needs and to better focus professional development efforts. This is also critically important considering that there are overall 144 transitional bilingual students and 101 special needs students in the school.

In teacher surveys and during the principal interviews, school personnel identified student behavior and the lack of parental involvement as additional barriers to improved student performance. Teachers tended to attribute student learning weaknesses to behavior and home problems more than did administrators. The school has provided for some students who "act out" to attend classes in a time out room for a period of time as one strategy to address behavior concerns. However, the school administration and the School Support Specialist (SSS) offered the view that some of the behavior problems are classroom management issues and they expect professional development and supervision of instruction as outlined in the plan to help alleviate the problem. There is a parental involvement section in the SIP, with goals and objectives geared to increasing parent involvement but not directly connected to the academic program in the rest of the SIP. The parent goals arose as a result of the school identification of the need for parental involvement that was revealed during the PIM process. The panel review team interviewed parent members of the School Council who expressed support for the SIP.

In the interview with the Superintendent, he acknowledged the need and challenge of changing instructional cultures in the school district, and Greene in particular, from teacher-directed to student-oriented. Both the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent stressed improving the quality of instruction rather than teacher qualifications in improving student performance and pointed out that all Greene teachers are qualified and have a Master's degree or are working

towards it. Additionally, teachers involved in the PIM process identified instructional as well as curriculum and assessment causes for low student performances that were common to both ELA and math. In response, the district adopted the research based ELA program, Harcourt *Trophies*, and the school implemented it in all grades in the 2003-2004 school year to assure continuity. *Developing Mathematical Ideas* (DMI), a teaching strategy program with accompanying professional development was introduced a year earlier than planned and a dedicated block of math instructional time was inserted in the day's schedule. Although not contractually required to do so but as a result of involvement in the PIM process, a number of teachers now reference the state learning standards in their lesson plans.

The panel review team reviewed district curriculum guides but they did not seem relevant or useful to the teachers. It was reported that new curriculum guides are being prepared by the district office. At the current time, the school has not developed curriculum maps to outline a specific scope and sequence by grade level. Interviews with the supervisors and the principal's leadership report indicate that the curriculum area supervisors are a presence in the school and the math supervisor is the school's liaison to the district Office of Instruction.

Title 1 resources in the school are targeted to classrooms with high academic needs by the principal. These resources include, among others, four Reading Recovery teachers, a Technology Resource teacher and 7.5 Special Needs teachers. As the implementation of the SIP moves forward and additional disaggregated assessment data becomes available, a reordering of the school's Title 1 resources may be necessary to better meet the needs of the entire student body.

In summary, the leadership, faculty and staff along with the assistance of the School Support Specialist (SSS) and other district personnel has completed an analysis of available data and program information and clearly identified and documented likely reasons for poor student performance. The SIP is well written, easy to understand and the action plan identifies strategies clearly linked to the identified student learning and instructional change objectives.

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

Yes. The plan's improvement goals are clearly written with objectives related to the root cause analysis. The plan sets out all requisite elements of a sound improvement plan with both the instructional change objectives and student learning objectives directly tied to specific findings in areas of identified weakness.

A reading of the plan and the leadership report shows a focus on teaching and learning. The parent goals and objectives in the plan are not directly tied into what the school is doing academically but apparently were not intended to do so. Rather, the parent objectives complement the academic goals based on the school's analysis of its essential needs. The plan's objectives and goals are well written, specific and measurable and within the two year time frame of the plan, achievable.

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

Yes. There are both specific program and instructional strategies in the plan which appear likely to lead to improved student results.

Program strategies are district mandated and have a demonstrated level of effectiveness. The *Harcourt Trophies* series replaces the *Houghton Mifflin Reading Program*, is integrated with existing Literacy Collaborative strategies and extended across the grades K-5, along with guided reading (using the Fountas and Pinell model), to achieve a consistent approach that did not exist before. The scope and sequence in the *Trophies* series appears to guide teachers' planning decisions. The school will continue with Reading Recovery as an intervention program for first graders significantly below grade level.

The math program remains Scott Foresman but *Developing Mathematical Ideas* (DMI), a program providing a variety of instructional strategies for teachers, has been introduced at the district's direction, a year earlier than originally planned. A dedicated one hour math block has been started which mirrors the ELA block of time.

These programs are in the process of being aligned with the standards, provide continuity across the grades for the student and provide professional development in instructional practices all of which were cited as deficiencies in the root cause analysis.

The implementation of the instructional strategies in the plan calls for professional development in many areas including the use of cooperative learning, graphic organizers and scaffolding with students to increase their ability to direct their own learning. Added to that, but not in the plan, is the need for 25 hours of professional development to implement DMI *in addition to* other professional development activities for reading and language topics. The panel review team questions whether this amount of professional development is possible to implement or even feasible, given available resources including time and finances, and the plan is weakened unless the school can faithfully implement the plan in this area.

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

Yes. The Greene SIP is clearly written, comprehensive and provides direction for the implementation of planned improvement initiatives. The plan outlines a reasonable course of action over two years, identifies benchmarks and action steps, as well as the person(s) responsible and resources required for carrying them out. There is clear linkage between identified improvement objectives and planned solutions.

The school's plan is primarily focused on math and literacy. The plan has evaluation methods accompanied by benchmarks to check periodic progress of student performance. To date, in math, these are limited to school selected problems and chapter tests from the Scott Foresman program given twice a year to all students. Students are expected to get 50 percent correct in

November and 75 percent correct in the April assessment. Written samples of the “problem of the day,” also given twice a year, will be scored using a Scott Foresman rubric.

In English Language Arts, Harcourt *Trophies* tests will be administered to all students to check for competency in a variety of reading skills as identified in the plan’s objectives, but assessment dates have yet to be determined. The Mari Clay diagnostic “Observation Survey” will be given twice a year to grades K-2.

The leadership report mentions that although remediation has been available to students it has not been as effective as needed. The plan calls for the development of new assessment tools to identify students and their needs, the use of common planning time for staff to collaborate on remediation, the use of math centers and the increased use of scaffolding techniques to support students with gaps in their skills. These strategies, if faithfully implemented, will address the need for additional remediation/ support the school leader identified as lacking.

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

Yes. Although there are questions concerning the viability of the process for ongoing evaluation of the plan’s implementation, the planning process was inclusive and thorough.

The PIM team was organized shortly after the opening of the new school and was comprised of representatives of all subject area and grade levels. The year-long process of writing the plan involved frequent reviews of the progress and content of the work by the faculty and as a result all stakeholders are familiar with the plan and committed to its implementation, according to teacher interviews and staff surveys.

Interviews with the principal and school support specialist indicated that previous improvement plans were considered but were found to be incomplete in many areas and not relevant to the student body of the Greene school that now consists of three merged schools.

Classroom observations by panel review members show a wide range of teacher competencies from weak to exemplary, perhaps reinforcing the need for the plan, the extensive professional development mentioned in the plan and the necessity for a sustained plan of classroom observations.

Of concern to the panel review team is that, although the SIP has many references to professional development, there is not yet a school or district wide professional development plan indicating the number of days required by the plan or its cost to the district. In addition, the final piece of the plan, a process for ongoing evaluation of the implementation of instructional practices, is incomplete, lacking coordination between the principal, leadership team, grade level teams and faculty self-study group, all of whom have some monitoring responsibilities.

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

No. There is widespread support for the school improvement plan and the principal has the confidence of the entire school community. However, there is uncertainty about the sufficiency of the human and financial resources that the district can provide to fully implement critical professional development and evaluation aspects of the plan.

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

Yes. In a short period of time, the principal has led the move of the faculties, staffs and student bodies of three schools into one new building and facilitated a collaborative approach to the school improvement effort in the process.

Prior to the merger of the three schools, the principal formed a transition team with representatives of the three faculties. These 12 individuals, including the principal, worked on creating a common school vision. They sought to align curriculum, teaching practices and classroom and school management policies of the three schools. Common faculty meetings began three months prior to the opening of the new school. The transition team became the new school's leadership team.

Interviews with faculty, parent members of the School Council, members of the school leadership and P.I.M. teams credit this strong leadership approach of the principal for the eventual smooth transition to the new school and for the positive school climate that presently exists.

The school's P.I.M. team includes representatives from each grade level and subject area as well as the principal and at least one parent. The principal participated in every session and helped to support and guide its work. Grade level teams meet monthly to examine practice and to provide feedback on the SIP implementation.

The panel review team found, in all interviews, expressions of confidence in the principal as the school leader.

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

Yes. The P.I.M. process involved the entire school faculty.

The commitment of school faculty's to the planned improvement efforts was questioned by the panel review team upon a review of faculty responses to the question in the DOE *Instructional Staff Survey* asking them to identify the most significant barriers to student achievement. The majority of responses identified all non-instructional barriers, such as lack of parental support. However, when this was brought to the attention of the principal, the P.I.M. team and individual teachers, they responded that the P.I.M. process, which the entire faculty participated in, had caused them to reflect on their own practices and stated, "We look at things differently now. We

need to zero in on areas of greatest need.” Reference was also made to the impact the graphic “Dimensions of School Improvement,” which was provided during the PIM work sessions, had on their deliberations.

In response to other survey questions and in teacher interviews and focus groups, teachers expressed agreement with identified needs and improvement strategies and stated that implementation of the plan will lead to improved student achievement. However, teachers have also expressed concern about being able to keep up with the professional development demands cited in the SIP and where it would fit in their schedules.

School leaders and staff are aware of the need to develop a process for review and assessment of instructional practices but that development is only in the beginning stages, and consists of self study sheets, grade level meetings and limited classroom observations.

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

No. Although the District does provide significant guidance and support to the school, human and financial resources sufficient to successfully implement the SIP are in doubt.

The Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for Administration exhibited an awareness of the district and school needs during their interview, especially the need to change school cultures and to move to student-centered instruction and away from teacher-centered instruction. The Superintendent is aware of the need for additional administrative staff for the Greene school but due to budget constraints is only able to provide a Teacher in Charge whose administrative role is largely undefined.

There is a district review team that assisted in the development of the school SIP and reviewed the plan several times while it was in development and returned it to the school with appropriate feedback.

The district supports the schools by providing four K-12 curriculum coordinators who also visit schools to conduct classroom observations. At the Greene School, the Harcourt *Trophies* Basal series and the Literacy Collaborative strategies are two initiatives supported by the district and the School Support Specialist is a districtwide position.

However, there is neither a district nor school wide professional development plan; therefore neither the cost nor the time commitment requirements of the Greene school professional development component is known. While the Title 1 funding provides a significant amount toward professional development, it does not appear to fulfill the full complement of activities designated in the plan. Likewise, both the principal and the SSS have indicated in interviews the need for additional human resources at the school to be able to monitor the instructional effectiveness of the plan. The Superintendent has indicated that the budget does not allow for more support.

CONCLUSION

In response to Key Question 1, the panel review team finds that Greene Elementary School does have a sound plan for improving student performance. The school's PIM document reflects a great deal of cooperative work in analysis and planning for the improvement of the instructional program and was accomplished in a short period of time following the transition to a new school.

For Key Question 2, the panel finds that the conditions are not in place for the successful implementation of the improvement plan. Specifically, the plan has a process for ongoing evaluation of the implementation of the instructional change objectives but lacks sufficient human and financial resources to carry out its plans. In addition, the school lacks a calendar that realistically lays out the professional development obligations cited in the SIP.

However, the panel review team agrees that, in light of the fact that the Greene School as presently constituted is only a year old, and in recognition of the advanced state of the plan and enthusiasm of the faculty and staff at this point, there has been insufficient opportunity for the staff and administrators to put into place the structures and procedures to fully implement the plan. In the panel's judgment, the plan developed by the staff and leaders at the Greene Elementary School can be accomplished given more time to identify and acquire the human and/or financial resources necessary to monitor the evaluation of the plan's instructional objectives. Given the recent reconfiguration of Greene, it seems reasonable to the panel to allow at least the balance of this school year to identify and acquire the necessary resources to monitor the plan's implementation. At that time, there would be sufficient evidence to judge the likelihood of long term persistence and commitment toward improvement at Greene Elementary School.

APPENDIX A
Team Members

Joseph Trunk, Panel Chairperson, Consultant, School Works, Beverly, MA.

Geri Lyn Ajemian, Panel Coordinator, Department of Education, Office of Accountability and Targeted Assistance, Malden, MA

Ann Deveney, Sr. Program Director, English Language Arts K-5, Boston Public Schools, Boston, MA.

Fred Scully, Principal, Hyannis West Elementary School, Barnstable Public Schools, Barnstable, MA.

Gerry Quatralo, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Pre-K-12, Title 1 Director, 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