

## **School Panel Review Report James F. Leonard Middle School Lawrence 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 Leonard Middle School met this criteria and was one of sixteen schools selected for panel review in winter, 2004. The panel review was conducted on Jan. 21-22, 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 Leonard 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 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.

### **James Leonard Middle School Profile**

#### **Enrollment**

The James Leonard Middle School is the only middle school in Lawrence, and one of 13 schools serving students in grades 6-8. Preliminary enrollment results show nearly 450 students attending this school as of October 1, 2003. Over the last four years, enrollment at the Leonard School has fluctuated between 360 and 606 students. During this period, the percentage of Hispanic students steadily increased while that of other racial groups declined. The proportion of Hispanic students rose to 96 percent this year from 80 percent in 2001. White students

accounted for eleven percent of the student body in 2001; this year they comprise two percent of the population of the school. The percentage of Black students in 2004 is three.

Between the 2001 and 2004 academic year, the population of low-income students at the Leonard School fluctuated between 85 and 93 percent. During this same period the percentage of students for whom English is not the first language increased from 78 to 93 percent; and the proportion of Limited English Proficient students fluctuated between 12 and 18 percent. In 2003, 18 percent of the total student body received special education services. For this academic year, 16 percent of students are reported to be receiving special education.

Between 2000 and 2003, attendance at the Leonard Middle School fluctuated between 93.9 and 95.1 percent, with students absent between 6 and 10 days on average. While in-school suspensions averaged 1.5 percent in 2003, the percentage of students suspended in school ranged from 13 to 22 percent in the three previous years. Out-of-school suspensions showed no trend. They fluctuated between 17.5 percent and 5.3 percent. Exclusion data for 2003 for the Leonard School is not available. 2002 exclusion data showed a sharp decline to 2.8 percent from 17.2 percent in 2000 and 6.6 percent in 2001.

### **Staffing**

The staff data report filed by the Leonard Middle School this academic year indicates that the school has a staff of 39 that includes two administrators, one guidance counselor, one nurse, 35 teachers, and two teacher aides. Seventy-two percent of the staff at Leonard has been at the school fewer than five years. All but three teachers are certified in the subjects they teach.

### **MCAS Overview**

Students at the Leonard Elementary School are assessed in grades 6 and 8 in mathematics and in grade 7 in English language arts (ELA). In the mid-Cycle III report (2003-2004) the school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the aggregate and for all its subgroups in ELA.<sup>1</sup> The school has made AYP twice for ELA in the last five determination cycles. For mid-Cycle III, the school failed to make AYP in the aggregate and for all its subgroups except Free/Reduced Lunch. Since 1999, the school has not made AYP in mathematics.

### **Student Performance in English Language Arts**

#### **Regular Education**

No clear trends emerged from the performance of regular education students in grade 7 in ELA. In the first year of administration of the MCAS in 2001, 32 percent of students were Proficient or

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 Leonard School in 2003 were Special Education, African-American/Black, Free/Reduced lunch and Hispanic.

Advanced, 52 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 16 percent at Warning. In 2002, the percentage of Proficient students fell to 24 percent. That year the proportion of students in Needs Improvement rose to 57 percent and those in Warning rose to 19 percent. In 2003, the percentage of Proficient students decreased by one percent and those scoring at the Needs Improvement level increased to 66 percent. The percentage of regular education students performing at Warning fell to 11 percent.

### Special Education

In 2001, 36 percent of special education students in grade 7 performed at the Needs Improvement level and 64 percent at Warning in ELA. In 2002, fewer than 10 students were assessed. In last year's assessment (2003), five percent of special education students were Proficient, 24 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 70 percent in Warning.

### Limited English Proficient

No data is available for these students. Fewer than 10 Limited English proficient students have been tested at this grade over the last three years.

## **Student Performance in Mathematics**

### GRADE 6

#### Regular Education

The performance of regular education students at the grade 6 level has been static in the last three years. Half of the regular education student population has consistently performed at the Warning level, and fewer students are Proficient each year in mathematics. In 2001, when the test was first administered at this grade level, 21 percent of students were Proficient and Advanced; 29 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level; 50 percent were at Warning. In the following year, the percentage of Proficient and Advanced students decreased to 17 percent. Thirty-five percent of students were in need of improvement and 49 percent scored at the Warning level. In 2003, 15 percent of students were Proficient and Advanced; the same proportion of students scored at the Needs Improvement and the remaining half performed at the Warning level.

#### Special Education

The performance of special education students in mathematics has gotten consistently worse over the last three years. In the first year that the test was administered, 18 percent of special education students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 82 percent in Warning. In 2002, five percent were Proficient; another five percent scored in the Needs Improvement level, while the majority (90%) was at the Warning level. Last year, there were no Proficient students. Four percent of scores fell in the Needs Improvement level and 96 percent at Warning.

### Limited English Proficient

In 2001 and 2002, fewer than 10 students were tested in grade 6 mathematics. In 2003, eight percent of Limited English Proficient students were proficient in mathematics, another eight percent performed at the Needs Improvement level and 85 percent at Warning.

## GRADE 8

### Regular Education

From 2000 to 2003 the performance of grade 8 regular education students at the Leonard School remained stable with nearly 70 percent of students performing at the Warning level and very few reaching the Proficient and Advanced levels. In 2000, seven percent of regular education students assessed were Proficient or Advanced; 25 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 69 percent at Warning. Student performance distribution in 2001 mirrored that of the previous year. Seven percent were found Proficient or Advanced; 23 percent were in Needs Improvement, and 68 percent at the Proficient or Advanced levels fell to five percent; 22 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 74 percent of scores were at the Warning level. Student performance in 2003 remained relatively constant with six percent of students at the Proficient level, 27 percent in Needs Improvement and 67 percent at Warning.

### Special Education

The performance of special education students at this school has remained static. In 2000 and 2001, 100 percent of students performed at the Warning level. In 2002, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2003, three percent were Proficient, another three percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 94 percent at Warning.

### Limited English Proficient

Fewer than 10 LEP students were tested at this grade in 2001 through 2003.

## PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

Yes. The staff at the Leonard Middle School used the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process to develop its Comprehensive Educational Plan for the 2003-2004 school year. Through the PIM process they were able to use student achievement data to not only identify the gaps in their curriculum and instructional practices, but to pinpoint the factors that have made it difficult for them to significantly raise students performance, particularly in the area of mathematics.

The goals and objectives that are outlined in the CEP are very clear and easily implemented in the school. Most importantly, they are directly linked to the teaching and learning issues that have identified from the PIM process. The school has also identified action steps that it will implement to achieve its goals of raising student performance during the 2003-3004 school year.

The CEP is a living document at the school because it is constantly being monitored by the staff. This constant monitoring, makes it possible for them to determine the efficacy of the plan. By doing this, they are able to adjust their strategies to address more effectively the needs of the students in the school.

**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. The school, with support from the district, has analyzed a variety of appropriate data to accurately identify the gaps in student learning as well as the factors that are having a negative impact on student performance. The school, then, uses this information to inform the development of its Comprehensive Educational Plan.

The school has done an extensive item analysis of the MCAS to clearly identify the areas in math and English Language Arts that students need to improve in. It has also collected and analyzed its internal assessment data. For example, it has done an analysis of student performance on the Terra Nova, Scholastic Reading Inventory, the Success for All 8-week reading assessment, the Gates McGinite Reading Test, the Lawrence district math assessment; and teacher made mock MCAS tests. According to teachers, this analysis provides them with information about what is happening at the classroom and instructional level. They have reported that they then use this information to make adjustments to their lesson plans and instructional practice.

Lawrence Public School district does a mid-year and annual review of the Leonard's student performance data to monitor its progress in raising student performance. Both the principal and the superintendent have reported that by analyzing the schoolwide data they have been able to make some determination about the efficacy of the school and district's improvement initiatives. According to the district curriculum coordinator, the district uses this information to revise its curricula and to develop professional development workshops for teachers

Because both the principal and assistant principal at the Leonard understand the importance of using data to raise student achievement, they make sure that there are systems in place at the school to facilitate this process. They use their collaborative meeting times as well as some of their professional development days to get teachers to meet in or across grade levels and in their content areas to become actively engaged in looking at student performance data. According to teachers, by actively looking at student data they have been able to start the process of developing a professional learning culture because it forces them to reflect on their practice and share ideas and strategies with each other.

**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. Through the implementation of the PIM process the school was able to clearly identify the factors that are responsible for low student performance. According to school leaders and teachers, some of these root causes include: the high mobility rate among students that make it very difficult for them to build on students' learning; the challenges of educating a student body that is made up primarily of English Language Learners; and the fact that students lack of basic skills in math and ELA to be experience success with the curriculum..

The improvement objectives in the CEP, are clearly linked to the school's efforts to ramp up students' skills in both math and ELA and to address the needs of ELL students. The push for the school, therefore, has been to improve the quality of professional development for teachers. They are expected to participate in both district and schoolwide trainings that will enable them to become more adept at implementing the district mandated Connected Math Program (CMP) and Success For All Reading Program in their classrooms. The principal and superintendent have stated that the school monitors its progress in meeting these objectives in a variety of ways. First, the leadership keeps track of the number and quality of professional development trainings that teachers participate in. Second, they, along with the content area coaches, conduct walk-throughs and classroom observations to check the quality of instruction as well as implementation of the schoolwide curricula. And third, they look at student performance on informal assessments to determine if their action steps are being effective.

Although the objectives are written in very broad terms on the CEP, there is clear evidence that the school has done a lot of work to make them more specific so that teachers can successfully implement them in their classrooms. Members of the Leadership Instructional Team (ILT) reported that teachers meet in their grade level and subject areas to use the Comprehensive Review protocol (CRP) to make the objectives in the CEP more specific and focused on student learning. The CRP was designed by the Lawrence Public School district to help teachers become more targeted in their approach to instruction as well as reflect on their practice. On the CRP, teachers have to identify the specific learning objective—which is aligned to the state's learning standards—they are addressing in their classrooms, identify the action steps that they will take to help students learn the concepts and skills that are associated with the learning objective, evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies they used, and to identify next steps.

Information from the protocol is then used to make changes to the instructional practice in the classroom. Teachers meet daily in their Collaborative Team Planning meetings to have conversations about how they are using the tool in their classrooms. They have reported that it provides them with the opportunity to learn from and share ideas with each other; thus, fostering a professional learning culture throughout the school.

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

Yes. The Leonard's CEP clearly outlines strategies for improving student performance in both math and ELA. In class observations and conversations with school personnel, panel members saw strong evidence of the school's commitment to implementing these strategies to raise student academic performance.

Analysis of the student performance data reveals that the majority of students at the Leonard are having difficulty with the district mandated CMP curriculum. According to the Leonard staff, students struggle with the math program because they lack basic math and language skills. In order to address this issue, the school has increased the amount of time that students receive instruction in math by adding a math support class to their schedule. Also, there is a strong professional development component in the school that is designed to help teachers become more proficient in implementing CMP in their classrooms. For example, they meet with the math coach on a regular basis and participate in district wide trainings that are designed to help them implement each new chapter of the CMP curriculum. Since the school is piloting the math support class this school year, panel members could not determine if it has helped them to achieve their goal of improving student performance in math. The school, however, is in the process of collecting and analyzing math scores for its mid-year evaluation of its CEP and will have more information about the efficacy of this strategy.

To build students' literacy skills, all the teachers at the Leonard use the district mandated Success for All Reading Program. They participate in extensive professional development that includes training and working with a SFA curriculum coordinator and consultant, who visits the school in the fall and the spring. Students' results on the MCAS and on internal assessments show that they are making some gains in ELA. The teachers attribute this success to the fact that SFA requires homogenous groupings of students which makes it easier for them to address their individual learning needs.

Although students at the Leonard seem to be making progress in ELA, there, however, panel members are concerned that this might not be the case for many students who are English Language Learners. In class visits, panel members witnessed ELL students having difficulty achieving the learning goals that have been set for the class despite the fact that the teachers use a variety of instructional strategies, such as collaborative learning groups and providing them with text books that are at their language development level, to help them. In interviews with panel members, teachers talked about the challenges of meeting the needs of diverse learners in their classrooms. This was also reflected on the teacher survey in which they identified participating in workshops that would enable them to better address the needs of diverse learners as their second most important professional development need. Both the principal and the superintendent have argued, however, that since SFA is focused on building students' literacy skills it is a good program for English Language Learners.

Although it was stated in the Leadership Report and not in the school's CEP, the school created a Learning Center to help special education students meet the Student Learning Objectives that have been identified for the 2003-2004 academic year. Both the principal and assistant principal reported that they made the decision, at the request of the special education teacher, to create the Learning Center when they realized that the school's pullout model for working with special education students was causing them to fall behind in the core content areas. Students with IEPs now receive one on one academic support in the core subject areas in the Learning Center. Both the principal and special education teacher have reported that they are beginning to see some improvement in students' performance. According to them, student participation rate went up by sixty percent and that there has been a significant decline in the number of suspensions for these students.

The school has also instituted other strategies to improve student achievement. For example, it has a partnership with GEAR UP to provide students with additional academic and life skills support. It has also instituted the breakfast and lunchtime help program among others to nurture students' academic growth. The panel has determined, based on its observations and conversations with school personnel, that the strategies that the school is currently employing to raise student achievement are likely to be successful if they are implemented well.

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

Yes. Because the school is very committed to improving student achievement the CEP has become a living document that is constantly being updated (it is reviewed mid year by the school and the district) to better reflect the reality of the Leonard Middle School. The use of the Comprehensive Review protocol also enhances the clarity and specificity of the CEP and it does a great job of keeping it current. As a result, a majority of teachers have acknowledged that they find it to be user friendly and that it clearly outlines the school's goals and expectations for raising student performance.

Despite the fact that it clearly outlines the school's improvement initiatives, the Leonard's CEP does not benchmarks for each objective. The lack of well articulated benchmarks in the CEP, seems to make it difficult for the school to know exactly where it is in terms of meeting the performance goals that they have set for themselves.

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

Yes. The school's leadership has worked very hard to involve teachers, parents, and district personnel, in the development of the CEP. Although the majority of teachers at the Leonard do not have direct input in the development of the school's improvement plan, they have many opportunities to make indirect contributions to its development. For example, they meet regularly with members of the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) to discuss the work that is taking place in the classroom; use their collaborative team planning meetings and professional development time to review and provide feedback about the Comprehensive Review Protocol and the CEP.

In interviews with the panel, the school administrators, members of the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), and teachers reported that the creation of ILT has led to an increase in teachers participating in the decision making process at the school. The ILT meets weekly with teachers and monthly with the school leadership to monitor and discuss the progress of the implementation of the school's improvement plan. The principal and assistant principal, with support from the ILT, then use the information from these meetings to make modifications to the plan. Most teachers said that they like this new structure because it not only gives them the opportunity to learn about what is going on in the school, but to have some input about the direction of the school. It was clear to panel members, that by using the ILT in this way, the

principal was able to make the decision making process transparent to teachers in the school. This has resulted in their support of the CEP.

Both the principal and district personnel reported that the development of the CEP was a collaborative effort by the school and the district. The district conducted an extensive item analysis of students' performance on the MCAS and this information, in addition to the school's internal assessments, was used to drive the creation of the school's improvement plan. The district also provides the school with some guidance as to how the principal should integrate the district's professional development initiatives into the plan. The superintendent has a deep understanding of the issues that are unique to the school and so is very supportive of the initiatives that the school institutes to address them.

Parents are informed of the CEP in a variety of ways. The principal sends newsletters and memos with information about the schools improvement initiatives to students' homes. The school organized a Curriculum and a Parent Night that it also used to inform parents of the CEP. The Superintendent says that he has monthly meetings with the presidents of the Parent Association and he uses these meetings to inform them of the CEP and to get them to sign off on them. In conversations with panel members, parents have stated that not all parents at the school are knowledgeable about the CEP, but those who do, strongly support it.

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

Yes. Through strong leadership and sound management the principal was able to create an environment that is conducive to the successful implementation of the improvement plan. By working collaboratively with teachers, parents, and district personnel she was able to get their support for the CEP. The fact that district's reorganization of the school has made it possible for the leadership to build systems and infrastructures that will support and sustain its improvement initiatives.

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

Yes. There is shared leadership between the principal and the assistant principal. This shared leadership seems to work well because they both have skill sets that complement each other. Consequently, they are both able to effectively manage the school.

The school's leaders have created opportunities for the different stakeholders to have some input about the management of the school. For example, they created the ILT to get teacher input in the development and assessment of the CEP. Both parents and teachers have reported that the principal and assistant principal have also instituted an open door policy that makes it possible for people to meet with them to discuss their thoughts and concerns about the operation of the school.

The principal tries to develop the leadership skills among her staff. Teachers are encouraged to participate in the hiring of new staff and they are given an opportunity to run the building when both the principal and assistant principal are out. Teachers are also encouraged to be proactive in

their approach to behavior management. This involves creating rich lessons that will keep students engaged in the learning process and addressing behavioral issues as soon as they arise in the classroom. Both parents and students have reported that there has been a decline in discipline issues; thus, creating a positive climate throughout the building. Students have reported that they feel safe at the Leonard.

Teachers have reported that by instituting the walk-throughs and having teachers meet regularly in their grade level and content areas to monitor and reflect on student progress, the school's leaders were successful in creating a professional culture of learning. They, especially those new to the school, feel that this has had a positive impact on culture of the school, because it provides them with the support they need to be effective in the classroom.

The principal has worked very hard to minimize the impact of the district's reorganization efforts to make it the only grade 6-8 middle school in Lawrence. Despite all the chaos that is associated with the creation of a new school, the principal—with help from the assistant principal—was able to create a school is well organized and has all the necessary infrastructures to support teaching and leaning. This was confirmed by the superintendent who expressed a lot of confidence in both the principal and assistant principal. He has stated that both the principal and assistant principal have turned the school around in the two years that they have been there.

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

Yes. Of the twenty five teachers interviewed only three were not supportive of the school's improvement efforts. This fact is supported by information in the teacher survey in which seventy percent of them responded that they are in favor of the CEP. As mentioned in earlier parts of the report, the teachers like the plan because they see it as a clear roadmap for improving instructional practice and increasing student performance. (Sixty nine percent actually stated on the teacher survey that they find the CEP to be a "well defined plan.")

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

Yes. The Lawrence Public School district provides guidance and support to the school in a variety of ways. They provide financial support to the school which makes it possible for leadership to cover the cost of curriculum resources and professional development to improve teaching and learning at the school.

The district is also responsible for providing the scope and sequence for the math and English Language Arts curricula that are being implemented throughout the school. To ensure that teachers are having success with using the curricula, the district has assigned content area coaches to the school to provide guidance and support to the teachers. In addition to placing content coaches into the school, the district has assigned a district liaison to the Leonard. The principal and assistant principal have reported that the liaison is usually their primary contact at the central office. The school leadership also works closely with the district curriculum coordinator who visits the school on a regular basis.

Lawrence Public Schools has modified the school's schedule to give teachers a half day for professional development every month. The superintendent clearly stated that by doing this the district is making sure that teachers have the skills, tools, and content knowledge that are necessary for raising student academic performance. In addition, he sees this as an opportunity for the school to create and sustain a professional learning culture.

The district has provided the school with access to technology (all the teachers have an email account) and created a structure in the school that supports small class sizes, which makes it easier for teachers to address the diverse learning needs of students. As mentioned earlier, the district has played an important role in assisting the school to analyze its student data. It also conducts a mid year and annual review of the CEP as a way of staying informed of the school's progress and needs.

## **CONCLUSION**

The leadership at the Leonard Middle School has a sound plan with clear performance goals and objectives that are based on the school and district's analysis of student assessment data. There is strong leadership at both the school and district level that is committed and working hard to put systems in place to raise student academic achievement. In essence, the school has made progress in creating the right environment for the successful implementation of its improvement plan.

While it is clear that both the teachers and administrators are working hard to raise the standards and expectations for students, it is not clear that all students, especially ELL students, are benefiting from this. The school, therefore, should continue with its professional development initiatives to help teachers become more proficient in delivering instruction so that they can help all students realize their full potential as learners.

**APPENDIX A  
Team Members**

**Aretha Miller, Panel Chair**, Project Manager, SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA

**James Neary, Panel Coordinator**, Department of Education, Malden, MA

**Patricia Clancy**, Title I Head Teacher—Reading/Mathematics, Worcester, MA

**Jane Daly**, Asst. Principal for Curriculum & Instruction, Dartmouth MS, Dartmouth, MA

**Karen Laba**, Director of Resource Development, SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA

**Andrew Zitoli**, Principal, Millis Middle School, 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