

## **School Panel Review Report Homer Street Elementary School Springfield Public Schools**

### **Introduction**

The purpose of the School Panel Review Process is to assist the Commissioner of Education in determining whether State intervention is needed to guide improvement efforts in schools where students' MCAS performance is critically low and no trend toward improved student performance is evident from MCAS data. The Homer Street Elementary School met this criterion and was one of 16 schools selected for panel review in the beginning of 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 Homer Street 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.

### **Homer Street Elementary School Profile**

#### **Enrollment**

The Homer Street School is one of 33 elementary schools in Springfield. The school serves students in kindergarten through grade 5. Enrollment at the Homer Street School has steadily decreased over the last four years, from 540 in 2001 to 400 as of October 1 this academic year, according to preliminary tabulations. Demographic statistics show that the school may also be slowly undergoing a transition. As the percentage of Hispanic students has increased over the last four years, the proportion of other races has decreased. In 2001, Hispanic students accounted for 40 percent of the school's total population. This year, they account for 55 percent

of the total student body. Black students comprised 49 percent of students in 2001; this year they make up 40 percent. White students, who accounted for 11 percent in 2001, now account for five percent. The only other reported race to experience an increase is Asian, from none in the previous three years to one percent this year.

The percentage of low-income students at the Homer School grew steadily over the last four years, rising from 61 percent in 2001 to 92 percent in 2004. Another subgroup that also demonstrated steady growth during this time is the non-native English speakers population, which went from nine percent in 2001 to 25 percent in 2004. The proportion of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students doubled to 18 percent in 2004 as compared to nine percent in 2001. In 2003, eleven percent of students enrolled at the school received special education services. This year the percentage of students receiving these services is twelve.

In 2003, the attendance rate at the Homer School fell below the state's 92 percent minimum to 89.5 percent. On average, students were absent 14.9 days that year. Last year retentions rose to seven percent. The retention rate in the previous year was one percent. The statewide retention rate was 2.6 percent in 2003. Out-of-school retentions in 2003 were 1.4 percent.

## **Staffing**

In their 2003 Staffing Report, the Homer School reported that its staff of 51 includes one administrator, one guidance counselor, one curriculum facilitator, eight teacher aides, and 41 teachers. Fifty-seven percent of the staff has been at the school for fewer than five years.

## **MCAS Overview**

Students at the Homer Street School are assessed in grades 3 and 4 in English language arts (ELA), and in mathematics in grade 4. In the Mid-Cycle III (2003) report, the school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for all its subgroups.<sup>1</sup> Since 1999, the school has not made AYP in either subject.

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

### **GRADE 3**

---

<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 Homer School in 2003 were Special Education, African-American/Black and Free/Reduced lunch and Hispanic.

### *Regular Education*

In 2003, the performance in ELA of regular education, third-grade students was lower than any previous year. In 2001, 28 percent of students in grade 3 were Proficient. Fifty-nine performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 13 percent at Warning. In 2002, 30 percent of scores were at the Proficient level; 63 percent of students were in Needs Improvement, and eight percent in Warning. In 2003, the proportion of Proficient students fell to 28 percent; 52 percent be at the Needs Improvement level, and those in Warning rose to 20 percent.

### *Special Education*

In 2001, 15 percent of special education third grade students were Proficient in ELA. Forty-six percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 30 percent at Warning. In 2002, fewer than 10 students were assessed in this area. In 2003, 47 percent of scores were at the Needs Improvement level, with the remaining 53 percent in Warning.

### *Limited English Proficient*

Prior to 2003, fewer than 10 LEP students were assessed in grade 3. In 2003, 46 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level and 54 percent at Warning.

## **GRADE 4**

### *Regular Education*

As compared to previous administrations of the MCAS, the performance in ELA of regular education students at the grade 4 level decreased in 2003. In 2000, one percent of students tested were Proficient. The majority (75 %) scored at the Needs Improvement level while 24 percent were at Warning. In 2001, the proportion of Proficient students rose to 17 percent; 47 percent were in Needs Improvement, and 36 percent at Warning. In 2002, proportion of grade 4 students performing at the Proficient level fell to 12 percent, while those in Needs Improvement rose to 53, and students in Warning remained almost the same with 34 percent. Last year, the percentage of Proficient students fell by half to six percent. Sixty-four percent of students performed at the Needs Improvement level, and the remaining 30 percent at Warning.

### *Special Education*

In 2000, the performance of special education students at the grade 4 level in ELA was evenly divided between the Needs Improvement and Warning levels. In 2001 and 2002 fewer than 10 students were assessed. In 2003, 36 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level and 64 percent at Warning.

***Limited English Proficient***

Fewer than 10 students have been tested in the last four years at this school.

**Student Performance in Mathematics****GRADE 4*****Regular Education***

Over the last four years the performance of regular education students at the Homer School has shown no signs of improvement. In 2000 13 percent of students assessed were Proficient; 46 percent scored at the Needs Improvement level, and 41 percent at Warning. The following year, one percent scored at the Proficient level of performance; 43 percent scored in Needs Improvement, and 55 percent at Warning. In 2002, eight percent of students were Proficient and Advanced; 42 percent were in need of improvement, while the majority (50 %) performed at Warning. In 2003, the proportion of Proficient students fell to two percent. Thirty-eight percent scored at the Needs Improvement level, and the remaining 60 percent at Warning.

***Special Education***

In 2000, 40 percent special education students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 60 percent at Warning. In 2001 and 2002 fewer than 10 students were assessed. In 2003, 29 percent of students scored at the Needs Improvement level and 71 percent in Warning.

***Limited English Proficient***

In 2000 and 2001 fewer than 10 students were assessed in mathematics. In 2002, there no LEP students scored at the Proficient level. Twenty-seven percent performed at the Needs Improvement level and 73 percent in Warning. Last year, the percentage of students in Needs Improvement fell to 10 while those scoring at Warning fell to 90 percent.

**PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS****KEY QUESTION 1: DOES THE SCHOOL HAVE A SOUND PLAN FOR IMPROVING STUDENT PERFORMANCE?**

No. Although an improvement over previous plans, the school's current School Improvement Plan (SIP) has a number of significant deficiencies. Among the deficiencies, the most notable is the failure to have any evaluation of the school's programs, curriculum or prior plans as a key starting point for new plan development. That shortcoming in analysis is reflected in the new plan, which fails to establish specific strategies to address identified program or student weaknesses, meaningful timelines, measurable progress benchmarks and evaluation techniques. There is also no clear component of the plan that provides for periodic review and possible revision of the plan on the basis of student achievement information gained during the year.

There are no solid indications of how the school will hold itself accountable for the plan's purposes.

Such important issues as falling rates of student attendance, declining MCAS results for all groups of students, but most particularly for Special Education students and those with limited English proficiency, changing pupil demographics in a school that has experienced a student enrollment decline of 26% in the last few years and a sharp increase in the school's retention rate last year are neither explained nor addressed in any form in the school's plan.

Members of the school's faculty reported both in the Teacher Survey and in interviews that prior plans as well as the current plan have been inconsistently implemented by all teachers, seemingly without correction or consequence. In fact, inconsistent plan implementation is repeatedly listed in the current plan as a weakness in the activities designed to improve student performance.

On the basis of classroom observations, interviews with teachers and the principal as well as discussions with the district's curriculum specialists, there is a good deal of evidence that specific strategies, either not clearly identified or very broadly mentioned in the written plan, are actually being implemented in the classrooms. Assessment activities, not thoroughly explained in the plan, are being conducted and led by the school's Collaborative Professional Development Teachers (CPDT) in ELA and Math. As will be noted later in this report, the actual activities being carried out in the school appear in some ways more detailed and comprehensive than the plan describes. Teachers overwhelmingly express their support for the plan, as they understand it.

The school received the last MCAS results on the last day of school in June 2003. The development of the new plan, with several teachers who were inexperienced with the process, began in September and took a good portion of the 2003-2004 school year. Some plan revisions are still being made. Some minor changes in the last three plan appendices dealing with action plans, benchmarks and assessment had been made to the plan since panel review members received the SIP before the on site review. The district's curriculum specialists, who had the opportunity to make suggestions about the early draft of the school's plan in the fall, indicated that they had not seen the latest version of the plan. They further indicated their interest and willingness in assisting the school team with their improvements to the current plan. Without exceeding their charge of responsibility, the panel review team feels that, at a minimum, the written plan presented to DOE should be an accurate indication of the full range of improvement activities being conducted at the school, reflecting district oversight in all areas. As will be explained further, the members of the panel review team feel that the current, written SIP does not provide a comprehensive guide or a complete description of the school's improvement efforts.

**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. The school has analyzed the most recent MCAS results, including the determinations made as a result of that analysis in the latest School Improvement Plan (SIP). Review of the most

recent plans revealed some strengthening of data analysis efforts compared with earlier efforts. That analysis is deficient, however, in that no program or curriculum evaluation process was included as a part of the data analyzed. As a result, the school lacked important program information to accurately determine why student performance gaps exist. Student shortcomings were more readily identified than curricular or instructional deficiencies. Further, important issues of inconsistent implementation of the school's plans by the entire faculty, poor student attendance, student behavior and concerns about support services such as counseling and other forms of student assistance, clearly and repeatedly identified in the staff survey as problematic, were neither analyzed nor addressed in the school's Improvement Plan.

The superintendent indicated in his meeting with the panel review team that a system of "Learning Walks", begun in November 2003, would be the primary means of evaluating the effectiveness of the district's curriculum and programs. Any results of that process at this school have not yet been incorporated into the SIP. The principal indicated the need for more time to gather that information and include it in the plan.

Information from other assessment data, collected and used at the school, such as the Developmental Reading Assessment done in grades K-3 as well as "end of unit" evaluations and analyses done by classroom teachers with assistance from the Collaborative Professional Development Teachers (CPDT) in the building was not included in the data analysis process used to develop the current plan.

No formal or rigorous assessment of the school's previous plans was done to assist in the development of the new plan. The discussions about the lack of student achievement progress, conducted by the faculty and the team developing the new plan, appear to have been more speculative than specifically focused on a systematic assessment of the prior plan's results.

**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 improvement objectives listed in the plan, although dealing with important student performance issues, are so broad as to lack the clarity necessary both for effective implementation and meaningful assessment of progress made toward the objectives. Those weaknesses, coupled with the data analysis shortcomings noted immediately above, represent significant shortcomings in the plan.

The objectives are mainly "student centered" rather than "teacher/instruction centered". All of the plan's "instructional change benchmarks" contain the same indication that teachers will participate in professional development activities connected to the objectives listed rather than establishing meaningful benchmarks to measure the plan's impact on student learning.

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

No. The written plan includes statements that seem to reflect the school's thinking about what they need to do but fewer specific strategies about how to do what they indicate they need to do. The panel review team noted, however, that strategies are being implemented in the school and were identified in the principal's school leadership report that are not as clearly identified in the written plan they were given.

Further, it is important to note that the school's faculty reports both a clear understanding of what they are expected to do and their support of those expectations. Driven by the district's adopted curriculum, there is a much clearer indication of specific strategies being used in actual practice than in the SIP document. It is not clear that the selection of the strategies in use was based on current research or any demonstrated level of effectiveness. The faculty's belief in and hope for the success of the strategies being used is clear. In some ways, the SIP could be strengthened and made more accurate by more carefully reflecting the actual practice within the building.

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

No. While the current plan reflects growth in the planning process on the part of school planners, it lacks important plan components. The deficiencies in thoroughly analyzing causal factors were mentioned earlier. There is a clear lack of measurable goals and objectives and an absence of specific steps to assess the plan's effectiveness.

The benchmarks listed in the plan are not meaningfully connected to the objectives stated. They represent a component of things that might support teachers' efforts rather than actual benchmarks. Virtually all timelines are simply listed as "daily" or "weekly". Such indications do not support the concept of planned, methodical progress toward clear goals. They do not appear to be actual timelines, as the members of the panel review understand the term. Measures of plan implementation often list job titles rather than indicate in any way the actual means and methods by which an activity is to be monitored and measured.

Since the school has not evaluated the effectiveness or results of its prior plans, programs or curricular offerings, these deficiencies in the current SIP are significant for two reasons. First, they are critically important parts of meaningful plans. Failure to include rigorous assessment measures reflects an approach lacking solid accountability intentions, denying school planners important information about the steps they are taking to improve student performance. Second, it's important for the school to begin to regularly incorporate these components in all future planning efforts.

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

No. The SIP was developed by a representative group of teachers with some initial assistance in the form of written comments and reactions from district curriculum specialists to an early draft of the plan. Those developing the plan, however, did not evaluate or consider the effectiveness of earlier improvement plans. There is no reference in the current plan to any regular review of progress or for plans to revise the plan based on the school's actual experience with it. The absence of such review will weaken successful plan implementation. The panel review considered that absence to be a significant flaw in the school's plan.

At the same time, the panel noted that the School Centered Decision Making Team (SCDM)/School Council approved the plan which was provided to all faculty and staff members. All were given an opportunity to react to and to make suggestions about the plan. Much professional development training is directly connected to the plan's purposes.

Faculty members overwhelmingly support the plan, indicating their understanding of what it requires of them. As noted above, the current activities and steps being implemented and practiced in the building seem to be somewhat more of a comprehensive plan than detailed in the current written plan. Assessment activities, not clearly identified in the plan, are being conducted. Teaching/re-teaching activities with specific students is occurring.

Interviews with the district's curriculum specialists indicated that they had not seen the final plan produced just before the arrival of the Panel Review team. They understood the shortcomings noted above and expressed interest in making necessary adjustments to strengthen and improve the school's plan.

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

Yes. Conditions sufficient to support successful improvement efforts are evident within the school. Despite some reservations about the steps being taken to assure consistent and successful plan implementation, teachers express very strong support for the principal as the school's leader and the improvement efforts currently being delivered to the school's students. Plan deficiencies, identified earlier, will have an affect on plan outcomes.

There is a great deal of evidence of plan implementation both in the classrooms and from discussions with teachers. Graphic displays of instructional aids, such as the Homer Hornet, the Hamburger approach to writing, super sentences and the like are evident in every classroom and in the school's hallways. Teachers enthusiastically report some initial successes with those approaches.

Professional development activities, focused on the specific steps being undertaken with the plan, have been presented and continue to be planned. Teachers describe discussions at weekly grade level meetings as helpful in identifying and resolving student issues. Some perceive a

gradual reduction in student discipline issues from previous years, a differing response from that reflected in the staff survey.

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

Yes. There is clear support expressed by the faculty for the school principal both in the faculty surveys and in teacher interviews. During interviews, parents also expressed their very positive opinion of the principal. Teachers consider her the school's leader and value both her support for them and her efforts to establish and maintain a positive school climate. They express strong confidence in her motivation and intentions, but less confidence in her management practices, which they perceive to permit inconsistent plan implementation and a lack of accountability for all involved in the delivery of the SIP. Expectations have been raised for students but not fully raised for all teachers as reflected in the plan and described in interviews with school and district personnel.

Effective communication occurs in activities ranging from weekly grade level meetings to School Council meetings and to presentations made to college students and faculty partnering with the school. Many speak of the positive and badly needed improvements made in the physical plant and in the school atmosphere during the principal's three-year tenure at the school. She is seen as genuinely caring for the students, working very hard to bring about needed growth in student achievement.

Some stakeholders have been involved in decision-making as demonstrated by the teachers involved in the development of the SIP and in the participation of faculty and students from American International College in tutoring and mentoring programs for students. The participation of parents as key stakeholders is much less evident and strategies to increase their involvement, participation and support are not included in the school's plan.

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

Yes. A clear majority of staff agrees both with the school's assessment of identified needs and with the improvement strategies they are putting into practice. In responding to the DOE survey, 87 percent of the teachers indicated that there is a well-defined plan and they know and understand their role in the plan.

Their expressions of belief that the current improvement plan will result in measurable, improved student performance are tempered by the shock they experienced when they received last year's MCAS results, achieved with a prior plan. Their disappointment with and surprise about that outcome results in their statements about the current plan being expressed in hopeful terms rather than in terms of solid conviction about the likely effectiveness of the current plan's objectives and strategies. The shortcomings in the new SIP, identified earlier in this report, including the failure to clearly evaluate prior plans and programs to fully inform new planning efforts as well as the absence of clear benchmarks, timelines and thorough assessment activities are significant for this school's faculty and its improvement planning efforts at this time. All of the lessons that

should have been learned from prior plan experience do not appear to have been learned and put into practice.

The current plan has been in place for a very short time. Classroom observations and teacher interviews showed that teachers have begun to implement improvement and assessment initiatives more clearly than the SIP identifies. Some elements of reviewing student progress are being put in place. A clear process for the regular review and assessment of instructional practice is not yet evident. Some teachers express concerns about the consistent implementation of the SIP by all members of the staff.

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

Yes. District leaders are well informed about the needs of the school and describe them in clear and focused terms. They assisted the school in the development of the SIP. As noted earlier, district curriculum supervisors had the opportunity to respond to and make suggestions about the initial draft of the school's proposed plan, which received a very low rating using the district's protocol for such plan evaluation. They indicate that they did not see the completed plan, which currently contains several shortcomings and omissions they could have helped the school to address.

The district administrator, responsible for assisting schools with the development of their improvement plans, notes the improvement in the new plan and the strong support for that plan evident in the building. He believes there is a willingness to continue to make efforts to improve and to respond to further guidance and suggestions on the part of the principal and faculty.

The district made long overdue building repairs and improvements recently, a factor affecting student welfare and staff morale. Teachers report that they have basic curriculum materials to support their efforts. There is an obvious shortage of technology resources in the building and some student assistance programs previously available, such as after school tutoring, which have been eliminated due to lack of funding for transportation. Teachers express some frustration with the loss of needed services for students.

The provision of the Collaborative Professional Development Teachers in ELA and Math is a welcomed and strong support of improvement efforts. Some teachers expressed the need for greater clarity and consistency in the role application of those positions to strengthen those improvement efforts.

## **CONCLUSION**

The school's new School Improvement Plan, developed recently and still being modified, represents improved and more focused planning efforts than reflected in prior plans. It also reflects serious deficiencies in the areas noted, beginning with a thorough evaluation and assessment of prior plans and current programs as a part of the data to be analyzed. It lacks clearly established benchmarks, timelines and assessment strategies, and makes no reference to

plan modifications on the basis of information gained during the year. It also fails to address important factors such as student absences and behavior.

There is strong support for the plan's purposes and the role expected of the faculty in carrying out those purposes. While there is a palpable sense of anxiety about future plan outcomes, there is a very positive climate within the building, much of that directly attributable to the staff's perceptions of the principal and her support of their efforts. Some expressed the view that her practice of "leading with her heart" could be strengthened by stronger management steps to assure that all teachers are fully practicing all of the new plan's requirements. They seem to understand the need for increased accountability in improving student achievement.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Team Members**

**George Blaisdell**, Panel Chairperson, consultant for SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA

**Richard Cunningham**, Assistant Superintendent for Student Support Services, Chicopee Public Schools, Chicopee, MA.

**James Neary**, Panel Coordinator, Program Support Specialist, Massachusetts Department of Education, Malden, MA.

**Ralph Paine**, Title I Director/Instructional Coach (4-8), Boston Renaissance Charter School, Boston, MA.

**Wendy Woods**, Principal, Chester & Blandford Elementary Schools, Gateway RSD

## 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