

School Panel Review Report Washington 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 not at a level that reaches the school's Adequate Yearly Progress targets in English language arts or mathematics, or both. Washington Elementary School met these criteria and was one of sixteen schools selected for panel review in winter, 2004. The panel review was conducted on March 1 - 2, 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 Washington 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.

Washington Elementary School Profile

Enrollment

The Washington School is one of 33 elementary schools in Springfield. The school serves students from kindergarten through grade 5. Over the last five years, enrollment at this school has been steadily declining, from 451 in 2001 to 371 as of October 1 of this school year. There have also been small yet noticeable changes in student demographics. Between 2001 and 2004, the proportion of White students attending the Washington school slowly declined from 21 to 13

percent, while the percentage of Black students rose from 20 to 24 percent. This year 61 percent of students are reported as Hispanics, compared to 58 percent in the last three years. Asian students who accounted for one percent in 2001, this year account for three percent.

Between 2001 and 2004 about 87 percent of the Washington School's students were from low-income families. Nearly 30 percent of the students had a primary language that was other than English. Limited English Proficient students accounted for a similar percentage of the school's student population. This school year 13 percent of students are reported to be receiving special education services, that is three percent less than last year.

In 2003, the Washington School registered an attendance rate of 91 percent, with students absent 13.5 days on average. The school's retention rate was half a percent. Out-of-school suspensions averaged 9.6 percent, more than three percentage points above the state's 6.1 average. In-school suspensions were 2.5 percent.

Staffing

This school year, the Washington School reported having a staff of 49 that includes one administrator, one librarian, two long-term substitutes, one nurse, four specialists, two curriculum facilitators, nine teacher aides, and 30 teachers. Sixty one percent of the school's staff has been there for fewer than five years. Three teachers lack a teaching certification.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Washington School are assessed in English language arts in grades 3 and 4 and in mathematics in grade 4. In 2003, the school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the aggregate and for all qualifying subgroups, except Limited English Proficient.¹ In the last five years the school has not once made AYP. In mathematics last year, the school made AYP in the aggregate but not for its Hispanic subgroup. 2003 was the first time in the last five years that the school succeeded in making AYP.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

GRADE 3

Regular Education

The performance of regular education grade 3 students in ELA has worsened in the last three years. When the test was first administered in 2001, 34 percent of students scored in the

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). In 2003 the qualifying subgroups in ELA at the Washington School were: Limited English Proficient, Special Education, Free/Reduced priced lunch, African American/Black, and Hispanic. In mathematics, they were: Free/Reduced Lunch, and Hispanic.

Proficient category, 60 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and six percent were at Warning. The following year, the proportion of students performing at Proficient decreased to 29 percent, 50 percent were in Needs Improvement, and the proportion of students performing at the Warning level increased to 21 percent. In 2003, 34 percent were Proficient, 44 percent in Needs Improvement, and 22 percent scored in the Warning category.

Special Education

Performance trends for special education students show no improvement since the test was introduced at the grade 3 level. In 2001, 30 percent of special education students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 70 percent at Warning. The next year, the proportions were reversed. In 2003, with 33 percent in Needs Improvement and 67 percent at Warning, the special education students' performance that year mirrored that of 2001.

Limited English Proficient

In 2001, 18 percent of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students were Proficient, and the remaining 82 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level. In 2002, fewer than 10 LEP students were assessed. Last year, 24 percent were Proficient, 47 percent were in Needs Improvement, and 29 percent scored at the Warning level.

GRADE 4

Regular Education

The performance of regular education grade 4 students in ELA has seen no improvement in the last three years. In 2001, five percent of students were Proficient, 71 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 24 percent were at Warning. The following year, the proportion of students performing at Proficient increased to 24 percent, 54 percent were in Needs Improvement, and 22 performed at the Warning level. In 2002, the proportion of Proficient students decreased to 15 percent, 49 percent scored in Needs Improvement, and the percentage of students in the Warning category rose to 36 percent. Last year, 24 percent of regular education students were Proficient, 61 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 15 percent at Warning.

Special Education

In 2000, 23 percent of special education students' performance was in the Needs Improvement category and 77 percent in Warning. In 2001, the performance of special education students in ELA was again divided between the Needs Improvement category, where 20 percent of students scored, and the Warning category, where the other 80 percent scored. In 2002, fewer than 10 students were assessed. In 2003, 19 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 81 percent at Warning.

Limited English Proficient

In 2003, the performance of grade 4 LEP students improved modestly, but still no trends of improvement are evident over the last four years. In 2000, all students tested performed at the Warning level. Both in 2001 and 2002, 17 percent of students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 83 percent at Warning. Last year, 44 percent were in Needs Improvement and 56 percent scored in Warning.

Student Performance in Mathematics

Regular Education

Over the last four years the performance of grade 4 students in mathematics has varied widely making little to no improvement. In 2000, 19 percent of students assessed were Proficient and Advanced. That same year 49 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 33 percent at Warning. The next year, the proportion of Proficient students was reduced to nine percent, 41 percent were in Needs Improvement, while the proportion of those performing at Warning rose to 50 percent. In 2002, seven percent were Proficient, and 32 percent in Needs Improvement. Again those at Warning increased to account for 61 percent of scores. Last year, the percentage of Proficient students further decreased, to three percent. Fifty nine percent of students were in Needs Improvement and 38 percent performed at the Warning level.

Special Education

In 2000, 36 percent of special education students were in Needs Improvement, and the remaining 64 percent performed at the Warning level. In 2001, all but 10 percent performed at the Warning level; none were Proficient. In 2002, fewer than 10 students were tested. Last year, 31 percent scored at the Needs Improvement level and 69 percent at Warning.

Limited English Proficient

Performance distributions over the last four years have varied for LEP students, but little improvement has been made. In 2000, 13 percent of students performed at the Needs Improvement level and 87 percent at Warning. All students performed at the Warning level in 2001. The next year all but seven percent were in Warning; none were proficient. In 2003, 21 percent were in need of improvement and 79 percent scored in the Warning category.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

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

No. The school's initial improvement team was comprised of three staff members. The team's efforts at developing the plan did not comprehensively analyze student assessment results, develop specific and measurable improvement objectives, or state strategies (Instructional Change Objectives) in such a way that would directly impact the identified weaknesses in student performance. The fundamental elements of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) (e.g., timeline, action steps, implementation strategies, learning objectives and designation of responsible parties) were inserted in the School Improvement Plan for Washington Elementary School for compliance to a prescribed template. The template, while comprehensive, did not provide the school with a sound plan for improving student performance.

Although some of the basic components of a plan for improving student performance are present in the current written plan, review of the plan by panel review team members indicates that the full faculty has not yet documented, nor precisely specified either the root causes or the corrective educational strategies that will ensure improved student performance.

Although the school's concrete efforts to improve students' performance, as observed by panel review team members and as evidenced in interviews with faculty and the school's principal, exceed the written documentation of the current School Improvement Plan, the initiatives are neither driven by a sound plan nor consistently implemented throughout 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?

No. According to interviews with the principal and teachers, only recently has the staff at Washington Elementary School participated in a comprehensive analysis of MCAS data or Stanford 9 results. Writing rubric scores have been analyzed at the district level and not been immediately available to inform instruction. Data review and analysis conducted at the district level and the local school level have identified what the gaps in student performance are but have not yet adequately determined why those gaps exist.

From interviews with teachers and administration, the SFA (Success for All) results are used to reorganize the reading groups every eight weeks. Students who do not perform well are regrouped for instruction with little evidence of differentiation of instruction for students who were struggling with concepts in reading. The superintendent stated that "the Latino population is the most needy and SFA is hard to differentiate for ELL students."

While the faculty has developed a *general* view of student deficiencies in each of the framework strands, the causal factors noted in the faculty survey for these deficiencies are generally reported to be rooted in external factors not directly associated with teaching and learning. A survey of staff report, for example, "In my opinion the most significant causes of low performance are: 1)

behavior and consequences (both home and school), 2) parental involvement, 3) lack of school community leadership, 4) employee turnover.”

In an interview the superintendent, he noted that the ownership of the SIP process was narrow at Washington but was now increasing due to a streamlining of the document. It was noted in interviews with sub-groups of faculty and various committees that direct training in the process of data analysis varies across the school.

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. When the template for the SIP was being filled out, the specific improvement objectives developed to address the analysis of existing data did not include ones that are specific and measurable. Upon review of the Washington Elementary School, School Improvement Plan the objectives are not grounded in a local understanding of the root causes of poor student performance.

The School Improvement Plan grew out of a targeted plan for improving students’ ELA skills and performance. While the plan includes an emphasis on reading concepts, writing and vocabulary development and the adoption of SFA and its implementation, the objectives cited do not have measurable outcomes to ensure success. The Student Learning Objectives and Instructional Change Objectives cited in Appendix 12 (School Improvement Plan – Action Plan) do not have operative words that convey measures for accountability or progress over time in fulfilling the stated Student Performance Goal.

Explicit in the SIP is the intent to alter instructional practice, especially in reaction to poor student performance in ELA. According to staff, the instructional changes are a result of SFA and not the result of a detailed analysis of the root causes of poor student performance.

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

No. The School Improvement Plan does not fully *describe* strategies that are likely to lead to improved performance. In the first iteration of the School Improvement Plan, the strategies listed are numerous but do not target the root causes of poor student performance. As an example, a listed instructional change objective states that “Teacher will read to students from appropriate text.” This strategy was aimed at fulfilling the student performance goal to “Increase percent correct on Literature from 51% to 68% by 2004 and from 68% to 75% by 2005 for ALL students.” The instructional change objectives cited in Appendix 12 of the SIP are not specific in their intent to get at the root causes for student underperformance.

The school’s strategies parallel those defined as part of the SFA (Success for All) reading program. However, the generic teaching strategies have not been examined to determine which are effectively implemented and which can be determined to be factors contributing to weak

student achievement. With only generic strategies listed, the plan is inadequate to guide teachers to change their practices in ways that are targeted to specific student weaknesses at Washington.

The school's planning documents (Appendix 11, *Current/New Strategies*, and Appendix 13, *School Improvement Plan - Instructional Benchmarks (ICB) Classroom Checklist*,) include lists of "Proposed New Activities," i.e., ELL Plan, Revision of SFA schedule, Sylvan after school tutorial program, Building Coach for Language Arts, and Desired Teacher Activities. However, in the panel's judgment, the lists are not expressed in language specific enough to lead one to expect their implementation is likely to improve student results. Classroom observations of the school's instructional practices; interviews with the principal, faculty, and school staff; and review of school documents do not indicate that the school's existing instructional practices, organizational structure, and existing culture are likely to lead to improved student achievement.

The School Improvement Plan does not mention a strategy to raise expectations for student achievement, an issue that appears to be a likely factor in the lack of academic progress. The superintendent stated in his interview that one of the greatest needs of the school was to increase academic expectations. A senior staff member noted that as the student demographics shifted over the years the expectation bar was lowered.

In interviews with the principal and the teachers it was noted that the SFA tutorial component is under funded and understaffed. The school has established a "tutorial period" as an after school academic assistance period which is also understaffed. According to the principal, the school has experienced difficulty in securing volunteers and paid professionals to completely fulfill the intent of the after school academic assistance period.

The school has adopted general strategies (SFA) to address student weaknesses in ELA. The school, for example, has focused on developing a consistent vocabulary for teaching ELA in each class across the school through the SFA program. A teacher reported that; "With SFA everyone is on the same page. Children and staff are using the same language in classes." In the panel's judgment, this small step, while admirable, is inadequate to meet the extensive needs of Washington students.

There are some steps already taken at Washington to begin the process of improvement. The school has reorganized the daily schedule, adopted faculty grade-level teaming for planning, and fully participated in meetings to understand the SIP. Two of the staff who are responsible for the professional development of the faculty participated in workshops on critical friends and looking at student work. These strategies, however, are not fully reflected in the current School Improvement Plan and not directly related to any improvement objectives.

Parent engagement is an ongoing concern at the school. Forty nine percent of staff responding to the instructional staff survey are either *unsure*, *disagree*, or *strongly disagree* that "Our school has effective strategies to keep parents informed of their children's academic progress." Sixty four percent of staff are either *unsure*, *disagree*, or *strongly disagree* that, "Our school has effective strategies to actively involve parents in their children's academic progress." These responses indicate an area of need not addressed in the school improvement plans.

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

No. The school's written documentation is not clear. The plan is long and difficult to navigate for meaning and guidance. The most recently crafted executive summary drastically reduced the length of the document, but did not add specificity enough to guide the implementation of planned improvement initiatives.

As described above (see sections A., B., and C. above), review of the Washington Elementary School Improvement Plan indicates that the formal planning document is not sufficiently developed to fully describe the school's actual action steps to improve student performance. The first iteration of the SIP was over forty pages in length. The present format (Executive Summary) of thirteen pages fails to describe specific instructional strategies, specific areas of curriculum development, and targeted Professional Development required to address identified and documented student learning needs in ELA.

In interviews with the faculty, the review panel found that the school has not adequately analyzed the deeper causes of student learning gaps (i.e., ELA deficiencies), nor has the school yet articulated comprehensive strategies (other than those prescribed in the SFA program) to address the specificity of students' learning needs, especially in regard to ELA skills. The interviews also indicated that the whole faculty has only recently become involved in the analysis of MCAS.

The review panel found the template's global objectives of "No Child Left Behind" and multiple appendices not to guide Washington School's improvement initiatives. The multiple appendixes contained information that was difficult to extrapolate. The interrelationship of one appendix to another was not clear and did not support the application of the plan's activities by faculty and staff throughout the school.

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

No. The School Improvement Plan submitted to the district office was not developed through a dynamic process that involved the entire school. In response to the instructional survey open ended question, What are you expected to do, according to your school's improvement plan, to improve performance?, seventeen of 44 staff reported either not to know what to do, had received multiple copies of the SIP and were unsure of what to do or had a mixed reaction of uncertainty. That statistic coupled with the fact that 57 percent of the faculty reported that "School Improvement Planning" was available but not adequate indicates that the plan was not developed through a process that will support its successful implementation.

Interviews with Washington teachers and testimony by district administrators indicate that that professional development for Washington School personnel is connected to the plan. Individual and focus group interviews with Washington teachers also indicate that faculty was involved in

the development of the executive summary of the School Improvement Plan. According to interviews, while the faculty views the executive summary as helpful in focusing and planning their instruction, there was not unified enthusiasm for all its elements.

The process that the Washington School went through in developing the SIP was not unlike the analysis of its assessment data. Both were initially done by small sub-groups that were not representative of the entire staff. Interview with parents revealed that not one parent had seen the school improvement plan or understood its purpose. When the process is not inclusive, the impact of the process is limited to very few and the unified enthusiasm for the product is diminished. Teacher responses to questions about the school improvement process noted a lack of consistency in understanding the priorities, the importance, and the strategies necessary for improving student performance.

While the executive summary of the SIP was developed in a more collegial manner, the initial process was flawed. The panel review in interviews with the faculty heard comments such as “I don’t know who wrote the plan.” “I was not involved in the development of the plan.” “I have never seen a copy of the complete School Improvement Plan.” This evidence underscores the fact that the process for developing the school improvement plan was not done in a manner that would generate support for its successful implementation.

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

Yes. Conditions are conducive to the successful implementation of a carefully constructed, sound School Improvement Plan. Observation of instructional practices, interviews with Washington teachers, observation of school climate, and interviews with district administrators (e.g., Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents for Instruction) indicate that there is positive intent of purpose toward improving the performance of Washington School students. .

In interviews, district leaders reported the importance and value of the School Improvement Plan and noted the importance that district analysis of student data played in enabling Washington (and other Springfield schools) to focus on actions not mentioned in the SIP to improve student achievement. Additionally, interviews with most Washington faculty, Washington curriculum staff (SFA coordinator, Title I, Collaborative Professional Development teachers), parents, and school council members, indicate a confidence in Washington’s principal to advance student achievement. This was contrary to the recently conducted faculty survey, which reveals there is mixed confidence in Washington’s principal to advance student achievement.

Although there were indices in the survey rated below positive for leadership, the majority of the responses were positive, suggesting that there exists leadership capacity to turn the school around and improve student performance.

There are conditions in the building now that didn’t exist in prior years (a new discipline plan, Pioneer Valley Partnership, a more active PTA, dedicated district efforts toward instruction), that will assist in the implementation of an improvement plan. These examples and the principal’s

positive attitude contribute to conditions for the successful implementation of a school improvement plan.

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

Yes. Interviews with staff indicate that there is mixed support for the school's principal among school staff, and the school council to promote a positive school climate. The faculty survey indicates that there is mixed support for the school's leadership; the majority of the responses to the indices were positive, suggesting that the staff in general agrees that the school does have effective leadership and sound management.

Parents of Washington students and paraprofessionals both stated their support for the school's leadership efforts to inform and involve families and support staff in the education of children, despite the contrary responses to the instructional staff survey.

The principal's expectations for teachers and students and her commitment to Washington students are evident in her caring and accessibility. The principal was observed to be around the building having intimate talks with students and staff. Staff did say in interviews that she is accessible and available. The individual belief on the part of the leadership that all children can learn has had a positive impact on the culture of the school.

Staff reported that faculty meetings are used for improvement issues. Agendas are established with purpose and exist to communicate clearly the intent of the day. The principal stated in her interview an acknowledgement of the challenges she faces as a new principal.

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

Yes. With all the teachers presently aware of the student performance results, the staff has pledged to actively work toward improving student performance.

Interviews with faculty indicate that Washington's staff endorses the planned improvement strategies of SFA contained in the School Improvement Plan. The panel review team did learn in interviews and confirm through observations that while teachers are not actively engaged in conversations about teaching and learning mentioned in the School Improvement Plan, they are actively working to improve student performance.

In eleven classroom observations and ten focus group interviews with Washington faculty, the panel review team noted that the school's faculty is aware of SFA and supports improvement efforts embedded in SFA. The narrowness of the understood improvement efforts supports the mixed response to question 12 ("What are you expected to do, according to your school's improvement plan, to improve performance?") of the recent teacher survey. Teachers did however speak of trying new teaching strategies prescribed in SFA. In interviews, teachers reported that the recent availability of data (SFA, MCAS, writing rubrics), SFA training and access to consultations and the Collaborative Professional Development teachers (CPD) combine

to support Washington faculty and, in turn, sustain faculty's confidence in Washington's efforts to address student's learning needs.

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

Yes. In interviews with district leaders, the review panel heard first hand about the Washington School's pressing needs. District leaders are well aware of the students' learning gaps. The district has established positions and processes that are aimed at providing guidance and support.

In a focus group interview conducted by the panel review team, district leaders discussed the district's analysis of student performance data, and indicated a range of measures that the district has taken to enhance student achievement including putting in place Collaborative Professional Development teachers, Training for Critical Friends coaches, unified extended day for teachers (per contract), Pioneer Valley Project, and four professional days prior to the opening of school for Washington teachers. Each of these initiatives is designed to support staff in their efforts to gain core knowledge about data analysis, develop strategies for diverse learners, communicate across grade levels, and bring about more partnerships with parents.

Additionally the principal has a mentor, professional development is made available to the staff on a regular basis and there was professional development made available for the SIP team. The district has implemented "Learning Walks" which support the School Improvement Plan. Three have occurred, with another planned for the spring. There is evidence that there is a district approach to solving Washington's problem in ELA. Each "Learning Walk" is targeted by the principal in advance to gather information about instruction to be used in discussion with the staff about how to improve student performance. Thus far the "Learning Walk" data has been used to generate discussions about assessment, instruction, and the SIP.

With the support of the district, the school elected to partner with SFA to improve student performance in ELA. Additionally the district office is committed to a review of school- and district busing boundaries. A redistricting effort would balance the student demographics in the building and allow for a more even distribution of human resources. Presently the Special Needs population and the ELL population are out of balance with other schools in the area. Documents confirmed that the school district is now addressing student mobility challenges and establishing district-wide curriculum consistency. These efforts, some of which are currently in effect at Washington, are designed to cumulatively impact student performance and to ensure improved student achievement.

CONCLUSION

The Washington School Improvement Plan does not specify the root causes for students' low performance in ELA and thus its objectives and strategies may or may not have a positive impact on student achievement. The school's efforts to improve students' performance, as observed by panel review team members and as evidenced in interviews with faculty and the school's principal, exceed the written documentation of the current School Improvement Plan. However the enacted initiatives are neither driven by a sound plan nor are consistently implemented throughout the school.

From observations of instructional practices, individual and focus group interviews, the panel review team were unified in their judgment that conditions are in place for successful implementation of a modified and clarified School Improvement Plan. The school possesses the conditions for students to become successful.

**APPENDIX A
Team Members**

William H. Wibel, Panel Chairperson, SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA

Jim Neary, Panel Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Education, Malden, MA

John Peron, Principal, Pittsfield, MA

Slavojka Sheehan, Instructional Coach, Boston Public School, Boston, MA

Paul Swen, Assistant Superintendent, Carlton, MA

APPENDIX B
UNDER-PERFORMING PANEL REVIEW SCHEDULE
Detailed Schedule for Review Panel School Site Visit

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 judgments 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—5:00 p.m. Panelists meet with Principal (and one other school-based individual, if appropriate). [location: the school]
- 5:00—6:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 2:** panelists synthesize interview information, further define findings, prepare questions, and develop a team strategy for Day 2 of the review. [location: hotel]

Day 2

All activities take place in the school

- 8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Panelists meet with the Principal
- 9:00—9:30 a.m. Panelists meet with the School Council (SCDM)
- 9:30—10:00 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

- 10:00 —11:15 a.m. Classroom observations and teacher interviews*

	Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
10:00 – 10:40 a.m.	Observe teacher 1	Observe teacher 2	Observe teacher 3	Observe teacher 4	Observe teacher 5
10:45 -11:15 a.m.	Interview teacher 1	Interview teacher 2	Interview teacher 3	Interview teacher 4	Interview teacher 5

11:25 a.m.—11:55 p.m. **Teacher Staff Focus Group # 6 & 7:** Panelists A & B meet with six staff in a focus group setting, panelists C & D meet with six staff in a focus group setting. Consultant co-chair to work on report.

12:00—1:30 p.m. **Team Meeting # 3** Working lunch

1:30—2:30 p.m. Classroom observations and teacher interviews*

	Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
1:30- 2:00	Observe teacher 6	Observe teacher 7	Observe teacher 8	Observe teacher 9	Observe teacher 10
2:00-2:30	Interview teacher 6	Interview teacher 7	Interview teacher 8	Interview teacher 9	Interview teacher 10

2:30—3:00 p.m. **Teacher Staff Focus Group # 7 & 8:** Panelists A & B meet with six staff in a focus group setting, panelists C & D meet with six staff in a focus group setting. Consultant co-chair to work on report.

3:00 – 3:30 p.m. Closing meeting with the principal to discuss next steps (all panelists are present)

3:30—5:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 4:** panelists deliberate and form conclusions