

School Panel Review Report Randolph Community Middle School Randolph 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 schools' Adequate Yearly Progress targets in English language arts or mathematics or both. Randolph Community Middle School (RCMS) met this criterion and was one of 21 schools selected for panel review in fall 2005. The panel review was conducted on November 29 and 30, 2005.

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. Is the school implementing a sound plan for improvement, and what gains have been achieved to date as a result of this implementation?
2. Do the conditions appear to be in place for successful implementation of the school's improvement plan?

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, together with school performance data, will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education for consideration in determining whether RCMS is deemed underperforming. 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 underperforming school, occurs at the next stage of the school review process.

Randolph Community Middle School Profile

Enrollment

The Randolph Community Middle School serves students in Grades seven and eight and is the only school in the district that services these grades. Enrollment at RCMS remained fairly stable from 2002-2004. Enrollment declined significantly, however, from 754 students in 2004 to 662 students in 2005. Student demographics have remained fairly stable over the last four years for the majority of subgroups, with the exception of Black/African American, White and First Language Not English. While the percentage of Black/African-American students has increased (37 percent in 2002 to 45 percent in 2005), the proportion of White students has decreased (43 percent in 2002 to 36 percent in 2005). In addition, the percentage of First Language Not English students has increased from 13 percent in 2002 to 34 percent in 2005.

Proportions of RCMS student subgroups in 2005, as compared to state averages, are presented below:

Subgroup	2005 Enrollment (%)	
	School	State
Asian	11	5
Black	45	9
Hispanic	8	12
Native American	0	0.3
White	36	74
Low-Income	35	28
First Language Not English	34	14
Limited English Proficient	3	5
Special Education	20	16

In 2005, the attendance rate at RCMS was 92.9 percent, with students absent 11.8 days on average. Across the state in 2005, the average attendance rate was 94.2 percent and students were absent 10.0 days on average. The overall rate of absence for RCMS is 1.8 days higher than the state average and 3.0 days higher than the district average. Male students are absent an average of 3.6 more days than are female students and are chronically absent 7.1 percent more often than their female counterparts. While the average number of days absent at each grade level is fairly consistent, there are significant differences in chronic absenteeism between seventh and eighth grade students, with the latter chronically absent 6.3 percent more often than the former. Among races, there are slight differences in attendance rates, except for Asian students who are absent half as often as other subgroups. There are, however, differences in chronic absenteeism across racial subgroups. Hispanic students have the highest rate of chronic absenteeism (29.1 percent), followed by Whites (22.5 percent) and African Americans (22.1 percent), with Asian students chronically absent the least (10.7 percent). RCMS's retention rate was 6.6 percent in 2004, the last year for which this data is available. The school's in-school suspension rate in 2005 was zero percent, and out-of-school suspensions averaged zero percent (a 19.4 decrease from 2003).

Staffing

The 2005-2006 RCMS staffing report indicates that the school is comprised of two administrators, 45 teachers, one school psychologist, one Special Education Department Chair, one school nurse and two teacher aides. The principal has been at the school for seven years and has a total of three years of administrative experience (two years as an assistant principal and one full year as principal). Of the teachers, approximately 60 percent have been at the school for less than five years, 40 percent have been at the school between five and ten years, and no teachers have been at the school more than ten years. Teachers' years of experience in the profession, however, is more equally distributed than is their time at the school. Approximately 33 percent have more than 10 years experience, 31 percent have between five and ten years experience, and 36 percent of the teachers have less than five years teaching experience. Approximately 84 percent of teachers are reported as being highly qualified and 58 percent hold advanced degrees.

MCAS Overview

Students at the RCMS are assessed in Grade seven in English language arts (ELA) and Grade eight in mathematics. RCMS’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report for 2005 Mid-Cycle IV shows an accountability status of Corrective Action for mathematics and Identified for Improvement-Subgroups only for ELA.¹ In the aggregate, the school made AYP in mathematics from 1999-2000 and again in 2003. However, they were unable to make AYP in mathematics for the aggregate in 2001-2002 and 2004-2005. In addition, RCMS has not made AYP in subgroups for mathematics for three consecutive years. In ELA, the school made AYP for the aggregate population from 1999 to 2004, but then failed to meet AYP in 2005. RCMS has failed to make AYP for subgroups for the past three years.

In 2005, the aggregate Composite Performance Indices (CPIs) for Randolph Community Middle School were 78.0 in ELA and 51.1 in mathematics. Year-by-year aggregate CPIs are shown below:

Year-by-Year Aggregate CPI Data Summary		
Year	ELA	Math
2001	81.4	50.8
2002	73.4	48.4
2003	81.3	53.4
2004	80.4	56.0
2005	78.0	51.1
State Target 2005	80.5	68.7

GRADE 7

ELA MCAS Results

Results of the 2005 Grade 7 ELA MCAS for students at RCMS are presented below:

2005 ELA	Percent			
	A	P	NI	W/F
Aggregate	1	43	43	14
Regular Education	2	52	41	5
Special Education	0	10	46	44

Regular Education students at RCMS have significantly outperformed Special Education students in ELA. There has been little progress in student performance since 2001, as reflected in the aggregate Grade 7 MCAS performance presented on the next page:

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, Low-Income, African-American/Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, and White. A minimum of 40 students (or 5% of the total number of students assessed, whichever is greater) 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 Randolph Community Middle School in 2005 were Special Education, Low-Income, African-American/Black and White.

Aggregate ELA	Percent			
	A	P	NI	W/F
2005	1	43	43	14
2004	1	46	41	11
2003	3	49	40	8
2002	1	41	42	16
2001	2	41	42	16

Since 2001, RCMS has averaged 1.6 percent of students scoring in the Advanced category, which is significantly below the state average of 8.4 percent. Student performance at RCMS generally improved from 2001 to 2003 and then declined slightly in 2005. While the percentage of students scoring Proficient has decreased six percent from 2003, the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing has increased six percent. RCMS students scoring Needs Improvement has fluctuated only three percentage points over a five-year time span, with the highest percentage (43 percent) of students in this category occurring this past year. Special Education students exhibit similar trends.

GRADE 8

Mathematics MCAS Results

Results of the 2005 Grade 8 Mathematics MCAS for students at RCMS are presented below:

2005 Mathematics	Percent			
	A	P	NI	W/F
Aggregate	1	15	34	49
Regular Education	2	18	41	38
Special Education	0	3	9	89

Regular Education students at RCMS have significantly outperformed Special Education students in mathematics, with 89 percent of Special Education students scoring in the Warning/Failing category. Student performance in mathematics appears to be heading in a downward trend since 2001, as reflected in the aggregate Grade 8 Mathematics MCAS performance presented below:

Aggregate Mathematics	Percent			
	A	P	NI	W/F
2005	1	15	34	49
2004	4	21	35	40
2003	3	19	31	48
2002	3	13	37	47
2001	5	13	37	45

Students scoring in the Advanced category have decreased from a high of five percent in 2001 to a low of one percent in 2005. Students scoring in the Proficient category reached a high of 21 percent in 2004, and has declined to 15 percent in 2005. RCMS students scored 12 percent

below the state average for students scoring in the Advanced category and 11 percent below state averages for student scoring Proficient. Warning/Failing percentages have increased from a low of 40 percent in 2004 to a high of 49 percent in 2005. Trends for Special Education students are similar over time, although the performance is significantly lower than the aggregate population, as reflected below:

Special Education Mathematics	Percent			
	A	P	NI	W/F
2005	0	3	9	89
2004	1	4	18	77
2003	0	0	18	82
2002	0	0	13	87
2001	0	5	13	82

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

KEY QUESTION 1: IS THE SCHOOL IMPLEMENTING A SOUND PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT AND WHAT GAINS HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED TO DATE AS A RESULT OF THIS IMPLEMENTATION?

Randolph Community Middle School (RCMS) is not implementing a sound improvement plan. The school's improvement document is not based on an analysis of student assessment information. It lacks performance goals, student learning objectives, specific strategies and implementation benchmarks. The School Improvement Plan (SIP) was not developed through a process that is likely to support improvement efforts. Though RCMS staff is working to implement improvement initiatives, they do not have a clear guide to follow.

A. Are the school's written improvement planning documents (including action plans) clear and specific enough to guide the implementation of planned improvement initiatives?

School Improvement Plans were submitted in preparation for School Panel Reviews scheduled in November and December 2005. Teams of three Department of Education (DOE) staff members reviewed the written plans and completed summary assessments of their soundness, based on a Department rubric with specific indicators for five central components: overall clarity and coherence of the plan, identifying and prioritizing problems based on multiple sources of data, analyzing the causes of weakness in student performance, establishing improvement objectives and selecting strategies, and establishing benchmarks for implementation and outcomes. The judgment on the soundness of these written documents provided in the summary rubric was based solely on a close reading of the written documents submitted. It was not a final determination. The panelists used the summary rubric to inform their discussion of the written plan each panelist had read individually prior to the review, and to help focus their time in the school on the implementation of the planned strategies. Final judgment on the soundness of the school's plan—and the panel's overall response to Key Question 1 in the Panel Review Protocol—depended upon further information about the development of the plan and evidence of the plan's implementation that was gathered by the panel during on-site interviews, focus groups and observations.

The written School Improvement Plan at Randolph Community Middle School is not clear and specific enough to guide the implementation of planned improvement initiatives. The SIP was not created based on an analysis of data and it does not contain student performance goals or learning objectives. As written, the RCMS SIP contains overarching improvement goals, but does not contain specific strategies or action steps to indicate how the school will achieve these goals.

Broad improvement goals are listed in the RCMS SIP in three areas: Curriculum and Instruction; School Safety and Discipline; and Communication/Public Relations. Three Major Improvement Goals are listed in the area of curriculum and instruction:

- To increase student achievement and reduce class sizes by un-leveling classes
- To improve student achievement through the use of differentiated instruction

- To improve literacy by reading across content areas through the development of a school-wide reading initiative led by a grant-funded Reading Leadership Team

Although these improvement goals may benefit the school, there is no indication in the SIP as to how they were determined, how they are defined or how these goals will be achieved. Specific areas of low student achievement have not been identified and, therefore, the SIP does not contain learning objectives or performance goals for RCMS students.

School and district leadership are aware of the significant deficiencies in the SIP. The superintendent, principal and assistant principal all indicate that the plan is not data-driven, not instructionally oriented and does not possess benchmarks to measure implementation progress. As stated by the superintendent, “The present improvement plan is only bullets. It needs to reflect where we want to be and develop a planned process to get there together.”

As currently written, the RCMS SIP is not a clear and specific document and is unlikely to be a useful guide for the implementation of improvement efforts. The SIP lacks many necessary and critical components of a sound improvement plan.

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

The RCMS school improvement plan was not developed through a process that is likely to support its successful implementation. The SIP was constructed by the principal only and did not involve a representative group. The school’s faculty is aware of the improvement plan but discussion surrounding the improvement initiatives is limited.

The RCMS SIP was developed by the principal at the end of the previous school year, with little input from staff. Initiatives listed in the SIP are a result of the initiatives the principal implemented at the RCMS during the 04-05 school year. The principal outwardly acknowledged that he “put the plan together on the fly,” during his first year on the job without guidance from the district, support from the community or input from school staff. School administrators and teachers corroborated this non-inclusive process, indicating that they did not contribute to the SIP’s development.

The SIP has been communicated to some of the school’s stakeholders but discussion of the plan’s purpose is limited. When asked in interviews if the school improvement plan was a living document at the school, the superintendent, principal and the assistant principal all agreed that it is not. Faculty members are aware of the SIP and some report that they have seen the document. Some teachers reported receiving the SIP at a faculty meeting this fall; however, other staff recall differently. One teacher stated, “It [the SIP] was passed out with a memo.” Discussion around the plan’s implementation has been limited. In addition to school staff, a small focus group of parents interviewed during the Panel Review (PR) team visit report that they have received a copy of the SIP.

As a result of the school’s status of Corrective Action in mathematics, school and district leaders report plans to revise the SIP using the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process. However, at the time of the PR team visit, this process had yet to begin. The assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction is a trained facilitator who plans to oversee this process through her retirement at the end of this school year.

The RCMS SIP was not developed through a process that is likely to support its implementation. The SIP is not currently a living or working document at the school.

C. To what extent is the school's staff actually implementing the plan?

Because the RCMS SIP is not considered a living document at the school and it does not contain clear and specific strategies to address student weaknesses, the extent that school staff is implementing the SIP cannot be determined. However, school leadership and staff speak uniformly about school-wide improvement initiatives that appear to be linked to the improvement goals listed in the SIP. Staff members possess some understanding of their roles in school improvement and classroom observations indicate that teachers are in the initial phases of implementation. Professional development is not sufficient to influence the necessary knowledge and training to effectively apply improvement strategies.

Based on the improvement goals listed in the SIP in the area of curriculum and instruction (see Question 1A), there is some evidence to indicate that school practices have changed as a result of these initiatives. For example: 1) un-leveling classes, and 2) use of Differentiated Instruction.

At the beginning of this school year, classes at RCMS were unleveled. Level three classes, which consisted primarily of special education students, were collapsed into Level two classes (the general population) to offer all students increased access to the school's curriculum. School leadership reports that this change is having the desired effect, and has also resulted (in some cases) in decreased disciplinary problems. In addition, some teachers report success with the un-leveling of classes. Other staff members report mixed feelings with regard to the new class structure.

Efforts to differentiate instruction were also evident at RCMS. When asked in an interview what the PR team should expect to see when observing differentiated instruction, the principal stated, "Student choices... more student-centered activities." Observations in nine classrooms yielded four examples of student choices. Student-centered activities were observed in five of the nine classrooms. In one classroom, for example, students had the choice to work either at their desks or on the board, on mathematics problems that were assigned according to their instructional level. Classrooms in which differentiated practices were not observed were characterized primarily by teacher-led direct instruction.

RCMS staff members have some understanding of the current improvement efforts at the school. This is evident in the practices being implemented in the classroom. In response to the *DOE Instructional Staff Survey*, 36% of the respondents (n=56) strongly agree that they are "well-informed about the initiatives undertaken by school leadership to improve student performance," 55% of staff agree. However, in response to the open-ended question on the same DOE survey, thirty-nine instructional staff responded to the question, "Do you know what you are supposed to do to improve student performance according to your school's improvement plan?" Eleven staff members (28%) responded "no." Six (15%) teachers responded they need to improve student MCAS scores, whereas six (15%) other staff indicated "differentiate instruction."

Professional development (PD) at RCMS is limited. School leadership and teachers report some PD related to differentiated instruction but many staff members stated that it is inadequate and/or not enough. A district professional development calendar does not exist, though content areas trainings (by department) do occur. The principal reported that often, planned school-based PD is

interrupted by department trainings. As a result, all school staff members are not receiving the PD designed for the school's entire faculty.

Because RCMS does not have clearly specified strategies in the SIP, the PR team could not determine the extent to which action plans were being implemented. However, some evidence indicating that the school's faculty is implementing the improvement initiatives with some understanding does exist.

D. What gains, if any, have been achieved relative to SIP goals or benchmarks, through implementation of the plan?

Because RCMS is not implementing the SIP, it is impossible to determine whether the school has made any gains. In addition, the SIP does not contain measurable goals for student achievement, nor does the plan contain benchmarks to monitor the implementation of the initiatives that are being undertaken at the school. Though RCMS leadership and staff have begun, as a school-wide practice, to look at student performance data from the MCAS, this is in its initial phase only. RCMS is not administering any additional norm-referenced or criterion referenced assessments that can be used to provide additional information on student areas of strength and weakness.

KEY QUESTION 2: DO THE CONDITIONS APPEAR TO BE IN PLACE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHOOL'S IMPROVEMENT PLAN?

The conditions to support improvement efforts or the implementation of a SIP, once developed, are not in place at RCMS. Though school administrators have provided RCMS with a more secure climate than in previous years, the lack of instructional leadership is a significant weakness at the school. Though the faculty supports the need for improvement at the school, the lack of guidance has limited the implementation of effective instructional strategies. The district has not provided RCMS with adequate guidance or resources to support improvement efforts.

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

The Randolph Community Middle School is a soundly-run operation. Over the past two years, leadership has nurtured a supportive and safe school culture with a vision that is supported by staff. However, RCMS currently lacks effective instructional leadership.

During the panel review, the team observed an orderly building with a limited number of student behavioral disruptions. Each morning, students recite a school pledge—ROCK—that speaks to Respect, Opportunity, Community and Knowledge. This is one strategy that the leadership has implemented to demonstrate support for a positive school climate that fosters strong morale. As the principal stated, it is important “to capture the students and give them a love of learning.” In focus groups and interviews, both students and teachers report positive changes to the school climate over the past two years.

School staff support the leadership provided at RCMS. In response to the *DOE Instructional Staff Survey*, 96% of staff either strongly agree or agree that the “principal provides effective leadership to guide and support staff efforts to improve the academic performance of our students.” In an interview with the PR team, one teacher described the principal as someone who “really cares about the kids and their needs.” In addition, district personnel support the

principal's vision for the school and the improvements made at the school to date. The superintendent indicated, "He has very good ideas."

Of particular concern to the PR team, however, is the lack of instructional leadership at the school. When asked in an interview to identify the instructional leader of the school, the principal responded that he assumed this role. The principal reported that he tries to visit classrooms several times per week, but due to the large number of tasks associated with running the school; it is difficult for him to perform this role alone. The assistant principal also assumes a leadership role at RCMS, but she is primarily responsible for disciplinary issues at the school. Although district personnel are available to provide some instructional support and oversight, they also have additional responsibilities associated with other Randolph Public Schools. As a result, instructional leadership is minimal at RCMS.

In addition, the principal is not responsible for conducting formal evaluations of content area teaching staff. They are, instead, conducted by district-level department heads. Though the principal provides input into the final product, he does not have sole ownership over this process for the large majority of the school's instructional staff.

The presence of leadership teams at the school has been inconsistent and only a few of the school's stakeholders are involved. For example, the school's instructional leadership team interviewed by the PR team consisted of the principal and the assistant superintendent only. The school's site council included only two members (teachers) in addition to the principal. Though the principal reports both of these teams are still under development; it has been difficult to get people involved. Current contract negotiations may be limiting the participation of some staff and school administrators cite apathy of community members as another obstacle.

The large number of deficiencies in the school improvement plan is further evidence of the lack of instructional leadership at the school. Student MCAS scores at RCMS have remained flat for the past five years, resulting in the school's current status of Corrective Action in mathematics. There is not currently a plan in place to address these low student performance rates, nor is the school culture focused on teaching and learning. Because RCMS lacks instructional leadership, the PR team determined that the conditions are not in place to support school improvement efforts.

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

It has been well documented in this report that RCMS does not have an effective or operational school improvement plan. As a result, teachers are unclear as to what improvement efforts are needed to increase the performance rates of the school's students. Staff members could not clearly articulate reasons for student achievement gaps that are linked to teaching and learning.

RCMS staff does not believe that the school has an adequate instructional action plan to increase student performance rates. In interviews with the PR team, some staff indicated that the current SIP is not a sound plan. On the *DOE Instructional Staff Survey*, in response to the open-ended question, "Do you know what you are supposed to do to improve student performance according to your school's improvement plan," some RCMS faculty members stated:

- "Yes and no, I feel as though I have an idea, but not a specific plan."
- "No, I am already doing what I know is expected and it is not enough."

- “No – we need SPECIFIC strategies to improve student performance, instead of being told to work harder.”

RCMS staff members have shown support for the improvement initiatives at the school through their implementation efforts (see Question 1C). Though most staff members are committed to improvement, the lack of clarity that surrounds instructional strategies and action plans to meet the needs of the school’s students has made the task of improvement difficult.

In addition, common planning time has been eliminated at the school this year, which has limited staff’s ability to engage in education-related conversations with their peers. Thirty-eight percent of RCMS staff meet only quarterly with other teachers to plan/coordinate lessons and instruction. As a result, some RCMS teachers do not feel they have been engaged in enough dialogue to support the improvement initiatives.

Because the focus at the school in recent years has been on the climate, RCMS staff express reasons for low student performance at the school that are peripheral to educational practices. On the *DOE Instructional Staff Survey*, in response to the open-ended question, “What have been the most significant causes of low student performance at your school,” 52% of staff indicated parent involvement; 31% indicated student apathy; and 26% indicated high rates of student transience. During interviews with the PR team, staff members did not consistently articulate student-learning needs that are linked to academic achievement. Rather, they expressed the following as pressing needs at the school: money, a larger budget, increased resources, a lower rate of student transience and an increase in exploratory classes offered at the school. Other teachers noted the lack of homework completion as a barrier to increasing student achievement at the school.

Because RCMS staff members are unclear about how to increase student performance rates, the PR team was unable to assess staff support for the improvement efforts. The limited focus on teaching and learning at the school also presented some concerns for the PR team.

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

Though the superintendent is new to the district this year and level funding has plagued the Randolph Public Schools in previous years, the lack of instructional support and improvement guidance provided to Randolph Community Middle School cannot be overlooked.

Low student performance rates have been an issue at RCMS for several years and the district has done little to support needed improvement at the school. The SIP was developed by the school’s principal with little assistance or feedback from by the district. Additionally, the superintendent and other district staff recognize the limited usefulness of the current SIP, and despite the school’s designation of Corrective Action, have taken no actions to combat this weakness. Though plans to revise the SIP are in place and district personnel plan to participate in the future, district presence in improvement planning has not been apparent to date.

Key Question 2A of this report identified the lack of instructional leadership that currently exists at RCMS. It is nearly impossible to provide support for, and oversight of, instruction and related classroom practices without sufficient personnel and training. The school’s leadership team is currently understaffed. There are only two school-based administrators at RCMS, who have difficulty completing tasks associated with managing a school during the time allotted. As a result, instructional leadership that is provided at the school is minimal. In addition, the principal

reports receiving minimal guidance from the district in this area. Allocation of necessary personnel and requisite trainings are responsibilities that fall at the district level.

CONCLUSION

Randolph Community Middle School is not implementing a sound plan for improvement. The school's written School Improvement Plan is not clear and specific enough to guide the implementation of planned improvement initiatives. The SIP was not developed through a process that supports its successful implementation. There are no benchmarks or timelines in the plan to measure implementation or student performance gains relative to SIP goals. Therefore, the PR Team cannot conclude that any gains have been achieved to date as a result of the SIP implementation.

The conditions are not in place to support the successful implementation of the SIP. RCMS lacks the necessary instructional leadership to guide improvement. The school has received minimal guidance and/or resources from the district to support improvement efforts.

APPENDIX A

Team Members

Megan Tupa, Panel Review Chair, SchoolWorks LLC, Beverly, MA

Cheryl Casper, Panel Review Co-Chair, SchoolWorks LLC, Beverly, MA

Kristin Burke, Panel Review Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Education,
Malden, MA

Rosalie Tashjian, Panelist, Principal, Winchester, MA

Patricia Clancy, Panelist, Coordinator of MS Academic Support Programs, Worcester, MA

Nancy Sprague, Panelist, Director of Curriculum and Staff Development, Framingham, MA

APPENDIX B
Randolph Community Middle School
Randolph Public Schools
POTENTIALLY UNDERPERFORMING PANEL REVIEW SCHEDULE
November 29 and 30, 2005

Day 1

- 9:00—9:30 a.m. **Panel chairperson and panel coordinator meet at hotel** to discuss and clarify roles, prepare for the first team meeting, and review general logistics/schedule for the review.
- 9:30a.m. —11:30a.m. **Team meeting # 1:** team meets for the first time to discuss each panelist's individual analysis; team forms preliminary judgments on key questions.
- 11:30a.m.—1p.m. **Lunch and travel to the school** (*NOTE: In districts undergoing multiple school reviews, superintendent interviews may be scheduled between 11am and 1 pm at the hotel.*)
- 1:00 – 2:00p.m. Panel meets with the school's **Instructional Leadership Team**.
- 2:00—3:00 p.m. Panelists meet with the district **Superintendent** (and Assistant Superintendent, if appropriate).
- 3:15—4:30p.m. Panel meets with the **Principal** (and one other school-based individual, if appropriate).
- 4:30—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.

Day 2

All activities take place at the school.

- 7:30—8:00 a.m. Panel meets with the Principal
- 8:00—8:30 a.m. Panel meets with the School Council
- 8:30—9:00 a.m. Panelists meet individually with Focus Groups. The Panel Review Coordinator and the Principal will identify participants for each Focus Group. The groups will be organized to include groups of individuals who can respond to questions designed for parents, students (middle and high schools), 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:** panel meets to discuss findings so far and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch).

12:30—1:00 p.m. Panel uses time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information.

1:00—2:00 p.m. Panelists meet with teacher focus 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	

2:15—2:30 p.m. Chair meets with the Principal to discuss next steps in the process.

2:30—5:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 4:** panel deliberates, organizes evidence, and formulates responses to key questions.