



The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT EFFECTIVENESS (DTSDE) CONCEPTUAL FRAME 4 REVIEW



2018-19 School Year

BEDS Code	660900010002	
School Name	Edward Williams School	
School Address	20 Oak Street, Mount Vernon, New York, 10550	
District Name	Mount Vernon City School District	
School Leader	Dr. Crystal Waterman	
Dates of Review	October 10, 2018	
School Accountability Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority School <input type="checkbox"/> Focus School	
Type of Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conceptual Frame 4 Review (A district-led review of SOPs 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.5)	
Review Team	Name	Affiliation/Title
School Leader	Dr. Crystal Waterman	Principal
District Representative	Dr. Waveline Bennett-Conroy	Assistant Superintendent
Additional Team Members	Dr. K. Dunkley	Lead Reviewer
	Ms. R. Depaul	Special Education School Improvement Specialist (SEIS) District Administrator
	Ms. M. McKitty-Bromely	District Administrator

School Information Sheet for Edward Williams School

School Configuration (2018-19 data)					
Grade Configuration	Pre-K-6	Total Enrollment	438	SIG Recipient	7
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes (2015-16)					
# Transitional Bilingual	0	# Dual Language	0	# Self-Contained English as a Second Language	0
Types and Number of Special Education Classes (2015-16)					
# Special Classes	6	# SETSS	0	# Integrated Collaborative Teaching	0
Types and Number of Special Classes (2015-16)					
# Visual Arts	1	# Music	1	# Drama	0
# Foreign Language	0	# Dance	0	# CTE	0
School Composition (most recent data)					
% Title I Population	82.8%	% Attendance Rate	89.8%		
% Free Lunch	80.6%	% Reduced Lunch	1.1%		
% Limited English Proficient	10.5%	% Students with Disabilities	15.7%		
Racial/Ethnic Origin (most recent data)					
% American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2%	% Black or African American	83.1%		
% Hispanic or Latino	7.6%	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.6%		
% White	11.6%	% Multi-Racial	1%		
Personnel (most recent data)					
Years Principal Assigned to School	3.1	# of Assistant Principals	1		
# of Deans	0	# of Counselors/Social Workers	2		
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate	0	% Teaching Out of Certification	0		
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience	35%	Average Teacher Absences	9%		
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2017-18 or most recent data available)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	20%	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	14%		
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)	72%	Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (8th Grade)	N/A		
Student Performance for High Schools (2017-18 or most recent data available)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	N/A	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	N/A		
Credit Accumulation High Schools Only (2017-18 or most recent data available)					
% of 1st year students who earned 10+ credits	NA	% of 2nd year students who earned 10+ credits	NA		
% of 3rd year students who earned 10+ credits	NA	4 Year Graduation Rate	NA		
6 Year Graduation Rate	NA				
Overall NYSED Accountability Status (2017-18 or most recent data available)					
Reward	N/A	Recognition	N/A		
In Good Standing	N/A	Local Assistance Plan	N/A		
Focus District	N/A	Focus School Identified by a Focus District			
Priority School	X				

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2017-18 or most recent data available)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	YES
Hispanic or Latino	YES	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	N/A
White	N/A	Multi-Racial	N/A
Students with Disabilities	N/A	Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	YES		
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics (2017-18 or most recent data available)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	----	Black or African American	NO
Hispanic or Latino	----	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	----
White	----	Multi-Racial	----
Students with Disabilities	NO	Limited English Proficient	----
Economically Disadvantaged	NO		
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science (2017-18 or most recent data available)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	----	Black or African American	NO
Hispanic or Latino	----	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	----
White	----	Multi-Racial	N/A
Students with Disabilities	----	Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	NO		

Describe the school's top priorities (no more than 5) based on the school's comprehensive plans (SCEP, SIG, DIP, etc.):

1. 10% improvement in ELA, from 20% to 30% (Based on Student Performance on 2017-2018 NYSE)
2. 10% improvement in Math, from 14% to 24% (Based on Student Performance on 2016-2017 NYSE)
3. Increase student engagement
4. Small group instruction

Information about the review

The review was led by Dr. Karren Dunkley, in collaboration with Dr. Waveline Bennett-Conroy, Assistant Superintendent; Ms. Rachel Depaul, and Ms. Michelle McKitty-Bromely, district supervisors.

- The review team visited a total of 30 classrooms during the review.
- Reviewers conducted focus groups with students.
- The lead reviewer conducted a focus group with teachers and attended a weekly PLC meeting.
- Reviewers examined documents provided by the school, including lesson plans, schoolwide data, teacher feedback, and student work.

Scoring Matrix

Tenet 2 - School Leader Practices and Decisions: Visionary leaders create a school community and culture that lead to success, well-being and high academic outcomes for all students via systems of continuous and sustainable school improvement.

Mark an "X" in the box below the appropriate designation for each Statement of Practice. Provide the letter rating in the OVERALL RATING row as the final overall tenet rating.

Statement of Practice	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
2.3 Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.		X		

Tenet 3 - Curriculum Development and Support: The school has rigorous and coherent curricula and assessments that are appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) for all students and are modified for identified subgroups in order to maximize teacher instructional practices and student-learning outcomes.

Statement of Practice	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
3.2 The school leader ensures and supports the quality implementation of a systematic plan of rigorous and coherent curricula appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) that is monitored and adapted to meet the needs of students.			X	
3.3 Teachers develop and ensure that unit and lesson plans used include data-driven instruction (DDI) protocols that are appropriately aligned to the CCLS and NYS content standards and address student achievement needs.			X	
3.5 Teachers implement a comprehensive system for using formative and summative assessments for strategic short and long-range curriculum planning that involves student reflection, tracking of, and ownership of learning.			X	

Tenet 4 - Teacher Practices and Decisions: Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn, so that all students and pertinent subgroups experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking, and achievement.

Statement of Practice	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
4.2 School and teacher leaders ensure that instructional practices and strategies are organized around annual, unit, and daily lesson plans that address all student goals and needs.			X	
4.3 Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.			X	
4.5 Teachers inform planning and foster student participation in their own learning process by using a variety of summative and formative data sources (e.g., screening, interim measures, and progress monitoring).			X	

Tenet 2 - School Leader Practices and Decisions: Visionary leaders create a school community and culture that lead to success, well-being, and high academic outcomes for all students via systems of continuous and sustainable school improvement.	Tenet Rating	3
---	---------------------	----------

2.3 **The school is in Stage 3 for this Statement of Practice:** Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.

Debriefing Statement

The school leader noted that she redesigned the master schedule, eliminated transition time between periods, and built back 20-30 minutes into the instructional day. The school leader emphasized that the redesigned schedule resulted in an added 30 minutes math Response to Intervention (RTI) block and supported the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). One highlight of the PBIS program is the PAWS journal that students complete during breakfast time. The school leader discussed how she organized staffing to accelerate student achievement. Specifically, the school leader shared that the school implemented a “pulling out” and “pushing in” consultant teacher model. The school leader also described that the special education coaches spend the entire day in the building to support instruction for special education students and the special education professional learning community (PLC).

Additionally, consultant teachers receive coaching support from the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). The school leader stated that she meets with the English as a New Language (ENL) teachers monthly and with the district’s ENL supervisor to ensure culturally relevant instruction. Regarding the human and fiscal inputs, the school leader noted that she added a crisis intervention position to support the high percentage of students in crisis, including the significant population of homeless and displaced students. The school leader described additional supports such as 1) a homeless liaison who supports the school three and a half days per week, 2) an attendance teacher who is on site at the school three out of five days per week, 3) restorative justice and crisis-management programs, 4) the Amazing Afternoon Westchester Jewish Community Center program, and 5) the Amazing Readers phonics-based program where volunteers come into the school and read with identified students during scheduled pullouts.

The school leader stated that she and the assistant principal visit classrooms daily and put specific structures in place to advance student achievement. For example, the principal and assistant principal described specific instructional supports, namely: 1) weekly PLC meetings that examine a different topic of discussion each week, 2) monitoring schedules of instructional needs, i.e., lesson planning, child study, looking at student work, which is a step before RTI (tier 2 and tier 3) and, 3) once-a-month vertical PLC planning meetings. Significantly, the administrative team reported that the horizontal and vertical PLCs provide teachers with a collegial space to engage in inquiry around the learning needs of students and grade groups. Importantly, the principal and assistant principal stated that the during PLC meetings, teachers should discuss specific strategies they use to increase learning outcomes. The principal also discussed the implementation of several committees to support inter-staff collaboration, including, 1) Health and Safety, 2) Restorative Justice comprised of the crisis

intervention specialist and assistant principal, school-based support team, and PBIS team, 3) Special Education, 4) Character Education, and 5) AVID site team that convenes once per month. Additionally, the school leader discussed how the math coach and literacy coach provided in-class support to teachers and ongoing support of the PLCs.

Importantly, the school leader gives focused attention to extended learning time, conceptualized as a five-days-per-week program from 3:15 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. that includes, 1) targeted instruction in English Language Arts (ELA), Math and Science for three days per week, 2) Character education one day per week, and 3) STEAM one day per week. Regarding the instructional core, the school leader discussed her thoughts on the urgency of modifying the Journeys ELA curriculum. Concretely, the principal shared that teachers follow the Journeys program with fidelity but that the curriculum did not have a balanced literacy component. The principal shared that the learning community's goal is to pivot to a workshop model to mitigate the need for balanced literacy in the ELA program.

The principal also discussed that she planned to scale up the use of AVID (Advancement via Individual Determination) instructional strategies across all grades during the school year. Explicitly, the principal stated that school-wide professional development (PD) sessions with the AVID trainer would begin mid-October. The principal plans to train all teachers on AVID by the end of the school year and to instruct four teachers in Discovery Education. Additionally, the school leader stated that the AVID trainer and literacy coach would support teachers' use of AVID strategies such as two column notes to improve writing. The school leader engages in deep data work with teachers during the school year. The first cycle of data review uses data garnered from the iReady assessment.

During the interview, the school leader emphasized the importance of the assistant principal, literacy coach, math coach and various committees in accelerating student achievement. Significantly, in the pre-DTSDE self-assessment, the principal cited the 10% improvement in ELA and 10% increase in math.

Strengths

To increase academic achievement, the school leader implemented a weekly PLC that focuses on promising instructional practices to improve teaching and learning. The school leader articulates that the learning community's primary goal is to improve the proficiency rates of students in ELA and Math.

Based on the results of these programs, ample evidence exists to show that the school leader uses systems, including expanded learning time to organize systems and appropriate resources to advance student success.

Commendations

- Students demonstrated on-task behaviors with learning activities in the majority of the thirty classrooms that the review team visited.
- Clear norms exist in classroom routines and instructional protocols.

<p>Tenet 3 - Curriculum Development and Support: The school has rigorous and coherent curricula and assessments that are appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) for all students and are modified for identified subgroups in order to maximize teacher instructional practices and student-learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Tenet Rating</p>	<p>2</p>
---	----------------------------	-----------------

3.2 **The school is in Stage 2 for this Statement of Practice:** The school leader ensures and supports the quality implementation of a systematic plan of rigorous and coherent curricula. All curricula are appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), which teachers monitor and adapt to meet the needs of students.

Debriefing Statement

During the principal and staff interviews, both the school leader and staff discussed how the school implements a rigorous and coherent curriculum appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). During the review, the school leader described how the school implements a school-wide instructional plan to provide targeted support, including 1) a PD plan based on a needs assessment and aligned to the district’s professional development plan, 2) weekly PLC meetings and vertical PLC meetings every six weeks, 3) the use of AVID strategies in thirteen classrooms, and 4) monthly faculty meetings and curriculum meetings. Explicitly, the school leader utilizes a variety of data sources such as iReady, DIBELS and Waterford to examine emerging trends regarding the achievement of all students. The principal and assistant principal in collaboration with the literacy and math coaches disaggregate data from the various sources to inform the focus of monthly curriculum and professional learning sessions. The focus on individual student data coupled with weekly class walkthroughs informs classroom instructional practices and school-wide learning goals. Importantly, teachers stated that they relied on consistent feedback to their lesson plans to improve the level of rigor and student engagement present in their pedagogy.

During the review, the principal emphasized the need to customize the ELA Journeys curriculum to include a balanced literacy approach, i.e., a reader’s workshop, and a writer’s workshop. One teacher stated that Journeys has a section on ELL students that includes different decodable readers that serve as a vital tool in ensuring ELLs’ access to the CCLS. Additionally, several teachers stated that they expose students to a rigorous curriculum through the customization of the instructional materials for ELA and Math. Teachers noted that in the math, they utilize standard-aligned learning activities and past exam state questions that the learning community share on a drive accessible to all teachers. One teacher articulated that the math examples grouped by standards, included on the shared, drive were easy to use in daily instruction. The math coach also stated that the teachers’ ELA and Math instructional guides give teachers the standard and that in turn, teachers incorporate the standards for the students to see in the learning targets that they make visible in their classrooms each day. One teacher described how the vertical PLC examines ELA and Math assessment data and uses these results to determine which standards to focus on building wide. One kindergarten teacher stated that teachers in the lower grades place a

premium on ensuring that their lesson plans scaffold instruction for students. Explicitly, teachers discussed the various ways in which they differentiated instruction for students by using: 1) AVID strategies, 2) Webb's DOK (Depth of Knowledge), 3) mini lessons, and 4) incorporating exam prototypes.

Also, teachers stated that they customized the Envisions math program by assigning specific problems to students to ensure that they master core skills before progressing to more difficult math concepts. The teachers also shared that they spend the time to meet once a week on each grade-level during "lunch n learns" to collaborate on lesson plans and promising instructional practices. One teacher highlighted that she tries as much as possible to build on students' strengths as they progress through multiple levels of academic rigor and address students' weaknesses through small-group instruction.

Areas of Improvement

Reviewers observed the uneven implementation of developed units aligned to the CCLS and NYS standards. Specifically, in the thirty classrooms that the team visited, it was difficult to distinguish the range of teaching strategies to provide students with multiple points of access to the CCLS. Importantly, the school leader acknowledged the need to "structure a systemic plan for the implementation of pedagogical support" to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Recommendations

- Implement select instructional strategies from AVID with fidelity to ensure a clear and coherent expectation of teaching and learning in 100% of classrooms for ELA and Math.
- Use weekly PLC meetings for teachers to develop and model the lesson flow in ELA classes.
- Identify an ELA classroom to function as a learning lab, and schedule interclass visitations for teachers to observe, and then apply improved reading and writing instructional practices.

3.3 The school is in Stage 2 for this Statement of Practice: Teachers develop and ensure that unit and lesson plans they use include data-driven instruction (DDI) protocols that are appropriately aligned to the CCLS and NYS content standards and address student achievement needs.

Debriefing Statement

The evidence shows that teachers attempt to develop unit and lesson plans, which include -- using data-driven protocols. However, the delivery of observed lessons demonstrates that lessons do not adequately reflect the use of data-driven instructional protocols that teachers monitor to address student achievement needs.

Reviewers visited a total of 30 classrooms. During the interviews, the principal and staff discussed how they use a multi-tiered approach to implement data-driven protocols such as: 1) the use of the data tracker in Math to scaffold instruction and group students; 2) the use of iReady online reading comprehension data to target student support; 3) the use of Waterford and DIBELS in grades K-2; 4) the examination of formative, interim and summative data during daily/weekly conferencing, weekly PLC meetings, and monthly curriculum meetings (i.e.,

performance on teacher-made assessments/checks for understanding, Running Records, generated reports from class dojo, NYS assessment data, Fountas and Pinnell assessments); and 5) designing lesson plans that include students' instructional small group.

Several of the teachers mentioned that they utilize the RTI process to address learning gaps for tiered learners. The teachers emphasized that the various data sources provided a context for teachers to determine whether or not to move students from tier one to tier three and to identify specific strategies for each tier within the RTI process. Overall, the teachers stated that they use the various assessments to tier students for small-group instruction and RTI.

Areas of Improvement

Despite both the teachers and school leader citing the use of school-wide, data-driven instructional (DDI) protocols, reviewers concluded that the PLC implements DDI protocols in an uneven manner. Explicitly, a review of sample lesson plans did not reflect specific ways in which teachers differentiated instruction to address the diverse learning needs of their students. The review team noted in the majority of classrooms it visited how teachers' application of DDI protocols remained indistinguishable. Significantly, teachers did not explicitly discuss how they utilize a full complement of curricula tools such as curriculum maps and pacing calendars to sequence learning for their students.

Additionally, based on the classroom walkthroughs, student interviews, and examination of student work artifacts, the learning community appears to use rubrics unevenly and inconsistently, making it challenging to lead students towards a standard expectation of college and career readiness. Many students were novice in their ability to identify individual or collective learning goals and could not express how teachers provided feedback to work in general or based on rubrics in particular.

Recommendation

- Implement a coherent feedback loop between teacher and student that includes the use of rubrics in daily and weekly conferences with students to advance students' comprehension of and progress towards skills' mastery.

3.5 **The school is in Stage 2 for this Statement of Practice:** Teachers implement a comprehensive system for using formative and summative assessments for strategic short- and long-range curriculum planning that involves student reflection, tracking of, and ownership of learning.

Debriefing Statement

The school leader articulated that the school was on track to implement its first data review cycle in mid-October 2018. During this data review cycle, the school leader shared that the PLC uses pre- and post-assessments as well as formative and summative assessments to make curricular decisions. Reviewers did not observe evidence of an activated schoolwide data system, noting the school leader's caution that the timing of the review early in the school year (October 10th) did not coincide with the activation of the school's data cycle.

The principal, assistant principal and teacher described multiple data sources that they used to inform short- and long-range curriculum planning. Specifically, they mentioned use of formative assessments to organize RTI groups of learners, and to make curricular decisions. Teachers cited how they use data from the NYS Assessments, iReady, DIBELS, Waterford, teacher-made assessments, and common assessments to differentiate effectively for students.

Areas for Improvement

The review team noted that limited evidence existed schoolwide in how teachers used formative assessments (checks for understanding). In rare instances, reviewers documented that several teachers used thumbs up and thumbs down as a formative assessment strategy. However, teachers routinely remained stationed at the front of the classroom and did not walk around or engage in broader types of checks for understanding to gauge students’ mastery. One reviewer stated that although teachers asked questions during the lesson that the majority of questions tended not to elicit higher-order thinking or prompted students to extend or justify their thinking. The lack of multiple types of formative assessments made it difficult to accurately assess how teachers use assessments to improve instruction and to ensure that students are adequately prepared to face 21st-century college and career readiness standards.

Recommendations

- Advance student ownership of learning by formulating grade-level goals and sharing these specific SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound) learning goals with students.
- Implement formative assessment lab classrooms, and leverage weekly PLC meetings and monthly curriculum meetings to model checks for understanding strategies.

Tenet 4 - Teacher Practices and Decisions: Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn, so that all students and pertinent subgroups experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking, and achievement.

Tenet Rating

2

4.2 **The school is in Stage 2 for this Statement of Practice:** School and teacher leaders ensure that instructional practices and strategies are organized around annual, unit, and daily lesson plans that address all student goals and needs.

Debriefing Statement

The school leader organizes instructional practices and strategies based on the end of common unit assessments administered in math and science, benchmark and mock assessments, and ELA. However, reviewers noted the

lack of evidence to support visible learning targets in the majority of classrooms they visited. The school leader shared that instructional coaches provide support for the implementation of curriculum and delivery of instruction. The principal also stated that the learning community would develop specific learning targets for ENLs and students with disabilities (SWDs). Both the school leader and teachers emphasized that weekly PLC meetings play an instrumental role in the development of core instructional strategies such as STAR and RACE to increase student engagement and inquiry. Both the literacy and math coaches and teachers delineated ways in which they incorporated the weekly PLCs and vertical PLC meetings -- coupled with multiple data sources -- to support annual, unit, and daily lessons to address student goals and needs. The learning community will regularly engage in data analysis about how best to address academic deficiencies and provide interventions to students. The principal cited the importance of the data coordinator in assisting teachers with utilizing data to organize instructional groups and to develop a literacy professional development plan around student goals and needs. Both teachers and the school leader highlighted the implementation of student engagement and inquiry principles from AVID. Several teachers emphasized the use of specific techniques such as turn and talks and questioning. During the majority of classroom visits, reviewers did not observe the use of lesson plan-embedded, higher-order-learning tasks or questions.

Areas for Improvement

Despite this expressed emphasis on student engagement and inquiry, reviewers observed that the majority of instructional time was teacher-centered. Reviewers reported a low frequency of high student engagement and inquiry across the thirty classrooms they visited. The anemic implementation of instructional practices that contribute to high-level student engagement and inquiry will limit student progress toward achievement goals.

Recommendation

- Bolster student inquiry across all grades and content areas by using AVID strategies such as WICOR with an emphasis on peer-to-peer Inquiry and Collaboration during daily instruction.

4.3 **The school is in Stage 2 for this Statement of Practice:** Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.

Debriefing Statement

The school leader and teachers discussed how the learning community implemented specific structures and strategies to provide instruction that is: 1) coherent, 2) appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLC), and 3) accessible, as it leads to multiple points of access for all students. For example, the learning community referenced the use of teachers sharing promising practices during PLCs to address students' needs. The school leader emphasized that teachers create and align their lesson plans to the CCLS and CCLS shifts. Specifically, the principal and teachers described instructional strategies, such as: 1) HOT (higher-order thinking) questions; 2) think, pair share; and, 3) Turn and Talk.

Teachers did not explicitly articulate how they ensured rigor by pushing students' critical thinking skills. However, the principal noted that the learning community expects students to provide text-based evidence to support responses in writing. One teacher mentioned that she ensured multiple points of access when organizing small-group instruction or during RTI.

Areas of Improvement

The learning community must provide additional descriptions and evidence-based practices of how teachers ensure multiple points of access for students. Reviewers reported that the engagement of students in the flow of the Math lesson was apparent compared to the lack of visible engagement in the flow of the English lesson. Specifically, it is not clear whether a coherent lesson flow exists in ELA. In addition, the ELA block needs revision and refinement to include clear protocols around the explicit teaching of vocabulary, the intentional use of academic language and the implementation of shared and guided reading. Consequently, only a few teachers tackle the CCLS instructional shifts by supporting students' mastery of critical skills during English classes. Reviewers consistently reported minimal evidence of higher-order-inquiry questions and peer-to-peer interactions.

Recommendation

- Establish a model for guided reading as a part of the ELA lesson flow across the learning community that members can implement with observable and measurable results.
- Deepen student engagement by developing a coherent model of instruction, then aligning this model to a coherent model of student learning. This model of learning must be characterized by a loop that includes a continual cycle of feedback, revision and reflection that stimulates deep levels of thinking and questioning in students.

4.5 **The school is in Stage 2 for this Statement of Practice:** Teachers inform planning and foster student participation in their own learning process by using a variety of summative and formative data sources (e.g., screening, interim measures, and progress monitoring).

Debriefing Statement

Both teachers and the school leader described the use of a variety of formative and summative data sources to inform planning and foster student participation in their learning. Concretely, the teachers use iReady, DIBELS, Waterford, teacher-made assessments and common assessments to monitor both upper- and lower-grade students. One teacher stated that she relied on the Envisions math assessment to differentiate learners as IOA, i.e., students who were in need of intervention; students who were on-track and students classified as accelerated learners. Teachers discussed that they triangulated data from various assessments to determine guided reading groups and to provide RTI support.

In the pre-DTSE self-reflection, the principal shared that the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) conducted focused instructional learning walkthroughs (FILWs) “to gain a better understanding of continuity across classes and grade-levels. The ILT team also utilizes the assessment data to provide feedback to teachers regarding targeted lesson planning and to determine ability-based grouping, which led to significant academic growth as evidenced by the beginning-of-the-year school data. During PLCs, faculty and curriculum meetings, the staff identifies common instructional practices such as STAR and RACES to address students’ needs.

Areas for Improvement

During the classroom observations, teachers engaged in minimal or inconsistent use of checks for understanding. In very few instances, teachers circulated throughout the room to check in with students during the lesson. During the limited times when reviewers observed teachers circulating around the room, they did not provide substantive or real-time feedback to students. In one class, the teacher asked students to read their written responses to an open-ended writing prompt. However, the teacher did not provide feedback to students’ responses or create a space for students to give feedback to each other through accountable talk. One reviewer noted that during observed-math student groups, the organizing principle for grouping was not discernable compared to reading groups where teachers identified a selected group of students for small-group instruction.

During the student interviews, it was difficult for the majority of students to share a particular learning goal in reading or math. One student stated, “[the] goal in reading is not to sound like a robot, skip words when reading,” and to “learn how to read without correction and to fill up reading logs, and read 30 minutes every night.” Moreover, the majority of students struggled to provide explicit examples of feedback from teachers that would guide them to improve their work and reach their specific academic goals. The lack of a coherent feedback loop or system abates student participation in and ownership of the learning process. Taken together, the absence of a coherent system of feedback coupled with the uneven use of checks for understanding diminished the number of opportunities available to foster student participation in and ownership of their learning.

Recommendations

- Develop a coherent cycle of actionable feedback that includes the use of rubrics to drive teaching and learning.

- Reinforce instructional strategies for teachers to guide practice through feedback. Model actionable feedback strategies during weekly PLC meetings and instructional walkthroughs.

Report Quality Assurance from the District

I certify that I have led this review on behalf of the district and assert that this District-led Review aligns with NYSED expectations and protocols.

Name	Karren Dunkley, Ed.D.
Title	Lead Reviewer
District Lead Credential status (choose one)	Issued by NYSED on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Pending -- The requirements have been fulfilled, but I have yet to receive word from NYSED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending -- I have not yet fulfilled the requirements, but plan on doing so by the June 30, 2019. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A This is the only School Review with District Oversight and District-led review I am responsible for.