NYSED/NYCDOE JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BEDS Code/DBN:	07X655
School Name:	Samuel Gompers Career and Technical Education (CTE) High School
School Address:	455 Southern Blvd. Bronx NY 10455
Principal:	Joyce Mills-Kitrell
Restructuring Phase/Category:	Persistently Lowest-Achieving/School Under Registration Review (PLA/SURR)
Area(s) of Identification:	Graduation Rate
Dates of On-site Diagnostic Review:	March 15 – 16, 2011

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

A. Community and School Background

Samuel Gompers Career and Technical Education (CTE) High School serves 795 students in grades 9 through 12. The school enrollment is 76 percent Hispanic; 33 percent Black; and one percent of Asian, American Indian and White students. Of these students, 28 percent are students with disabilities and 18 percent are English language learners (ELLs). The school has a large number of overage students and more than 75 percent of the students are male. Many students live near the school, but a number commute from distances of up to 30 miles.

The Principal and eight Assistant Principals (APs) form the administrative team. The Principal has been at the school for eight years. One AP has been at the school for less than one year, one for fewer than three years, and six for more than three years. Of the 66 teachers, 12 percent have been in the school for less than one year, and 18 percent have been in the school for fewer than three years. Ninety-two percent of the teachers are highly qualified. Teacher turnover is 15 percent.

PART 2: ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

A. Performance on Key Indicators of Student Achievement Trends and School Progress

Positive or Negative Indicator (+/-)	**School Performance Indicators**	✓
	NYSED Quantitative Performance Measures	
+	Performance data for the school on NYSED Accountability Overview Reports (AOR) for the past two consecutive years) indicate the school has reduced the achievement gap between identified subgroups and **the *All Students*** subgroup in ALL identified subject/area(s) by ten percent or more.	✓
-	School is ten or more points away from meeting its Effective Annual Measurable Objective (EAMO) for one or more identified subgroups in subject/area(s) of identification.	✓

Positive or Negative Indicator (+/-)	School Performance Indicators	✓
-	For 2010-11, the school was identified as a **Persistently Lowest- Achieving school.**	✓
-	Total high school Cohort Graduation rate is below 60%	✓
-	**NYCDOE Quantitative and Qualitative Performance Measures**	
+/	Grade of C on the most recent NYC Progress Report	✓
+/	NYC Quality Review Score of Under-Developed	✓

B. School Strengths

Many students, parents and the community recognize the impact of the CTE program on the future careers of students and adults who take technical courses at the school.

C. Key Findings and Recommendations

Summary of the key issues (causal factors), and other areas of concern, identified during the on-site diagnostic review that are negatively impacting student achievement in identified areas, as well as recommendations, as related to the seven JIT Indicator Categories:

I. Curriculum

Findings:

- The curriculum is not rigorous, and school leaders have not monitored alignment with New York State (NYS) Standards. Curriculum maps have recently been introduced but are not yet having an impact on student achievement. This is a major factor that contributes to the low graduation rate.

- The curriculum is ineffective because pacing calendars aligned with NYS Standards are only now being developed for all subjects through the recently formed Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Consequently, these pacing calendars have yet to have an impact on instruction.

- Resources to support learning across the school are lacking. Textbooks are outdated in some classrooms, and supplementary materials are limited. For example, in one global history class the textbook in use was published in 1998. Students stated that they cannot take textbooks home.

Recommendations:

- The Network should work with the school on the development of curriculum in all core areas and ensure that it is clearly aligned with the current New York State (NYS) Learning Standards. The curriculum should align with the new NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards in English language arts and literacy and mathematics to prepare for implementation in school year 2012-13. The school's curriculum should be developed by knowledgeable and trained individuals (national, state, or local) who understand the key elements of curriculum development.

  All teachers and administrators should participate in professional development (PD) on how to plan and implement a curriculum with rigor, as well as delivery methods that are student-centered. The curriculum should be relied upon as the basis for assessing the individual student

mastery and progress. Walkthroughs and formal evaluations should include how well the teacher knows and implements the curriculum for the subjects being taught.

- Common planning time and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) time should be used to ensure that pacing calendars are aligned across grades and support instruction. School leaders should use walkthroughs to monitor teacher implementation of the calendars.

- School leaders should establish a mechanism to regularly audit resources to ensure that they support the State standards and curriculum. The quality and number of resources should be regularly checked and funding made available to keep books up to date.

II. Teaching and Learning

Findings:

- The quality of teaching and learning varies considerably across the school. Many students were passive, reluctant to take part in debate, and unengaged in the lesson because the teaching was dull and uninspiring. The quality of tasks set by teachers for small group work was poor because the tasks were not focused upon creating learning opportunities and activities to extend student ideas and understanding. The level of student engagement in mathematics, special education and science classes was minimal, with some students totally disengaged.
- Many mathematics and science teachers are resistant to change, despite guidance provided by a recently appointed AP, and demonstrate an unwillingness or inability to move from direct instruction to a wider range of instructional strategies.

  Teaching in special education classes was ineffective. Instruction was primarily whole class, despite the small numbers, and did not include targeted support, activities or practices to support the individual academic or social growth of the students.

  Regular education instruction is mainly teacher directed and does little to engage the students. In science, much of the teaching is lecture style. Many lessons in mathematics and science follow the textbook or use worksheets; therefore, there is little variety of activity to maintain the interest of students.

- In the few examples of co-teaching that were observed, one teacher took a dominant role, with the other adopting the role of an assistant. This model missed opportunities to enhance the quality of student learning and achievement.

- Much lesson time was wasted, particularly in mathematics, science and special education classes. Too much time was allowed for activities, and students often waited doing nothing when they had completed their work. In science, students did not attempt the work and the teachers did not challenge this. In mathematics, the 'do now' frequently took more than 15 minutes, thus decreasing the amount of time left to develop new learning. In special education classes, the 'do now' also took a long time, and there were no summaries at the end of the lesson.

- Expectations for students to arrive on time for class are low. Consequently, many students arrive late and unprepared for work. In many instances, lateness went unchallenged. Teachers had to spend time going over the work again for the latecomers. In one science class, the teacher had to

do this three times, which disrupted the learning of the students who had arrived on time. Transitions in some classes were also slow, especially in science, special education and mathematics.

- Frequent, intrusive announcements during the school day interfered with instruction.

- There was little reference to the cultures represented within the school population in classrooms or throughout the building with the exception of the bilingual classes. There were few books in classrooms that reflect the varying cultures represented in the building, except in ELL classes.

- Teachers post learning goals but do not always ensure that students understand them. In many lessons, students were unclear about the purpose of the lesson. The goals were not written in student friendly language.

- In many classes, posted work on display was of low quality and outdated. Little of the posted work had reference to a rubric, and feedback did not indicate how the work should be improved.

- The school grading policy was rarely displayed in classrooms to guide students.

- In many subjects, but particularly in science, special education and mathematics, the majority of questions required literal responses and teachers did not extend student learning by asking probing questions. There was limited opportunity for students to develop problem-solving skills in these areas. In social studies, there was little opportunity for students to develop higher order thinking. Across the school, students were rarely encouraged to self-evaluate their work.

- In most lessons there was no differentiated instruction. Despite placing students in working groups, the materials distributed were not leveled or varied to address the diverse learning needs of the students, and students completed the same tasks. Some students finished work early and some did not bother to complete the work. In science, students with disabilities were all given the same work despite their differing needs.

- The use of technology widely varied across the school. In many classes, the SMART Boards were inappropriately used as a chalk board or a projection screen. The administrative team has not insisted that teachers use available SMART Boards and computers as part of their teaching and learning.

Recommendations

- Structures should be established to ensure that all teaching is of the highest quality by setting clear expectations for teaching and learning, based upon the analysis of data. Monitoring of instruction should be regular and robust, and school leaders should seek support from the Network in ensuring that the attributes of effective teaching are embedded in all classrooms.

- Teachers should receive differentiated PD from the Network or other external expertise, specifically structured to introduce a variety of strategies, such as group work, student engagement and leadership, and questioning techniques. School leaders should be responsible for monitoring the impact of PD in the classroom.

- The role of each teacher in the co-teaching model should be delineated within the lesson plan. School leaders should provide time for co-teachers to plan together and ensure through walkthroughs that the co-teaching model is effective and adds to the quality of student learning.

- Student engagement and motivation in the classroom should be closely monitored by reviewing lesson plans and frequent, focused walkthroughs. APs should model strategies that demonstrate how to engage students. School leaders should also enlist the Network to provide PD to support the effective use of a variety of different activities that are carefully paced to maintain student motivation.

- Expectations for punctuality and attendance should be clearly established and rigorous procedures enforced by the school community. Teachers should make clear that students should arrive prepared for the lesson and on time. School leaders should regularly check that these expectations and procedures are consistently implemented.

- Announcements should be made at a time that does not interfere with instruction.

- Teachers should select books and articles pertinent to the students' culture to ensure that the school reflects the cultures of the student population.

- With the support of the Network, all teachers should develop strategies for writing effective learning goals. Students should be encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning through knowing what it is they are expected to achieve in the lesson or course through objectives that are written in student friendly language. Goals should be referred to at the start, during and at the end of lessons to assess what has been learned. School leaders should ensure this practice is commonplace.

- Teachers should display student work in all classrooms and hallways. A schoolwide policy should be developed outlining the expectation of what this work should look like and how often it is changed. Rubrics should be displayed and there should be a high level of consistency across classrooms as to why a piece of work has been assessed at a particular level. Teachers should provide specific feedback to students on what they need to do to reach the next level. School leaders should conduct walkthroughs to ensure that expected practices are consistently in place.

- Teachers should ensure that the school grading policy is available in all classrooms. Teachers should make students aware of the content of the grading policy and the part that students can play in the grading process by taking a greater responsibility for their own learning. School leaders should ensure that the grading policy is displayed and consistently implemented in all classes.

- School leaders should request Network support or identify an external source of expertise to provide PD on effective questioning and in improving student ability to problem solve, carry out inquiry and research tasks. School leaders should make clear their expectations to teachers about the need to include key questions in lesson planning and then monitor lessons to ensure that the plans are implemented.

- PD should be provided for all teachers on how to use data to plan for differentiated instruction. School leaders should clearly express their expectation that all lesson plans show how teachers differentiate student tasks and activities and then monitor the effective implementation of the plans.

- An evaluation of the use of technology should be conducted, and teachers should receive training tailored to their needs to guide them in how to effectively integrate technology into their teaching to improve student learning.

III. School Leadership

Findings:

- There is no plan to address how the school is going to raise the graduation rate. School leaders have not taken into account the changes in school demographics and have instead adopted a blame culture. The Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) does not reflect the areas for improvement identified by the Quality Review. The CEP does not have appropriate goals and the impact of the CEP on student achievement is not monitored and evaluated.

- The school leader has not revised achievement goals for two years. Not all school leaders have overall goals for their departments.

- Not all school leaders have conducted lesson observations and provided teachers with feedback. The school leader has not ensured that the observation of lessons is rigorous, reflects school priorities and is based upon high expectations.

- The school leaders are only now tackling the root cause of poor teaching in mathematics and science through the recent appointment of an AP responsible for oversight of these content areas.

- The sense of urgency around school improvement is not evident. The school leader and most APs regard the change in student population as the reason for the low graduation rate and have done little to evaluate the quality of instruction and make changes that take this into account.

- Many of the APs are ineffective in their roles, have low expectations for student academic performance and an inaccurate perception of why the graduation rate is low. The AP for special education has not ensured that the school is in compliance with regulations and has not observed teachers. The APs for guidance and attendance have not worked to analyze data to determine the reasons for low attendance. The AP for guidance has not ensured that Academic Intervention Services (AIS) are used to support students. The AP for humanities has not given a clear direction to staff or rigorously monitored the quality of instruction; therefore, teaching relies on the personal initiatives of staff. The AP for organization has not provided effective structures or administrative procedures to ensure the smooth running of the school.

- The School Leadership Team (SLT) is ineffective. The CEP goals lack challenge, are too general and do not convey the urgency required to move the school out of its current low level of performance. The actions that need to be taken to achieve the goals are not clear, measurable or time framed. The SLT does not monitor and evaluate the school's progress towards it goals, and parents on the SLT did not know the goals. In addition, parents are not systematically involved in instructional decisions, and parents on the SLT knew little of the CEP goals.

- The organization of the school is poor. Documentation about the school organization was incoherent and disorganized. For example, each department master schedule was in a different format, and meetings that were requested were not arranged until the last minute. The staff

roster does not include all of the names that are on the departmental programs. The program for special education was inaccurate.

- The AP for security has had little support from the school leader to address his concern that teachers are not visible in the hallways during transitions. Student safety is compromised, and instructional time is lost through students arriving late to classes. The school leader has not enforced punctuality despite knowing that attendance and punctuality are contributing factors to the low graduation rate.

- The programmer indicated that when information is received from the APs with respect to the creation of classes, there is no indication of instructional priorities.

- There is no system by which support staff can plan with teachers, and collaborative team teachers have little opportunity to meet together and plan. There was little evidence in classes of the outcomes of work from common planning meetings.

- The school staff has declined as student numbers have dropped, but the number of APs remains at eight, which is excessive for a school of approximately 800 students. The APs have little access to clerical support and spend time on low level tasks rather than on improving instruction. The allocation of resources is ineffective and significantly impedes the learning of students. There is a lack of textbooks and libraries for classrooms.

- Strategies to involve parents in their children's education are ineffective. The administrative team has recently introduced Skedula, an on-line system that provides teachers and parents with customized data reports on student progress. However, it is not having an impact because teachers do not have the confidence to use it, and many parents do not have access to computers. Ways to convey the information from Skedula to parents have not been explored. Parental response to the Department of Education's (DOE) annual survey is low. School leaders do not use the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) or the community to give them ideas about how they can increase parent involvement.

- Structures for the implementation of staff PD are incoherent. Systems for using information from observations to provide PD are informal and ineffective. The school leader does not require APs to systematically follow up PD and data is not used to drive the priorities for PD.

- The school leaders do not ensure that State and Federal guidelines are implemented with regard to ELLs. Some ELLs are only partially served. There is no native language arts class in the transitional bilingual program, apart from Spanish.

- The school leader and AP for special education are not ensuring that the needs of students with disabilities are met. Only nine out of 27 teachers for students with disabilities hold a license in special education. There is no transitional linkage coordinator for special education. Four students with disabilities are not receiving mandated counseling and 14 are not receiving occupational therapy. In addition, 42 students have not had their annual reviews within the required timeframe.

- The system for teacher evaluation across the school is poor. Walkthroughs are generic, not based on the school priorities and are not linked to PD. The school leader has not established a system

to share the information across the leadership team. As a result, there is an incomplete evaluation of the quality of instruction across the school.

- The AP for special education has only completed five formal observations and, previous to this year, he was only involved in compliance and did not complete any observations.

- The school leader's requirement and expectation that individual teacher PD plans include goals for achieving higher pass rates is not evident. Most of the goals are not precise, and the school leader has not required them to be changed to reflect observations or Network input.

Recommendations

- As a matter of urgency, school leaders should develop a plan to ensure that all students in the school, particularly those with disabilities and ELLs, achieve graduation. The data for each student should be analyzed and the information used to inform instruction. School leaders should take account of the changed demographics of the school and provide programs that are challenging and meet the needs of all students. The Network should monitor the implementation of the action plan and evaluate its success. All displays and information should reflect the school's focus on improving the graduation rate so that all stakeholders are clear that this is a school priority. School leaders should work with each academic and department to highlight and celebrate student accomplishments and departmental initiatives on an ongoing basis. Electronic bulletin boards and other technology-based displays should highlight the vocational and technical aspects of the school.

  Resources should be provided for students with disabilities to ensure that they receive the best possible support for their careers after graduation. These supports should include a counselor within the college office who is knowledgeable about the options that are available for students with disabilities.

- Each department should develop and implement action plans that clearly state how goals are to be achieved and who is accountable for their success. The action plans should be on the agenda for each school meeting to ensure that they are regularly monitored and all teachers are working together to improve the school. Leaders should involve the Network in monitoring the progress towards the goals.

- A rigorous observation framework should be developed and used consistently by all leaders. The information from observations should be regularly shared at leadership meetings and policies about instruction developed from the analysis. The policies should be implemented. Network support should be sought to develop teaching strategies that motivate all students to learn.

- As a matter of urgency, the AP for mathematics and science should be supported to develop and implement the structures that have just begun that are aimed at improving student achievement.

- Attendance data should be analyzed by subgroup to determine the root causes of absence and to find out if any group has greater absence than others. School leaders should use this information to plan a program that will raise attendance levels and evaluate its impact across the school.

- The administrative structure should be reviewed and reduced to reflect declining enrollment. With the support of the Network, roles and responsibilities of the administrative team should be

reviewed to ensure that school leaders collaboratively work to develop structures to gain an overview of the school with a consistent, coherent and concerted focus on raising achievement.

- The SLT should receive training from the Network on their roles and responsibilities and should be supported in establishing school goals and evaluating progress towards them. School leaders should actively involve parents in the SLT decision-making process. Decisions under the control of the SLT should be made by the entire SLT and not by school leaders in isolation. The school leader should contact the Network for support in facilitating SLT meetings.

- The master schedule should be reviewed to ensure that scheduling of classes reflects the priorities of the school and is accurate. School leaders should implement the schedule in an effective manner to bring about improvements in student learning.

- School leaders should collaborate with students, parents and teachers to establish a comprehensive and systematic school code of behavior that has clear rewards and sanctions and is implemented fairly and consistently throughout the school. Once in place, the code's effectiveness should be regularly evaluated by school leaders.

- School leaders should work closely with the programmer to develop a master schedule that reflects the school priorities in the CEP. The schedule should be reviewed constantly and revised as necessary to reflect the changing needs that may emerge throughout the year.

- Common planning time should be made available for support teachers and for co-teaching teachers to formally plan together. School leaders should ensure that new teaching strategies or approaches to the curriculum that emerge from common planning meetings are regularly monitored and evaluated.

- The school leader should align the number of APs and Deans with the number of enrolled students. Evaluations should be conducted as to how APs are released from clerical work to enable them to spend more time as effective instructional leaders. The school leader should look to reallocate funding to ensure that there are adequate learning resources in all classrooms.

- Parents should be surveyed, and the information should be used to create systems that encourage parents to play a more active role in their child's education. School leaders should seek dialogue with the PTA and the Network in identifying proven strategies in similar schools for strengthening parental involvement. The full potential of Skedula as a tool for keeping parents informed should be maximized.

- School leaders should use data related to instruction and achievement to develop PD that clearly addresses weaknesses in teaching. PD should be regularly monitored and evaluated to ensure its impact on instruction and achievement.

- All ELLs should receive the program of support and instruction to which they are entitled according to City and State regulations.

- Resources should be appropriately allocated to meet State/Federal program requirements for students with disabilities. Licensed teachers should be recruited. School leaders should review the master schedule to ensure that all mandated services are provided. The school leader should

ensure that annual reviews for students with disabilities are carried out within the specified timeframe and arrange for those that are overdue to be reviewed as soon as possible.

- School leaders, with the support of the Network, should develop a system for lesson observation and feedback to teachers that brings about sustained improvements in instruction. Informal walkthroughs and formal observations should have a focus that reflects school priorities. The weaker aspects of observations should be the focus for future visits, and the information used as the topic for PD. A master chart that tracks formal and informal observations and posts conference dates should be developed. Formal times should be allocated to share the findings with the administrative team.

- Support should be given by the Network to ensure that monitoring and evaluation of the quality of the curriculum and instruction is used to improve the learning and achievement of students with disabilities.

- The Network should work with the school to develop teacher understanding of specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely (SMART) goals. School leaders should then ensure that teachers' PD plans have SMART goals and that they are fully implemented.

IV. Infrastructure for Student Success

Findings:

- The school has an unwelcoming appearance, including poor lighting. The building has few welcoming or directional signs. It is difficult to find as there are few external indicators to identify the building as a school.

- The learning environment is drab and unappealing, and the school has little identity in the community. Hallways are not effectively used to display student work, promote the school mission statement, and create an exciting learning environment that fosters a unique school identity.

- Communication across the school is weak. The Inquiry team was unsure of procedures for students' entry and exit from school and was uncertain about who was responsible for parental links.

- The suspension rate is high and the strategies used by the guidance team have been ineffective in reducing it.

- The current AIS program lacks detail and is ineffective. The 37.5 minutes additional time is not effectively used to help and support students, as it is added to each period.

- Many students are unaware of their academic progress towards graduation. Credit accumulation and assessments are posted by an ID number and only available on request, so that a number of students, especially those who attend irregularly, are unaware of their status.

- There is an inconsistent approach to preparing students for college. A number of students do not receive adequate college counseling services. There is no evidence of continuous college advising. A program has only been recently developed for grade 9 that involves all support staff but does

not continue into the other grades. There is no transitional linkage coordinator to service students with disabilities. The result is that transition plans are not always written as part of students' Individual Education Plans (IEPs).

- There is no formal structure for the articulation of student support services. Teachers make opportunities to meet informally on student issues without any formal protocols.

- There is no mandated counseling for students with disabilities, no occupational therapy for 14 students with disabilities, and no consistent delivery of test modifications as indicated on IEPs. In addition, 42 students have not had their annual reviews completed within mandated timeframes.

- There is no formal system for identifying at-risk students and connecting them to after school or Saturday programs. A new system for tracking at-risk students has recently been introduced. However, not all teachers are trained on its use, and it is not yet effective in identifying at-risk student needs and matching them to appropriate services. No evidence was found that materials selected or used were research-based or differentiated to meet the needs of identified subgroups.

- Parental involvement has not increased in any comprehensive or significant way. Five to ten parents attend PTA meetings. The school does not have a newsletter and communication with parents is only sent by regular mail.

- The school does not have a comprehensive and systematic structure for the sharing of assessment information with parents. The Computerized Pupil Path program has just been introduced, along with training for the parents who chose to attend. Systems to ensure that parents receive information about their child's graduation rate are not robust. Notices informing parents of student failure to graduate are sent home by regular mail and there is no guarantee that parents receive the information, as there is no formal system for follow up.

- There appears to be no systematic and effective translation service. The team asked for evidence of translated letters, but they were not provided.

- Parents have not been surveyed in a systematic and comprehensive manner in order to target their needs and improve the school's instructional program. Parents only receive the City survey and the response rate is low. No evidence was available to show how the information is used to modify practices.

Recommendations:

- School leaders should work with the school custodian and school facilities to review all school environment issues and address the lighting issue in particular.

- A task force consisting of staff, parents and students should be formed to work with the art department in order to improve the learning environment in the building.

- The system for communication should be reviewed to ensure that information about the school, including its organization, is accessible to all staff. The school leader should regularly check channels of communication and seek ways for continuous improvement.

- School leaders should explore the reasons for the high suspension rate and then take swift action to reduce it.

- A comprehensive student support service plan that includes AIS resources should be created with Network support. It should include rigorous action plans and deadlines for addressing issues. The plan should be shared with the whole school community, and school leaders should monitor and evaluate the success of the plan.

- A calendar for the frequent and timely reporting of credit accumulation, assessments and graduation requirements should be established. Regular status updates to parents and students should be sent and available electronically, via direct mail and through personal conferences with school counselors.

- A comprehensive and systematic career and college advising program should be established that addresses the needs of all student subgroups beginning in grade 9. Student progress toward graduation should be monitored with clear communication protocols involving students, teachers, guidance staff and parents. Additionally, the school should hire a transitional linkage coordinator to work with students with disabilities in formulating plans for post-secondary education or training for employment opportunities.

- Regular meetings should be scheduled to enable articulation between support staff and classroom teachers to share information about students and their progress. Support staff should make presentations at staff conferences to share information about successful intervention strategies and proactive measures to deal with student achievement.

- All counseling mandates should immediately be implemented. An occupational therapist should be hired to fulfill all mandates. A system of protocols and staffing should be established to provide every student with their test modification for every examination. The designated AP should develop a comprehensive plan to complete annual reviews within the mandated timeframe.

- Protocols should be established that identify at-risk students and place them with the appropriate support staff and programs to meet their needs both during the school day and after school on Saturday. Additional training should be provided for teachers on using the new at-risk student electronic data identification system. The Network should assist the school in reviewing the materials being used in at-risk support programs to assure that they are research based and directly linked to the needs of identified subgroups.

- A comprehensive needs assessment should be conducted to ascertain parent interests and needs. The topics should be prioritized and incorporated into an agenda for future meetings and the timing of future meeting should be adjusted to maximize parent participation. Communication with parents should include the development of a newsletter, e-mail contact, parent breakfasts/lunches and phone contacts.

- A comprehensive communication system should be implemented to ensure that parents are in receipt of current assessment results for their children.

- All written and oral communication to parents and guardians should be provided in the home languages of all student groups.

- School leaders should provide additional support to the parent coordinator in order to improve the schoolwide parental survey. This communication should be supported through e-mails, phone

calls, and outreach to increase the response level to the DOE survey and promote better articulation with community-based organizations.

V. Collection, Analysis, and Utilization of Data

Findings

- Teachers rarely use information from assessments to plan instruction to meet the needs of students and do not use the recently introduced Skedula. The school's data binder contains raw data but no analyses. There has been no analysis of attendance data by subgroup or to identify any trends. The use of data has been an issue in the last two Quality Reviews and there is little evidence that its use has improved since the date of the last review.

- Data is not analyzed to identify trends in the school. Little attention has been paid to conducting an in-depth analysis of data related instructional issues and areas not making AYP. The Inquiry Team is not examining strategies for improving achievement as it is focusing on attendance.

- There was little evidence of the use of formative assessment. There is a wealth of available data that could be used to provide information about improving teaching and learning but it is not used. Neither is the data analyzed to track the progress of students. Skedula has been introduced to do this, but the system is too new to have had an impact.

Recommendations:

- School leaders should seek Network support to develop an action plan to improve teacher use of data to drive school improvement. All staff should be involved in implementing the plan. School leaders should regularly observe classes to ensure that data is being used to guide differentiated instruction.

- A data specialist should be appointed to work with school leaders to analyze the data to identify trends in achievement and attendance of subgroups of students. This information should be regularly shared with all staff. Regular observation of lessons should focus on how effectively teachers use this information to ensure student achievement.

- School leaders should seek support to provide PD to teachers on how to systematically collect data. They should then ensure that teachers use the data to inform instruction. The data specialist and school leaders should regularly meet with teachers during common planning time and focus upon the data to determine how the curriculum and teaching should be adapted to meet the needs of each student.

VI. Professional Development

Findings

- There is no comprehensive PD plan based upon the changed population of the school that focuses on meeting the different needs of teachers. There was little evidence that PD has changed instructional practices.

- The UFT Teacher Center is not effectively used to support PD.

- Insufficient time is given for PD and school leaders have not evaluated the impact of the PD that has taken place. The recently introduced common planning time is used to develop the curriculum and instruction but there was little evidence of outcomes from this in the classrooms.

- The impact of the recently created Inquiry Teams and PLCs is not evident. There was no evidence of assigning teacher mentors or coaches to new teachers, teachers in need of improvement or teachers new to the grade.

- There are no mechanisms for linking information from observations or the performance of students to PD. The survey taken by teachers in the use of digital media was not followed up with staff development to address the needs of the teachers. School leaders attribute low achievement to students coming into the school with fewer skills and lacking in motivation. School leaders have not focused on addressing changing student needs and the needs of the teachers who work with them.

- There is no mechanism for sharing feedback from observation of lessons among the administrative team to determine priorities for PD. Workshops on the use of assessment and differentiation of instruction have taken place, but there was little evidence of this in classrooms. The schoolwide protocols for walkthroughs are weak. School leaders have identified student engagement, the use of assessment and differentiation as areas for improvement, but the impact of the work to develop these areas was not evident.

- The PD plan does not indicate how PD will support teachers understanding of meeting the needs of students with disabilities and ELLs. Teachers received PD for ELLs in February 2011 and for students with disabilities in August 2010 but there is little evidence of effectiveness in observed classes.

Recommendations:

- School leaders should review the individual professional needs of staff and develop a comprehensive PD plan. The plan should take into account the diverse needs of the students, the school goals and be differentiated to meet the needs of all staff.

- The UFT Teacher Center should work closely with school leaders to provide high quality PD. Consideration should be given to establishing an exemplar classroom and to identifying master teachers for each subject who could be used to model instruction.

- The PD plan should be monitored and the effectiveness of PD regularly evaluated through observations of lessons, focused walkthroughs and analysis of data.

- School leaders should focus the work of the Inquiry teams and PLCs on raising achievement and then monitor the effect on student achievement.

- School leaders should establish a mechanism for analyzing the information from lesson observations and then use this to inform the PD plan. Walkthroughs should focus on the impact of the plan on classroom practice.

- School leaders should seek external support to ensure that all teachers receive PD that reflects the increase in number of ELLs and students with disabilities. Observation of lessons should focus upon how instruction differs for these students.

VII. District Support

Findings:

- The Network has not adequately monitored the school budget to assure allocations were effectively accessed, that translations were always provided and that purchase of instructional materials were prioritized.

- The Network did not effectively monitor the budget to prevent a lack of balance between the large number of school leaders and the allocation of other instructional resources.
- The Network appears not to have followed up their recommendations with a review of the final CEP or by giving additional support for the implementation of needed revisions.

Recommendations:

- The Network should work with school leaders to create a more effective infrastructure to support teaching and learning by prioritizing departmental needs according to subgroups and academic areas not making AYP. An in-depth needs assessment survey by departments should be conducted and then a comprehensive plan should be created to address all identified needs in a timely fashion. Budget decisions should be informed by this assessment and spending planned on an ongoing basis with critical gaps in instructional materials and translation services quickly addressed.

- The Network should work with school leaders to review the budget and allocation of resources to ensure that instructional needs are prioritized and targeted according to areas not making AYP. The allocation of resources should be regularly monitored to make certain that they are correctly aligned. The Network should work with school leaders to seek grants in order to support the work to improve the graduation rate.

- The Network should work with school leaders to ensure that the SLT is effectively participating in the development, ongoing assessment and implementation of the CEP. The Network should also assist school leaders with identifying and securing additional NYCDOE support resources for SLT training and CEP development.

- The Network should support the school in the implementation of the JIT recommendations.

PART 3: OVERALL FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Overall Finding

Reference	Review Team Finding	✓
(c)	The school has not made sufficient progress in identified areas, and is unlikely to make AYP under the current structure and organization.	✓

B. Overall Recommendation

Reference	Review Team Recommendation	✓
(c)	Develop and implement a new plan that could include significant changes in staff, organizational structure, leadership and/or configuration, to address issues that continue to negatively impact student academic performance in identified areas.	✓

C. In the space below, include specific information to support the District in determining how the above recommendation should be accomplished.

The school with its present organizational structure is not going to increase the graduation rate because the administrative team has not established high expectations for the achievement of students or effective structures for school management. Significant change in school leadership and staff, with a focus on the areas of science, special education and mathematics, is recommended. In addition, the following should occur:

- Involve all members of the school community in establishing a vision for the school that is not only shared with all stakeholders but also understood by them. This should be widely advertised in order to create a sense of identity for the school within the community.

- Establish a system of teacher evaluation that is supportive and developmental and is regularly monitored for effectiveness.

- Use the wealth of data in the school to develop a differentiated program for staff development based on the identification of school and individual teacher priorities.

- Develop a program to attract students to the school by marketing the school's CTE component in middle schools and the community.

- Establish a system of support for all students from grades 9 through 12 that provides individual counseling and advice during their time in school and supports their decisions about work or college.