

NYSED/NYCDOE JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BEDS Code/DBN:	13K605
School Name:	George Westinghouse Career and Technical Education High School
School Address:	105 Johnson Street Brooklyn NY 11201
Principal:	Janine Kieran
Restructuring Phase/Category:	Restructuring Advanced Comprehensive Mathematics- All Students; Black Students; Hispanic Students;
Area of Identification:	Economically Disadvantaged English Language Arts- Hispanic Students and Economically
Other Area of Identification:	Disadvantaged
Dates of On-site Diagnostic Review:	March 8-9, 2011

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

A. Community and School Background

The George Westinghouse Career and Technical Education High School (CTE HS) serves 915 students in grades 9 through 12. George Westinghouse CTE HS shares the site with another high school. The two schools operate on different schedules but share the same entrance, gym, cafeteria and library and some classrooms. The school enrollment is 76 percent Black, 14 percent Hispanic, three percent Asian, two percent White and one percent American Indian students. The background of four percent of students was not reported. Just over one percent of students are English Language Learners (ELLs) and 15 percent are students with disabilities. Students travel to the school from all five boroughs of New York City.

The administrative team includes the Principal and six Assistant Principals (APs). The Principal is in her third year as leader of the school. The AP for organization has served in that role for eight years. The AP for guidance and students with disabilities has held that position for two years. The AP for security has been in post for ten years. The AP for mathematics, science and the ninth grade academy has served for two years. The AP for English language arts, social studies and the upper grade academies has served for ten years. The AP for scheduling and career technology is new to the post this school year. The turnover in administrative staff has been low.

There are 56 teachers on staff. Four are new to the school this year, and ten have been at the school for one to three years. Ninety percent of the teachers are highly qualified. The teacher turnover rate is eight 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	
+	The school’s most recent Total Cohort graduation rate reflects a 20 percent gap reduction between the school’s graduation rate in the previous year and the State’s 80 percent graduation rate benchmark.	✓
-	Negative trend data for one or more identified subject/areas and subgroups for the past 2 consecutive years (2008-09 and 2009-10), as indicated by an decrease in the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3 and/or a decrease in the Performance Index.	✓
-	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.	✓
-	Performance data for the school on NYSED Accountability Overview Reports (AOR) for 2008-09 and 2009-10 show an increase in the number of subgroups that did not make AYP in identified area(s).	✓
-	Performance data for the school on NYSED Accountability Overview Reports (AOR) for 2008-09 and 2009-10 indicate an increase in the achievement gap between identified subgroups and the All Students subgroup in one or more identified subject/area(s).	✓
	NYCDOE Quantitative and Qualitative Performance Measures	
-	2008-09 NYC Progress Report Grade of D or F (or C for 3 consecutive years)	✓
+/	NYC Quality Review Score of Proficient	✓

B. School Strengths

The school provides an environment that is respectful of students and parents and is safe and clean.

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

Finding:

The school has not developed a curriculum in mathematics that is fully aligned to the school’s needs and the New York State (NYS) Standards. While some work has begun and some units have been developed, these do not effectively drive instruction across all mathematics courses.

Recommendation:

The Network should work with the school on the development of curriculum in mathematics and ensure that it is clearly aligned with the current NYS Learning Standards. Curriculum should be aligned

to the new NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards in Mathematics to prepare for implementation in school year 2012-13. Mathematics 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 in the subjects being taught.

II. Teaching and Learning

Findings:

- Teachers do not use a wide variety of instructional strategies or resources, particularly in mathematics. Most teachers used whole group instruction supported by textbooks and worksheets.
- In math co-teaching classes the general education teachers conducted the lesson while the special education teachers provided some assistance where needed.
- Overall, the pace of lessons in both English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics was too slow. The extended period was not used to continue instruction but was used for independent reading. In some classrooms, poor transitions led to a loss of instructional focus and time on task.
- In mathematics classes, engagement was generally low. There was minimal student-to-student interaction. Mathematics instruction generally involved worksheets, board problems, and textbook problems. In many cases, students waited for extended periods while other students wrote solutions to problems on the board. Goals were not explicitly referred to during lessons. Few instances of small-group instruction were observed. In cases where small groups were created, it was not clear if data were used to form groups. Students indicated that grouping was often based on behavior or their personal choice.
- There was limited evidence of effective instructional strategies, especially in mathematics classes. While modeling was observed in some mathematics classes, the primary mode of instruction was lecture. No checking for understanding was observed in mathematics classes.
- Most questions in mathematics were low-level and procedural and did not develop student understanding. No evidence of higher-order thinking skills was observed in mathematics. Problems that were given to students were procedural and did not develop higher-order thinking skills.
- Overall, there is scant evidence of effective differentiated instruction based on the diagnosed learning needs of students. There were a few instances of student choice, but that strategy was not effectively employed to address diverse learning needs. There was no evidence of differentiated instructional strategies in mathematics.
- In mathematics, student work was limited. While there appears to be a standard mathematics rubric for the school, it is inconsistently used in classrooms for grading and providing feedback on

student assignments. In both ELA and mathematics classes, teachers did not sufficiently provide instructive feedback on student work to guide their next steps.

- Available technology, such as SMART Boards and laptop carts, was not effectively used in either ELA or mathematics classrooms.
- In mathematics, there is a common grading policy that is interpreted differently by teachers, e.g., different weights associated with formative and summative assessments are used. Of the four core subjects, mathematics consistently has the highest marking period pass rates; however, students are not passing the Regents mathematics test and this prevents the school from making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Recommendations:

- The school should enhance support for teachers to increase their repertoire of instructional skills by increasing one-on-one coaching, especially in mathematics. School leaders should build upon the current practice of intervisitations by requiring those who engage in these to turnkey best practices for their colleagues. School leaders should hold teachers responsible for implementing effective instructional techniques that are learned during intervisitation.
- The school should provide time for common planning between co-teaching partners. Intervisitations to model co-taught ELA classes should be facilitated for mathematics co-teachers. The Network should provide ongoing PD and support to facilitate the use of effective co-teaching strategies, and school leaders should regularly monitor the implementation of these strategies.
- Administrators should monitor the pacing of lessons and the consistent use and following of the lesson schedules (“flow of the day”) that are posted in classrooms. In addition, teachers and administrators should ensure that transitions between lessons are smooth and swift so that there is no loss in instructional time. Teachers of extended period classes should be provided with PD on how to effectively plan for these periods to appropriately challenge all students.
- The school should provide intensive PD for mathematics teachers on developing effective strategies to engage students in active learning and on how to incorporate cooperative learning strategies in lessons. The Network should support teachers in the effective use of data to formulate small groups.
- The school should identify model classrooms where teachers are especially effective at modeling and routinely check for understanding using a variety of methods, both within the building and in other schools. School leaders should schedule intervisitations and hold teachers accountable for implementing best practices that are observed.
- Training in Bloom’s Taxonomy and other techniques should be revisited to assist teachers in developing students’ critical thinking skills. Teachers should be held accountable for the routine incorporation of critical thinking and problem solving by regular review of their lesson plans.
- The use of differentiation of instruction should be given a high priority in all classrooms. The Network should conduct study groups to increase teacher and school leader understanding of how students learn and why differentiation is critical to meet student needs and improve outcomes. School leaders should hold teachers accountable for differentiating instruction through a review of lesson planning and observations of teaching.

- Exemplars should be created and used to support effective feedback for student work based on the rubrics currently in use. School leaders should model how teachers should communicate feedback on next steps so that students know how to improve. School leaders should create cross-disciplinary teacher partnerships to leverage effective feedback.
- The school should develop a plan for how technology is integrated into classroom instruction. The school should evaluate the services of current instructional technology consultants to ensure impact on classroom practices and outcomes.
- The established grading policy should be consistently applied. Mathematics inquiry teams should be used to investigate the causes of success and failure in courses and on Regents exams.

III. School Leadership

Findings:

- The school leader has formulated a clear vision for high expectations for the performance of students, but it is unclear whether this has been effectively communicated.
- The school leader has established a collaborative, democratic approach to leadership through the school leadership team (SLT). Therefore, all constituents feel empowered to engage and fully participate. However, the analysis of school needs has not been sufficiently rigorous, school goals are weak and activities are too generalized to ensure the necessary improvements.
- The teacher schedule includes common planning time for some grades and content areas; however, the impact of these arrangements on improved teaching and learning is unclear. Except for grade 9, staffing assignments do not permit all teachers of a common subject to meet together to discuss program construction, delivery and student progress. The impact of this practice is thus limited.
- Administrators have been diligent in implementing a rigorous system of teacher evaluation. All observation reports provide reasonable recommendations, mainly for increased rigor, more student involvement and more use of differentiated activities. However, follow-up to these recommendations is not clear, except in the case of unsatisfactory ratings.

Recommendations:

- The school leader should communicate her vision for high student achievement verbally and in writing, through faculty conferences, department meetings, student assemblies, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings, interface with community-based organizations (CBOs), and the SLT to ensure understanding and buy-in from all stakeholders.
- The Network should assist the SLT in root cause analysis of the school's failure to make AYP. This analysis should inform high but attainable goals for student learning. In addition, action plans should be specific and targeted to the urgent areas of identified need.

The school should reorganize teacher schedules to ensure that common planning time is provided to teachers by subject area to offer opportunities for articulation across grades and content areas, with agreed agendas designed to share good practices and consistently improve student progress.

- The school leaders should build immediate follow-up activities into their system of teacher observation, to ensure that recommendations are implemented effectively and that further support and training is provided to individuals and groups as appropriate.

IV. Infrastructure for Student Success

Findings:

- School leaders interviewed expressed suitably high expectations for learning. Nevertheless, goals set in the Comprehensive Education Plan (CEP) are not in line with the school leaders expectations. Some teachers do not demonstrate high enough expectations for student learning.
- Materials and instructional methodologies used in academic intervention services (AIS) are not differentiated sufficiently enough to meet the individual needs of students.
- The electrical capacity of the school building is insufficient to support the effective use of instructional technology.

Recommendations:

- The CEP should develop a clear picture of student needs, along with goals that specifically address those needs and the school's identification for improvement in mathematics and ELA. Further, goals should express ambitious, high expectations that prepare students for college and careers. All stakeholders should have shared expectations regarding the outcomes for all students.
- The school leaders should evaluate the effectiveness of current AIS systems and structures, including scheduling, instructional approaches, materials used, and curricula. Based on the evaluation, the school should make appropriate revisions to the AIS plan to ensure that these programs serve the intended purpose of improved learning.
- The Principal, with Network support, should request an evaluation of the building's electrical capacity. Modifications should be made where necessary to ensure that the electrical capacity is appropriate to enable technology to support instruction across the school.

V. Collection, Analysis, and Utilization of Data

Findings:

- There is little evidence that the school uses data to review the efficacy of programmatic decisions. While the school has identified mathematics and ELA as broad areas in need of support, there is no evidence that the school has thoroughly analyzed the reasons for the lack of student success, particularly in mathematics, and has evaluated instruction, programs, and systems in these areas.
- The administration expects teachers to use data, and teachers use common benchmark assessments in all academic subjects. Item analyses are generated for each course and teacher. The use of the data in instructional planning is limited, evidenced by the lack of differentiation in instructional approaches or student materials and the predominance of whole class instruction. While administrators report that teachers use common planning time to analyze student work, there is little evidence of the findings of these analyses and the resultant impact on instruction.

- Teachers collect data from formative and summative assessments. Teachers report that they are in the early stages of learning to use 'hard' data effectively to plan their instruction and many need support in doing this effectively.
- Students are identified for AIS based on performance on a variety of standardized tests, including Regents and incoming grade 8 test performance. However, instructional strategies and materials within these remedial periods are the same for all students, suggesting that teachers are not using data well enough to develop specifically tailored interventions for the students in these programs.

Recommendations:

- The school should engage the services of the Network or a highly qualified consultant to assist the school in developing a systemic approach to using and analyzing data to identify and address the reasons for low student achievement, particularly in ELA and mathematics.
- The data specialist should have a reduced teaching load to provide the opportunity to work side by side with teachers and school leaders on the effective collection, analysis, and use of data in planning instruction.
- School leaders should increase the expectation that teachers use numerous data points, including formative assessments, to plan lessons. The plans should show the use of effective differentiation to address identified student needs. Through the review of lesson plans and the observation of instruction, school leaders should hold teachers accountable for delivering data-driven differentiated instruction.
- The school leaders should evaluate the effectiveness of current AIS systems and structures, including scheduling, instructional approaches, materials used, and curricula. Based on this evaluation, the school should make appropriate revisions to the AIS plan to ensure that these programs serve the intended purpose of increased learning.

VI. Professional Development

Findings:

- There is a well-developed calendar of PD activities reflecting school goals and other identified needs. However, a clearly designed schoolwide, content-based program for improving instruction in ELA and mathematics that includes the participation of all staff is not in place.
- Practices such as inquiry, action research and peer review are not systemic and only about ten percent of teachers are involved rather than the 90 percent expected by the City. The observed inquiry team was in the beginning stages of development.
- Teachers give feedback to the school leader on PD activities. This may well influence future PD opportunities for that member of staff, but it is not evident that this influences a schoolwide review of PD needs. While there is a calendar of PD activities, there is no schoolwide PD plan that focuses on detailed subject needs.
- Written evaluations of classroom instruction do not make sufficient reference to the impact of PD on student learning.

- The lack of a comprehensive PD plan inhibits the institution of a systemic approach to planning and delivering schoolwide PD in support of the attainment of schoolwide goals. Rather, individual PD arises from observations of instruction for some, but not all, teachers and content areas.

Recommendations:

- School leaders should create a PD committee tasked with the creation of a schoolwide, comprehensive PD plan specifically designed to improve the quality of instruction, especially in the areas in which the school has not made AYP.
- The Network should support the school in establishing inquiry teams in both mathematics and ELA to increase teacher involvement to 90 percent. These teams should focus on using data to examine student outcomes and teacher practices, and inform revisions to instructional approaches that evidence suggests are effective at raising student achievement.
- The recommended PD committee should establish routines for enlisting feedback from teachers about the quality and impact of all PD activities and use this to revise and improve future offerings to continue to meet all teacher needs.
- School leaders should devise a protocol for identifying PD, including workshops, coaching, and intervisitations, attended by teachers they observe. Observation feedback should be provided relative to the specific instructional strategies addressed in those offerings.
- The recommended PD committee should regularly evaluate the impact of the PD program against student outcomes and teacher practice.

VII. District Support

Finding:

The Network reviewed the CEP and provided feedback. However, the feedback was mainly procedural, i.e., ensuring that the school followed the correct format, rather than evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the content. For instance, the Network did not counsel the school to adjust goals to reflect high expectations accurately for students and the gains necessary to make AYP. Further, there is no evidence of the Network monitoring the implementation of the CEP.

Recommendations:

- The Network should be guided by the needs assessment and assist the school to improve the CEP.
- The Network should support the school in the implementation of the Joint Intervention Team (JIT) recommendations.

Other Concern:

Among the school leaders, there is not sufficient content area expertise to lead curricular implementation and give support to teachers in ELA and mathematics.

PART 3: JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM OVERALL FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Overall Findings

Reference	JIT Finding for Restructuring Advanced Schools	✓
(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	Recommendation by the JIT for Restructuring Advanced Schools	✓
(c)	Develop and implement a new Restructuring Plan that includes <u>significant changes in staff, organizational structure, leadership and/or configuration</u> , 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 JIT recommendation should be implemented.

- The school leader should enlist all stakeholders in creating a comprehensive Restructuring Plan that incorporates the recommendations specified in the JIT report. The plan should include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - Replace staff who are unwilling or unable to implement the Restructuring Plan.
 - Reorganize the responsibilities of APs to ensure effective leadership for mathematics, as well as science and the humanities. Appoint an AP with certification in mathematics.
 - Reorganize teacher schedules to embed common planning time by academic subject area and ensure opportunities for articulation across all grades and content areas. Common planning time should be structured to address critical areas regarding curriculum development, instructional practices and the efficient and effective use of assessments to result in increased student learning.
 - Reorganize the current organizational structure of three academies (small learning communities) to allow for common staffing to ensure effective impact.
 - Reconfigure the data specialist position to allow for a reduced teaching load to ensure opportunities for the specialist to work side-by-side with teachers and school leaders on the effective use of data.
 - Develop a clearly defined PD plan that is sufficiently robust to produce the expected outcomes for improved teaching and learning in mathematics and ELA.

- The Network should continue its strong support for the school and play an active role in implementing the Restructuring Plan by assisting school leaders in evaluating the effectiveness of current instructional practices and programs and identifying research-based solutions for:
 - Continued development of standards-based curricula for all content areas;
 - Developing teacher capacity to deliver effective instruction especially in mathematics and ELA;
 - Refinement of skills in the analysis and effective use of student performance data;
 - Improving the impact of inquiry teams; and
 - Redesigning AIS structures to ensure rapid improvements in student learning.