

NYSED/NYCDOE JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|--|
| BEDS Code/DBN: | 11X144 |
| School Name: | JHS 144 Michelangelo |
| School Address: | 2545 Gunther Avenue Bronx, NY 10469 |
| Principal: | Pauline Mattis |
| Restructuring Phase/Category: | Restructuring Advanced Comprehensive |
| Area(s) of Identification: | English Language Arts- All students; Black students, Hispanic students, Students with Disabilities; English Language Learners; Economically Disadvantaged students |
| Dates of On-site Diagnostic Review: | March 29-30, 2011 |

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

A. Community and School Background

JHS 144 Michelangelo serves 969 students in grades 6 through 8. The school enrollment is 68 percent Black, 25 percent Hispanic, three percent Asian and two percent White students. Eight percent of the students are English language learners (ELLs), and 18 percent are students with disabilities. Students live within a radius of five miles from the school.

The administrative team consists of the Principal and three Assistant Principals (APs). The Principal is in her first year as school leader but has been at the school for more than three years. The three Assistant Principals (APs) have been at the school for more than three years. There are 78 teachers on staff. Twelve percent of the teachers have been at the school for fewer than three years, one percent for less than one year, and six percent are new teachers. Teacher turnover has been low at seven percent. Eighty-four percent of the teachers are highly qualified.

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 | |
| - | Negative trend data for one or more identified subject/areas and subgroups for the past 2 consecutive years (2007-08 and 2008-09), 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 | ✓ |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Positive or Negative Indicator (+/-) | School Performance Indicators | ✓ |
| | subject/area(s) of identification. | |
| - | Performance data for the school on NYSED Accountability Overview Reports (AOR) for 2007-08 and 2008-09 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 2007-08 and 2008-09 indicate an increase in the achievement gap between identified subgroups and the <u>All Students</u> subgroup in one or more identified subject/area(s). | ✓ |
| | NYCDOE Quantitative and Qualitative Performance Measures | |
| - | 2008-09 NYC Progress Report Grade of C | ✓ |
| + | NYC Quality Review Score of Well-Developed | ✓ |

B. School Strengths

Teachers treat students with respect and are supportive of one another.

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:

- Curriculum maps for reading and writing are not aligned to the New York State (NYS) Performance Indicators. Work to align these curriculum maps is planned for the end of the semester. The implementation of curriculum maps varies between and within grades.
- Curriculum maps and pacing calendars have not been modified for students with disabilities or ELLs with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Curriculum maps and pacing calendars were not sufficiently refined for New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) students to align with the goals on their IEPs.
- Curriculum maps and pacing calendars have not been revised based on information from assessments, both longitudinal and current. An assessment grid aligned to the reading and writing curriculum maps is not sufficiently specific.
- Resources for English language arts (ELA) do not support progress in reading because the selection of books in classroom libraries is not aligned to the different reading levels of all students. Additionally, the books are outdated and in poor condition. There are insufficient whole class book sets for each grade, as each grade has a choice of only two titles.

Recommendations:

- The ELA department should ensure that the plans to align curriculum maps to performance indicators and the Common Core State Standards are undertaken as quickly as possible. The school leader with responsibility for ELA should monitor lessons to ensure that teachers consistently use the curriculum maps.
- The ELA department should modify curriculum maps and pacing calendars to meet the needs of all students with disabilities and ELLs. Additionally, curriculum maps and pacing calendars should be refined to include alignment of NYSAA alternate performance indicators.
- School leaders should analyze data for patterns and trends and adjust curriculum maps and pacing calendars to more closely meet the needs of the diverse populations of students across the school.
- School leaders should work with the Network to secure funds to increase the number of books in the class libraries. A wide range of books should be selected to reflect the different reading levels of the students in each class.

II. Teaching and Learning**Findings:**

- Teaching was predominantly didactic; it was led by the teacher and directed at the whole class. Teachers did all the work and students had few opportunities to develop as independent learners or to extend their language skills. Many teachers did not understand how to adapt their teaching to address the needs of students with disabilities or ELLs.
- The activities planned by teachers did not encourage lively discussion to deepen student understanding, and questions to guide learning were unfocused. Many teachers did not reinforce their expectations that students would discuss their work to extend their learning or language skills. Students with disabilities rarely engaged in small group interaction.
- The majority of teachers had poor understanding of ways to differentiate instruction to meet the specific needs of individuals or groups. Many teachers mistakenly thought differentiation was achieved by placing an academically proficient student with one who was not academically proficient. This did little to ensure that academically proficient students were appropriately challenged. Less proficient students did not receive instruction that met their individual needs. Teachers did not use information from data to plan work to meet the needs of the different student ability levels in each class.
- The pacing of lessons did not allow for effective learning. Activities were frequently prolonged and, as a result, many students became disengaged. For example, the 'do now' at the start of many lessons was too long. This set an inappropriate tone for the lesson and students did not regain their motivation.

- There were few resources to reflect the cultures of students in the school or of world cultures. Materials were outdated and predominantly about American culture.
- The diagnostic assessment of reading by ELA teachers was weak, so students did not receive the support they needed to become proficient readers. Reading assessment using the Writing and Reading Assessment Profile (WRAP) is conducted twice a year. This assessment is not effectively used to define students' strengths or weaknesses in order for teachers to plan individual student support and progress. Additionally there is no grade-by-grade system of benchmark levels to support goal setting for students in reading across the year. Students are placed on a reading level at the first assessment and remain on that reading level during the entire school year. Guided reading groups are not being implemented due to a lack of available supportive library texts. Additionally, there are no appropriate curriculum materials and resources specific to the needs of students with disabilities and students participating in the NYSAA.
- The assessment of writing is weak because the school has not developed a system that takes into account growth from grade to grade.
- Although teachers wrote the learning goal from the NYS Standards on their boards, they were rarely constructed in student friendly language. Rubrics, based on the Standards, accompanied much of the work, but lacked rigor, with little to differentiate a Level 1 from a Level 4. The performance indicators were not used as the basis for rubrics. The next steps for students were frequently superficial and focused on grammar instead of the equally important shaping of ideas.
- Many teachers lacked an understanding of ways to develop student literacy skills across the content areas. Most teachers employed word walls but these were mainly used to reinforce spelling and not to consolidate student understanding of the concept of the technical vocabulary. In all content areas, many students had difficulty in making sense of the written word.
- The questioning skills of teachers were poor. Questions were predominantly closed and demanded one-word answers with few follow-up questions to probe student understanding or to extend thinking. Rarely were students expected to develop higher-order thinking skills.
- Teachers do not effectively use technology to support student learning because computers are outdated and the school staff have little technological expertise.

Recommendations:

- School leaders should extend the range of teaching and learning strategies to more involve students in their learning by drawing on external coaches and other expertise from the Network. Professional Development (PD) that includes individual support to teachers and monitoring of lessons should focus on ensuring that students spend more time working independently.

- School and Network leaders should work with teachers to plan lessons that use the information from data to group students. Activities should be planned that encourage students to discuss and justify their points of view and thereby deepen their understanding of the content of the lesson.
- School leaders and the Network should bring in external expertise to develop leaders' and teachers' understanding of ways to use the analysis of data to plan lessons that meet the individual learning needs of all students, including students with disabilities and ELLs. Lesson plans should include a section on how teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students in their class. This should be a focus for all lesson observations.
- School leaders should ensure that teachers plan lessons that incorporate a range of activities to engage students and are carefully paced to maintain their motivation. School leaders should monitor lesson planning and lessons to ensure that all plans are consistently implemented in the classroom.
- The Network should help school leaders to provide resources that reflect world cultures. Teachers should ensure that lesson planning includes raising student awareness of the richness and diversity of world cultures. School leaders should regularly survey student understanding of different cultures.
- School leaders, with the support of the Network, should provide PD to increase teacher understanding of the diagnostic testing of reading. A continuum of reading levels should be defined based on student data, with medial benchmarks established for student achievement across the year. Additionally, PD should reinforce the use of ongoing running record based assessments, aligned to benchmark progressions for each student across the year. These benchmarks should be an integral part of goal setting for all students. Interim benchmarks coupled with specific Writing Reading Assessment Profile (WRAP) data should form the basis of next steps for each student as a personal intervention plan (PIP). School leaders should monitor teaching and learning of reading to ensure strategies learned are put to effective use in the classroom.
- The school should use writing assessments aligned to NYS Standards Performance Indicators to form the basis of high quality monitoring of student writing and standardize these across the school. The school leader with responsibility for ELA should monitor the quality of feedback from teachers and evaluate the impact of this work on students' writing.
- School leaders should make expectations for teacher planning clear and consistent across grades and subjects. All lesson objectives should be written in student friendly language, shared with students and revisited throughout the lesson to ensure that the objective is being met. Rubrics should be rigorous, and students should be taught how to effectively use the rubrics to assess the quality of their own work and that of their peers.
- School leaders should work with the Network to use external coaches to provide PD on consolidating and extending student language skills in all content areas. School leaders should work with departments to examine the language demands of their subjects and plan

lessons that enable students to develop these language skills. Department leaders should monitor all lesson plans to ensure that they include all agreed language elements.

- School leaders should provide PD and guidance to staff on developing a range of questioning techniques that encourage students to think analytically and explain their ideas at length. School leaders should evaluate the impact of this PD in the classroom through the observation process.
- School leaders should work with the Network to secure funding for modern technology and PD should be provided on how to integrate technology into instruction. School leaders should then monitor how effectively students and teachers use these strategies.

III. School Leadership

Findings:

- Although the school leader's newly implemented initiative to raise teacher expectations for student performance has not yet impacted upon student achievement, students and teachers recognized that there has been movement towards higher expectations through the raising of grades for honor and merit rolls and a zero tolerance policy for inappropriate behavior. There were differences among staff about interpreting emerging policies because these were not fully embedded into the culture of the school. The Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) does not support the movement to raise achievement, as the actions do not have success criteria or timelines.
- The organization of the school did not reflect the needs of the school. APs had recently taken on the additional responsibility of supervising content subjects along with leadership of the three academies. The way in which they approached their new roles varied. There is no clear leader for curriculum, instruction or PD and few formalized procedures for managing the school.
- The School Leadership Team (SLT) functions as an arm of the administrative team but there are no formalized procedures for reviewing the CEP and monitoring progress of school goals. Parents have little involvement in the development of the CEP or in decision-making.
- School leaders have not yet ensured that there are up-to-date resources to support the instructional program. Resources, including books, are in short supply, are old and worn and do not motivate students to learn. Technological equipment is outdated and the school lacks technological expertise. Consequently, students have little experience with technology to prepare them for high school or their future careers.
- The school is not appropriately staffed to meet the varied needs of all students. For example, the literacy coach has only three periods to work with ELA teachers and also works as the Special Education Teacher Support Service (SETSS).

- There is no overarching plan for PD aligned to the needs of the students or teachers. Informal arrangements exist for teachers to attend PD and to turnkey their learning. This has not improved the quality of instruction.
- Students with disabilities do not receive their mandated Level 1 vocational assessments in preparation for high school, and there are no transition plans for students entering secondary schools. Students with disabilities in least restricted environments do not have equal access to the curriculum as they do not receive instruction in music, technology or art.
- The current system for teacher evaluation and feedback is not rigorous enough to improve the quality of instruction. Walkthroughs are not always focused on the school priorities, and information from monitoring the quality of instruction does not always direct PD.

Recommendations:

- The entire school community should work together to establish a vision that is based upon high expectations for students and teachers. The school vision should be accompanied by a rigorous CEP that clearly indicates high goals for student achievement with action plans to support these goals that contain success criteria and timelines. Interim benchmarks and a schedule to monitor progress towards the goals should be established. The school leader and Network should monitor progress towards meeting the goals.
- School leaders should work with the Network to review the leadership structure and to reorganize it to better meet the needs of the school. This should include allocating responsibility for key areas of identified improvement, including PD, instruction and the curriculum.
- The school should seek guidance from the Network in clarifying the role of the SLT. Formalized protocols should be established for the development of the CEP, particularly in setting dates for the review of the CEP and evaluating how well the school is meeting its goals. The protocols should ensure that parents have equal representation at meetings and are fully involved in school improvement processes.
- School leaders should work with the Network to review resources, draw up a needs analysis to identify areas of shortage and then realign existing resources to address the identified needs. The Network should provide advice on ways in which new resources can be procured and can effectively be used to improve student outcomes.
- The school leader should clarify the roles and responsibilities of the literacy coach and ascertain how her skills can be used to have a greater impact on improving ELA instruction and student achievement.
- School leaders should establish a PD plan that is aligned with school priorities in the CEP and individual teacher needs. The plan should draw on expert advice, including the Network. School leaders should monitor the plan to ensure that it is consistent with changing school needs.

- School leaders should ensure that students with disabilities receive all required services. The organization of the curriculum should be reviewed to ensure that students with disabilities have access to a full curriculum, and school leaders should observe practice in the classroom.
- School leaders should establish a formal plan for lesson observation that includes calibration of judgments and a focus on school priorities with systems that feed back into the school PD plan. The system should include a formal rubric for all observations, with written feedback that is developmental and leads to appropriate support in the identified areas for each teacher.

IV. Infrastructure for Student Success

Findings:

- There is currently inconsistency among staff as to how they perceive high expectations for students and implement them in their classrooms.
- A recently revised code of conduct for the school is not strictly and consistently enforced. Not all teachers follow the code of conduct, for example, the introduction of a rule to walk on the right side of hallways is not modeled by teachers, and therefore students do not follow the code either. The school has introduced the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) Program, and it is in the early stage of implementation. Data to review the effectiveness of this program is not yet being collected.
- Saturday tutorials targeting ELLs are not well attended. Only three out of 64 ELLs have attended additional academic support sessions. Counseling services are provided within the school on a limited basis and are not expanded to include family counseling.
- There is no formal system for identifying at-risk students. Reading assessments are not effectively used to determine student needs, or used by teachers to guide them when planning specific interventions for individual students.
- Except for mandated Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) incorporating some at-risk students, there were no additional Academic Intervention Services (AIS) during the day for level 1 or low level 2 general education students, ELLs or students with disabilities. A program for reading is used by SETSS teachers. Other struggling readers have little additional support, apart from the afterschool Supplemental Educational Services (SES) programs or Saturday Academy for ELLs that are poorly attended.
- Technology, including software programs, is not used to support the reading and writing skills of students with disabilities or ELLs because the technology is antiquated.
- There are no written Pupil Intervention Plans (PIPs) as required for all at-risk students.

- The Library Media Center is poorly provisioned with outdated computer technology and outdated library resources. Additionally, there is poor quality Internet connection in the school to support research projects as well as grade 8 exit projects.
- Science laboratory facilities are outdated and do not support effective teaching and learning.
- Parental involvement in school activities is low. Information is sent home via students, and parents report that students do not pass on the letters to them.

Recommendations:

- School leaders, with the support of the Network, should ensure that all teachers understand how to support the move to raise their expectations for students and that they are accountable for improving student outcomes. School leaders should consistently model high expectations in all their interactions.
- School leaders and teachers should model the code of conduct for students. School leaders should monitor classrooms and the building to ensure that the school code of conduct is consistently applied. Guidance counselors should review the effectiveness of the newly implemented code of conduct and the PBIS Program should be periodically reviewed and adjusted accordingly. Staff development should focus on all staff, including school safety officers and school aides to support consistent implementation of PBIS systems.
- The parent coordinator, with the support of the Network, should work with interested parents to canvas their views on how to involve more parents of ELLs in their child's education. The school should seek out the support of community-based organizations (CBOs) to expand services for at-risk students and their families.
- The school, with Network support, should provide PD to determine how to assess and support students who are at-risk, especially in reading and writing. A review should be conducted to determine the students at-risk and the services and funding necessary to support them. This list should be regularly reviewed and updated. Leaders should monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of all intervention services and supports.
- With Network support, school leaders should research effective programs to support students who are at-risk of failure. The school should work with support services to seek strategies to encourage family involvement in the Saturday schools that are available for ELLs.
- School leaders should work with the Network to seek funding to improve technological resources across the school. Leaders with responsibility for students with disabilities and ELLs should use external expertise to seek out rigorous software programs to support the development of student language skills and to understand how to effectively use them.
- School leaders should ensure that all students who are at-risk have written PIPs. These should be regularly monitored, evaluated and adjusted to ensure their success.

- School leaders, with the support of the Network, should identify budgetary resources and grants to expand the school library and media resources. Resources should be selected to reflect the diversity of the school population.
- The school, with the support of the Network, should identify budgetary resources and grants to support the expansion of science equipment and materials to provide sufficient hands-on learning experiences for all students in this content area.
- The school, with support of the Network, should identify CBOs that are skilled in outreach to strengthen and increase parent participation in all aspects of school community life. School leaders should develop new communication systems to ensure that all information about students reaches parents.

V. Collection, Analysis, and Utilization of Data

Findings:

- There are no data structures established in the school to support inquiry work. The lack of this has led to the inability of the school to effectively monitor student achievement and instructional programming. Additionally, the inquiry teams that are in place do not follow data protocols, nor do they work to identify schoolwide trends.
- There is a lack of a thorough analysis of data concerning student skills across all subject areas. The school looks at skills analysis in a cursory manner, identifying only standards that need to be addressed rather than specific strands.
- Assessments used across the school lack the consistency and variety to precisely identify either individual student or whole-school needs. The school uses Acuity, State tests and a variety of teacher based assessments, but do not to coordinate or standardize the use of these assessments to develop useful data trend analysis, formatively or otherwise.
- There is a lack of consistent data analysis using the assessments that are already in place. This has resulted in the inability of the school to identify student strengths and weaknesses and then to inform instructional planning to provide appropriate challenge in all lessons.
- At-risk students, including ELLs and students with disabilities are inconsistently identified and their progress is monitored in a limited way. Therefore, the school is unable to create targeted and appropriate instructional strategies to meet their specific learning needs.
- The school does not have appropriate promotional criteria for students with disabilities.
- The school has a system to inform parents/caregivers of students who are falling below standard by using interim progress reports to communicate this information. However, this system is not formalized by grade, content or academy.

Recommendations:

- The school should establish a schoolwide inquiry team led by the Principal. Representatives should include the data specialist and a member of each academy, as well as teachers who teach students with disabilities or ELLs. Regular analysis of schoolwide trend data with goal setting should then be turned over to academy meetings and inquiry teams, and aligned with curricular goals. Embedded within the structure of inquiry teams should be clearly outlined data protocols along with regular observations of practice to ensure consistent modifications.
- The school should identify external PD to directly support teachers in the establishment of data protocols and how to effectively use data analysis to inform instructional practice across all content areas. School leaders should monitor classroom practice to evaluate how well data is used to drive instruction.
- All assessments should be chosen to reflect school needs and should be expanded across the content areas to ensure consistent instructional practices that positively impact student achievement.
- The school should develop effective and consistent data use by all teachers to monitor student performance and to assist in the development of lesson planning by addressing the instructional needs of all students in all classes in all content areas.
- A clearly defined system to identify and monitor at-risk students should be designed to inform scheduling of supports to improve instructional practice for all subgroups.
- The school should develop a promotional criteria policy for all students, based on performance indicators that are aligned with State Standards. Students with disabilities should have promotional criteria appropriately modified to meet the requirements of their IEPs.
- The school should implement an interim progress report, standardized by grade, subject, and academy for all students. Included in the progress report should be a parent response section to provide additional feedback to the instructional process. The parent coordinator should be identified as the liaison between the school and the home.

VI. Professional Development**Findings:**

- There was no evidence of a comprehensive PD plan for the school focused on ELA, as identified within the State accountability report.
- There is no formal system to train other staff members after persons attend external PD offerings. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the PD activities that staff members have participated in have improved either instructional practice or student achievement.

- Too few PD activities include peer observation and model lesson demonstrations. The ELA coach demonstrating the model lessons has too few periods for coaching activities and is not used as an ELA resource for most staff members. The lesson observation process does not inform PD activities or monitor its implementation.

Recommendations:

- A comprehensive PD plan, closely aligned with the school goals, should be urgently developed. This plan should support individual teacher needs. The plan should include targeted strategies to ensure that teachers are provided with exemplary instructional practices that meet the unique needs of special populations, i.e., ELLs, long-term ELLs, students with disabilities, and other at-risk students. This PD plan should be specific and focused on identifying the key next steps to improve the instructional program leading to improved student achievement.
- School leaders should establish a formal mechanism to ensure that strategies learned by teachers in external PD are shared with other staff members and that sufficient time for this is provided. In addition, school leaders should monitor the effectiveness of implementation of all strategies learned in PD during routine classroom observations. All external PD should be in close alignment with the PD plan of the school and should relate to the identified needs of teachers and students.
- School leaders should seek high quality outside expertise to provide training and modeling in the strategies of differentiation of instruction. Feedback mechanisms should be established for learning walks, informal observations and instructional coaching activities to provide additional information to support more formal observation processes. All feedback should be designed to systematically improve the quality of teaching and learning across the school.

VII. District Support

Findings:

- The Network offers a generic menu for PD. However, the Network does not provide support to monitor the implementation of this PD within the school.
- The school receives limited support and guidance from the Network to coordinate its inquiry process. The work that has taken place has not had a positive impact on student achievement or instructional practice.
- The school receives generic budget guidance from the Network as to compliance with appropriate funding sources. The school's current lack of material resources and difficulty in scheduling human resources adversely impacts the instructional process and student performance.
- The Network provides PD in instructional areas but this has had a limited impact on student achievement and is not specific enough to meet school needs. The school has identified

effective questioning as an instructional strategy that needs to be further developed, yet the Network has been unable to support this initiative.

Recommendations:

- The Network should work with the school leader to develop a PD plan, based on the needs assessment conducted by the schoolwide inquiry team and areas of instructional improvement identified in the observation process. The Network should offer specific PD to respond to these indicators and provide mechanisms to monitor the implementation of these activities.
- The school and Network should identify additional supports through PD, school visitations, and the effective management of technology-based data tools and/or systems to develop the inquiry processes in the school. These should include clearly defined data protocols and inquiry team structures and responsibilities to enable close monitoring of student achievement and adjustment of instructional practices.
- The Network should provide ongoing budget guidance, beyond compliance issues, to maximize the use of available funds and identify potential sources to support school goals.
- The Network should develop a needs assessment to identify the instructional supports needed to guide school improvement, provide the PD opportunities and mechanisms to monitor their implementation, and modify them as needed.
- The Network should support the school in the implementation of the Joint Intervention Team (JIT) recommendations.

Other Concern:

The school has a high number of suspensions since the new system for recording all student offenses that occur after school and off the premises has been implemented.

PART 3: JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM OVERALL FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Overall Findings

| Reference | JIT Finding for Restructuring Advanced Schools | ✓ |
|-----------|--|---|
| (b) | The school has made some progress in identified areas, and may make AYP with further modification to the Restructuring Plan. | ✓ |

B. Overall Recommendation

| Reference | Recommendation by the JIT for Restructuring Advanced Schools | ✓ |
|-----------|--|---|
| (b) | Continue implementation of the current Restructuring Plan with <u>modifications</u> recommended as a result of the review. | ✓ |

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

- The Network should assign a mentor with experience in transformational leadership to work closely with the Principal on the establishment of an infrastructure to support school improvement and to monitor its effectiveness.
- With the support of the Network and a mentor, the Principal should review the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team to take into account the curriculum, PD and instruction. APs should be responsible for areas of the curriculum, for example, ELA and social studies; mathematics, science and technology; and the programs for ELLs and students with disabilities. The roles of academy leaders should be reviewed and reallocated to teacher leaders.
- A comprehensive PD plan, based upon a needs analysis, should be established and structures put in place to monitor the impact of PD on improving teaching and learning. The plan should be regularly reviewed to ensure that it takes account of emerging school priorities and students and teachers needs.
- A rigorous system of monitoring and evaluation of teaching and learning should be established, and the information from this should be used to provide PD and support to weak teachers. APs should be held accountable for the quality of teaching and learning in their areas of responsibility.
- All leaders and teachers should attend PD on how to use data to ensure that instruction meets the individual needs of all students.
- School leaders, with the support of the Network, should review the services provided to support students with disabilities and ELLs. A formalized structure should be established to ensure that all at-risk students are identified appropriately and that services are provided to meet their specific learning needs. Staff development for teachers of students with disabilities and ELLs should be ongoing and the impact of it monitored and evaluated by school leaders.
- The Network should closely work with the school to procure adequate resources to support effective teaching and learning in all content areas.