FINAL

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Accountability

Differentiated Accountability - School Quality Review (SQR)

SCHOOL QUALITY REVIEW REPORT

BEDS Code:	58090502004
District Name:	Hampton Bays Union Free School District
School Name:	Hampton Bays Middle School
School Address:	70 Ponquogue Avenue, Hampton Bays, NY 11946-1799
Principal:	Dennis J. Schug, Jr.
Accountability Phase/Category:	Improvement (year- 1) - Focused
Area of Identification:	English Language Arts – Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners
Dates of On-site Review:	December 13, 20, 2011 and January 13, 17, 2012

PART 1: MISSION STATEMENT

"Hampton Bays Middle School, in partnership with parents and the community, provides a safe, orderly environment with enriched educational programs and the strong leadership necessary to instill the ideals of responsibility, self-respect, and good citizenship that enable each student to develop to his or her fullest potential.

We work together to ensure learning is relevant for all students, honoring who we are today and who we hope to become during our time at Hampton Bays Middle School."

PART 2: SCHOOL STRENGTHS

- Hampton Bays Middle School is a new school, having been established less than four years ago.
- The staff was drawn from the elementary and high schools and consists largely of volunteers who subscribe to the middle school philosophy.
- The school features a daily advisory period and interdisciplinary teams, two important elements of the middle school philosophy.
- The building's design was informed by this philosophy and consists of four grade level pods where the core academic instruction takes place.
- While the school is a unified learning community, the pods make the 600 student school seem like four 150 student schools, thus providing a personalized and supportive environment to the students.

- The staff is responsive to student needs, and the school provides structural supports, such as scheduled Academic Intervention Services (AIS) and summer school, for struggling students.

- Teachers frequently provide after-school extra help.

PART 3: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND UTILIZATION OF DATA

FINDINGS:

- The school systematically collects data on student achievement, and these data come from multiple sources. There is evidence of systematic analysis of summative data, including trend analysis.

- There is evidence that teachers regularly administer formative assessments. There is some evidence that data from formative assessments is disaggregated by subgroups, particularly the data derived from the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) assessments.

- The reading teachers are using SRI data to plan instruction.

- With the exception of the reading teachers, there is little evidence that the data derived from assessments is used by the teachers to inform instructional planning. This is particularly the case for English Language Learners (ELLs).

- The Performance Indicators (PI) reports are infrequently used and do not usually form the basis for long range instructional planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Teachers should make systematic use of formative and interim assessment data to inform instructional planning. For example, SRI data could be used by content area teachers in common planning periods to set short-term instructional objectives for content area instruction.

- The reading teacher should regularly attend common planning periods and offer assistance to the classroom teacher in the interpretation of SRI data. The English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher should attend common planning periods and collaborate with regular education teachers to improve the achievement of ELLs.

- Data from New York State (NYS) English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) should be shared and analyzed, and those data should be used to improve the achievement of ELLs.

- On an annual or semi-annual basis, teachers should use data from the PI analysis of summative assessments to inform long range instructional planning.

- The school should provide professional development (PD) to support the use of data to inform instruction. In particular, refresher sessions should be regularly provided to reinforce the PD that has already been provided in this area.

II. TEACHING AND LEARNING

FINDINGS:

- There is limited evidence that general education teachers are developing instructional plans that address the instructional needs of ELLs. General education teachers have access to the Individualized Education Program (IEP's) of students assigned to their classes. However, specific roles and responsibilities were not made clear before instruction began in September, and thus not all modifications and accommodations specified in the IEP were implemented during the first week of instruction.

- The instructional plans reviewed by the team frequently did not contain instructional objectives, and in the lessons observed by the team, the objectives generally were not stated or posted.

- The school offers a continuum of services, i.e., resource room, consultant teacher, and self-contained classroom for students with disabilities. However, in grades 7 and 8, there was little evidence that consultant teachers were able to push-in and provide in-class support to students with disabilities.

- There is limited evidence that the regular education teachers are including modifications for the ELLs in their instructional plans.

- The bilingual program is taught in English. The classroom lacked Spanish language reference materials, and the implemented bilingual program is not a recognized, research-based program.

- ESL students at the basic level are scheduled in regular education classrooms throughout the school day, thus making it difficult for the ESL teacher to meet with the basic level students in a homogenous group.

- There is some evidence of schoolwide collaborative teams, particularly among teachers focused on students with disabilities. There is no evidence that such teams exist for teachers of ELLs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Regular education teachers should view themselves as having primary responsibility for the acquisition of ELA by ELLs and students with disabilities. ESL and special education teachers support the regular education teachers. To that end, regular education teachers should increase and intensify their use of instructional strategies that promote student accountability for learning. Examples of these strategies include:
    - Use of wait time in asking questions of students;
    - Asking questions at varying levels of cognition;
    - Use of white boards or other devices to keep students actively involved in lessons;
    - Use of colors to emphasize the important parts of lesson presentations;
    - Use of graphic organizers;
    - Use of realia (tangible objects to illustrate concepts);

- Scaffolding;
- SMART boards (to address visual learners);
- Small cooperative groups that are task orientated and heterogeneous;
- Testing accommodations that make classroom-level assessments accessible for ELLs and students with disabilities.

- Teachers should specify their instructional objectives for the various instructional activities in their classes. The Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) provides both guidance in developing content and language objectives and a teacher to teacher collaborative method that supports this process. The school should consider providing PD in SIOP, and more information about SIOP can be found at the Center for Applied Linguistics web site: http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/sheltered.html.

- The school should increase the amount of time consultant teachers push in to general education classes to provide support to students with disabilities, and/or increase the implementation of the integrated co-teaching model.

- The District should consider devoting more staff resources to the coordination of the ESL and bilingual programs. If financing permits, a full-time coordinator should be appointed.

- The bilingual program should include instruction in Spanish in one of the content areas.

- ESL students should be assigned to general education sections so that ESL students on the primary level can be homogenously grouped for ESL support services. In most cases, this would mean assigning primary level students to one or two sections.

- The review team recognizes that scheduling difficulties contribute to the lack of ESL teacher involvement in the departmental common planning periods. Nonetheless, the review team encourages the school to strive to include ESL and bilingual teachers in as many common planning periods as possible.

III. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

FINDINGS:

- The school has developed a master schedule that demonstrates a commitment to building a collaborative instructional team. The inclusion of common planning periods is a feature of this schedule; however, ESL and reading teachers typically are not included and do not share the common planning period with general education teachers.

- Teachers are assigned to classes based on certifications and qualifications. There remains, however, a need to increase the number of teachers with bilingual and/or ESL certification.

- In addition to the mission statement, the school leader communicates his vision through memos, SWOT analyses, and post observation reports to individual teachers.

- In addition to the mentor program, the school has provided round table discussions for new teachers, where instructional issues are regularly discussed. This program has recently been opened to veteran teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The school should require teachers to use the common planning period to develop weekly or bi-weekly instructional objectives for all students and when appropriate, modified objectives for ELLs and students with disabilities. Student performance with respect to these objectives should inform the next set of plans. A written record of these planning periods should be submitted to the school leadership.

- The school leadership should continue its efforts to increase the number of teachers who possess bilingual and/or ESL certification.

- In collaboration with the teachers, the school leaders should develop a school specific mission statement that is consistent with the District vision and State expectations for what a mission statement should contain.

- The school should continue providing the mentor program to new teachers, and the round table discussions to both new and veteran teachers.

IV. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

FINDINGS:

- The master schedule contains evidence that AIS is available to students during the regular school day. The room for administering testing accommodations is staffed by teachers.

- For some students, instruction in ELA and mathematics occurs in the afternoon.

- There is evidence that parents are informed about their children's progress; however, there is no evidence that progress reports or report cards are available in the parents' native language.

- The school psychologist's availability for students is limited due to the amount of time required by the role of chairperson of the CSE.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The school should provide Academic Intervention Services to all identified students within the regular school day. The school should consider hiring a teacher assistant to staff the testing room, thereby freeing up teachers to deliver more AIS services.

- The school leaders should strive to schedule ELA and mathematics in the morning. If that is not possible in departmentalized grades, the school should consider scheduling the same cohort of students to four or five subject area teachers. In that way, the teachers can vary the time when ELA and mathematics instruction is delivered over the course of a school year.

- The school should investigate the feasibility and costs of providing report cards and progress reports in Spanish. If feasible, the school is encouraged to do so. The report card for ELLs should include information about the student's progress in language acquisition.

- The District should consider hiring an individual to fulfill all the CSE chairperson duties, thus freeing up the school psychologists to deliver more direct services to students.

- The school should consider extending the bilingual program in grades 5 and 6 to grades 7 and 8.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FINDINGS:

- There is evidence of a wide variety of PD activities. However, there is little evidence that PD is linked to student academic performance.

- There is little evidence of PD for regular education teachers that is linked to improving performance of students with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The school should devote a significant part of the agenda of each faculty meeting to PD that is focused on improving the academic achievement of ELLs and students with disabilities. (Communication of school administrative details can be accomplished with a periodic faculty newsletter or by email.)
    - One example is an annual agenda of faculty meetings that would involve presentations by general education teachers that describe their effective instructional strategies with ELL students and with students with disabilities.
    - Another example is a series of faculty meetings devoted to specific instructional strategies that are effective in improving the learning for ELLs and students with disabilities.

- The school leaders should regularly conduct classroom walk through visits that are focused on items discussed in the faculty meeting staff development sessions. The District is encouraged to evaluate its PD in terms of how it affects the academic performance of its students.

- The District should connect the four annual PD sessions to student academic performance. To this end, the District is encouraged to select two or three areas, such as the performance of ELLs and students with disabilities, and focus PD on improving their performance.

VI. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

FINDINGS:

- There is adequate technology hardware and software to support an instructional program infused with information technology. However, there is some evidence that the lap top computers do not always function reliably.

- There is evidence that the print resources are adequate to support the instructional program in English, but there is little evidence of complementary print resources in Spanish.

- There is some evidence that students are not permitted to take text books home.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The school should review its procedures for keeping lap top computers fully functional and make adjustments to those procedures as necessary.

- The school should devote more of its instructional texts and materials budget to increasing its supply of Spanish language print resources.

- The school should consider acquiring classroom sets of texts. This would permit students to keep a text at home and thereby reduce the wear and tear on the books. In some districts, the PTA or PTO has provided financial support for this kind of effort.

PART 4: CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The findings and recommendations noted in the report are intended to guide the school's inquiry, planning, and the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) for school year 2012-13. The school should also continue its efforts in the implementation of the following Regents Reform Agenda initiatives: P-12 Common Core Learning Standards, Data Driven Instruction and the Annual Professional Performance Reviews for teacher effectiveness.