

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Accountability

Differentiated Accountability - School Quality Review (SQR)

SCHOOL QUALITY REVIEW REPORT

BEDS Code:	441201060006
District Name:	Monroe Woodbury CSD
School Name:	Monroe-Woodbury High School
School Address:	155 Dunderberg Road, Central Valley, NY, 10917
Principal:	David Bernsley
Accountability Phase/Category:	Improvement (year 1) - Focused English Language Arts - Students with Disabilities
Areas of Identification:	Mathematics - Students with Disabilities
Dates of On-site Review:	March 6-8, 2012

PART 1: MISSION STATEMENT

“Our mission is to challenge each student to strive towards his maximum potential and to share his unique talents, skills and sensitivities. To fulfill the challenge of this mission, we commit ourselves to the “Pursuit of Excellence.”

Although we recognize that man transcends definition, we perceive the themes of this mission as consisting of three strands; the academic, the affective/personal, and the societal/cultural.

We endeavor to inspire, motivate and encourage in every student, awareness of the past, involvement with the present, and aspirations for the future.”

PART 2: SCHOOL STRENGTHS

- Many resources are available, e.g., technology, textbooks, number of staff/administrators and classroom materials.
- The building is clean and well-maintained. There is a safe learning environment.
- A wide array of extracurricular activities is available.
- There are strong partnerships for community support of students and families.
- Parental support and engagement appears to be strong.

PART 3: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND UTILIZATION OF DATA

FINDINGS:

- While large amounts of summative data are available to some staff, there was little evidence of in-depth use of data by staff.
- Use of formative and interim assessment data was not evident.
- It did not appear that staff have access to or knowledge of some data sources, e.g., Inform and nySTART.
- Interviews indicated concerns about the inconsistent implementation of the student attendance policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Provide professional development (PD) and ensure that all staff are familiar with and consistently use summative data.
- Provide PD and ensure that all staff are consistently using formative and interim data and engaging in analysis of both. Provide PD and ensure that all staff are consistently using interim assessments and benchmarked assessments.
- Ensure that all staff have knowledge of and full access to a variety of data sources, including Inform and nySTART.
- Conduct a review and discussion of the attendance policy with staff to ensure consistency of implementation.

II. TEACHING AND LEARNING

FINDINGS:

- There was no evidence of a coherent instructional/programmatic roadmap.
- There was some evidence of implementation of parts of the New York State (NYS) P-12 Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) in one subject.
- There was little evidence of literacy instruction across the core content areas.
- There was inconsistent evidence of rigor and relevance reflecting high expectations in classrooms visited. Use of evidence-based and research-based instructional strategies was sporadic. The majority of classes were teacher-centered. There was minimal evidence of:
 - coherent lesson planning;

- clear learning objectives; and
 - checks for understanding and closure in all daily lessons.
- The continuum of special education programs/services is limited. There was no evidence of specially-designed instructional methodologies for students with disabilities in general education classrooms. There was little evidence of explicit instruction of skills and strategies in resource rooms. The current mindset appears to be one of exposure to content in general education classrooms for students with disabilities instead of full integration with general education students.
 - While the majority of English language learners (ELLs) receive the required amount of English as a second language (ESL) instruction, instructional models used in ESL are traditional and neither standards-based nor reflective of instructional best practices. Scaffolding language and content for ELLs was not evident. Collaboration between ESL and content area teachers was not evident.
 - There was no evidence of differentiated instruction and intervention strategies in general education classrooms.
 - Accommodations/modifications of instruction for students with disabilities in general education classrooms were not evident.
 - While there is evidence of some schoolwide collaborative teams, they are limited in focus and membership.
 - A data team has been created and has recently begun work. However, no clear goal and training could be articulated.
 - Interviews indicated that there is a disconnect between midterm examinations and instruction in some core areas.
 - Delivery of Academic Intervention Services (AIS) is inconsistent and approached differently by each department.
 - There was little evidence of monitoring student progress to achieve Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Develop and implement a consistent, coherent instructional/programmatic roadmap.
- Conduct a formal curriculum revision and alignment process. Begin the process to fully implement the new CCLS in all subject areas (refer to <http://engageny.org/>)
- Integrate explicit literacy instruction across all content areas.
- Provide ongoing PD on evidence-based/researched-based best practices and encourage visitations to colleagues effectively using evidence-based instructional strategies. Develop a building-wide lesson plan format and monitor to ensure consistent implementation in using a wide range of teaching strategies

that are student-centered. Ensure that learning objectives are posted, clearly provide the purpose for the content and/or strategies being taught and are aligned with the instruction.

- Consider expanding the continuum of special education programs/services to include a consultant teacher model and a co-teaching model. Ensure and monitor delivery of specially-designed instructional methodologies for classified students in general education classrooms. Ensure and monitor delivery of explicit instruction of skills and strategies in resource rooms. Review appropriate and required instructional integration of students with disabilities in general education classrooms. Require action plans from each teacher reflecting progress monitoring, as well as delineation of strategies and approaches to be used.
- Ensure that all ELLs receive the required amount of ESL instruction. Review and implement standards-based instruction in ESL that reflects current instructional best practices.
- Provide ongoing PD on differentiated instruction and intervention strategies for all teachers, monitor implementation and conduct instructional walkthroughs.
- Ensure and monitor that all accommodations/modifications for instruction in general education classrooms are consistently occurring.
- Expand schoolwide collaborative teams to include a broader range of staff and focus areas.
- Revisit the goal of the Data Team and provide PD.
- Ensure alignment and continuity between instruction and assessments.
- Conduct a formal evaluation of the AIS program. Review approaches used. Consider linking provision of AIS programming to the same core subject teacher.
- Establish consistent practices and procedures that require the monitoring of student progress by all staff to enable students to achieve IEP goals.

III. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

FINDINGS:

- There was no clear evidence of shared values, mission and vision.
- There does not appear to be a strong match between teacher skill/experience and student learning needs in staffing assignments as reflected in the master schedule.
- There was limited evidence that instructional leadership is the top priority of all school leaders.
- There was no evidence of a strong, schoolwide plan-assess-adjust cycle to sustain the school's continuous improvement efforts.

- There was no evidence of schoolwide shared accountability for student learning and results.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Engage the schoolwide community in revisiting the values, mission, and vision.
- Ensure that there is a strong match between teacher skill/experience and student learning needs in staffing assignments in order to maximize student learning. Ensure that all department chairs and directors have direct input in the design and development of the master schedule.
- Review and revise the duties and responsibilities of current school leaders to ensure that instructional leadership is their top priority.
- Involve all staff in creating a strong, schoolwide plan-assess-adjust cycle to sustain the school's continuous improvement efforts.
- Expand the staff involvement in schoolwide shared accountability for student learning and results in order to assure ownership and responsibility for individual student progress by all.

IV. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

FINDINGS:

- While opportunities for extra help are provided to students, it appears that some scheduling and programming is not optimal for student use of time.
- It does not appear that a strong house structure is in place.
- Pathways for student success and transitions from grade 8 to grade 9 may not be optimal. Parents indicated that there were adjustment challenges with some freshmen students.
- The current structure and organization of the Instructional Support Team does not appear to be having optimal effect. Two teams with different meeting times appeared to be functioning.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Ensure that scheduling and programming maximizes student use of time to minimize excessive number of study halls.
- Review the current house structure to ensure its fidelity to a strong house model.
- Increase transitional support for freshmen. Consider instituting an advisory period or a big brother/big sister program.
- Review and modify the current structure, organization and focus of the Instructional Support Team.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FINDINGS:

- There was no evidence of a long-term or a short-term schoolwide PD plan based on analyses of data, classroom observations and identified needs of students and teachers.
- There was limited evidence of high-quality, continuous standards-based PD with multiple approaches differentiated as applicable.
- There was no evidence of a research-based PD program, or a specific form of evaluation or measurement to determine impact.
- There was no evidence of regular analysis and collaborative discussion of student work based on common, interim or formative benchmark assessments.
- There was no evidence of a schoolwide culture of shared internal professional accountability for all.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Develop a strong schoolwide short-term and long-term PD plan that is based on data, classroom observations and identified student and teacher needs.
- Ensure opportunities for high-quality, continuous standards-based PD with multiple approaches differentiated as applicable.
- Ensure a research-based PD program, and develop a specific form of evaluation or measurement to determine its impact.
- Develop a systemic approach to regular analysis of data by all staff, including collaborative analysis of student work based on common, interim or formative benchmark assessments.
- Establish and monitor a systemic approach to shared internal professional accountability by all staff and establish a professional learning community.

VI. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

FINDING:

There was little evidence of student work displayed in classrooms that addressed learning standards in all areas. Several classrooms appeared bare.

Recommendation:

Ensure displays of student work in all classrooms.

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 CCLS, Data Driven Instruction and the Annual Professional Performance Reviews for teacher effectiveness.