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PART 1: INTRODUCTION

A. Community and School Background

John Ericsson Middle school serves 338 students in grades 6 through 8. The student enrollment is 71 percent Hispanic, 21 percent Black, four percent White and two percent Asian students. Twenty-one percent of the students are English language learners (ELLs), and 34 percent are students with disabilities. Most students are from throughout the District and not from the immediate area, as District 14 is a middle school choice District. The school shares the building space with two other schools.

The administrative team consists of the Principal and three Assistant Principals (APs). The Principal is in her third year at the school. Two APs also are in their third year at the school, and one AP is long serving. There are 32 teachers. Eight teachers are in their first year, and an additional four teachers have been at the school for fewer than three years. All teachers are highly qualified. While the school does not have a history of administrative turnover, it does have a high rate of teacher turnover.

PART 2: ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHOOL’S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive or Negative Indicator (+/-)</th>
<th>School Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- NYSED Quantitative Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative trend data for one or more identified subject/areas and subgroups for the past two consecutive years as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3 and/or a decrease in the Performance Index.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance data for the school on NYSED Accountability Overview Reports (AOR) for the past two consecutive years) show an increase in the number of subgroups that did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in identified</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. School Strengths

The school has recently been awarded a Magnet Grant.

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 school does not have a uniform written English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum for all students aligned with New York State (NYS) Standards. This has adversely impacted the school’s ability to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA for all subgroups by preventing long-term teacher planning, creating inequality in learning environments, and undermining student performance in classrooms and on State assessments.

- The quality of pacing calendars is poor. They vary by content areas and do not effectively guide the scope and sequence across grades. Lists of day-to-day skills provide only the sequence of skills to be covered and do not provide long-term curriculum designs that stress important key ideas within a coherent instructional structure. Some curriculum maps listed topics to be covered and did not demonstrate a clear correspondence among content, assessment, skills, essential questions and standards.

- Lesson plan objectives and learning goals are not aligned. A selection of reviewed teacher lesson plans indicated that New York State (NYS) Standards were not referenced or used during the planning of instruction. Therefore, instruction lacks effective guidance.

- The availability and quality of instructional resources varies from classroom to classroom. The English as a second language (ESL) classes had no glossaries in the native languages relevant to the students and no resource books.
**Recommendations:**

- The District should work with the school on the development of curriculum in all core areas and ensure that it is clearly aligned with the current NYS Learning Standards. Curriculum must be aligned to the new NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards in ELA and literacy and mathematics to prepare for implementation in school year 2012-13. All 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.

- School leaders and teachers should participate in training sessions to acquire expertise in developing pacing calendars that guide rigorous instruction within set timeframes. These should be implemented in every classroom. The school should seek help from the Network to build a framework of skills and concepts to be taught and a sequential order within which to teach them. The school leaders should monitor the pacing of instruction through formal and informal classroom observations.

- School leaders should ensure that planning documents contain learning objectives that are aligned to instructional goals contained in State Standards. Students should be made aware of the learning goals at the beginning of and during the lesson so they understand both learning purpose and intended product.

- School leaders should conduct a review of resources across the school to ensure equity between and across grades and classes. School leaders should ensure the adequacy of resources in meeting the different needs of all students, with particular reference to addressing the shortage of appropriate learning resources for the ESL program.

II. Teaching and Learning

**Findings**

- The range of instructional strategies used by teachers was limited. Didactic teaching characterized most lessons. This led to teachers talking for extended periods. Lessons were often taught to the whole class and did not take into account the differing needs of the subgroups. During these times, students were passive recipients of knowledge rather than active participants in their learning.

- There was little evidence of differentiation of instruction in the lessons observed. Tasks were not linked to prior performance levels and students became disengaged and disruptive in many lessons. Although the PD documentation, posters in hallways and the Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) suggested that teachers were adept at differentiating activities, there was minimal differentiation observed. There was little opportunity for students to share ideas or learn from each other.
• Classroom learning resources are at times inadequate to improve student learning. Classroom libraries were limited in the range of topics and levels available to effectively support learning.

• Much of the co-teaching instruction observed was unsuccessfully delivered due to the absence of joint planning time. Teachers did not equally and fully participate in the instructional process and, generally, one teacher dominated the lesson while the other was relegated to the role of the assistant. Paraprofessional teachers provided limited academic support.

• The pace of learning in all observed lessons was poor. There was a lack of urgency and low teacher expectations that frequently resulted in students being off task.

• Student transition at the end of the period was often chaotic, and considerable learning time was lost. Most transitions were volatile and behavior was unacceptable. This was characterized by widespread use of obscenities, prevalent cursing, pushing, running, and occasions of overt violence. Security and staff on duty in the hallways displayed little interest and had limited impact on modifying student behaviors. This uneasy transition caused students’ staggered arrival to class, resulting in a disrupted start to the lesson. Consequently, student attitudes toward and preparedness for instruction was poor. Administrators did little to address this behavior, even when present.

• Recognition of cultural diversity in instruction was poor. Opportunities to maximize the potential of learning about different countries and cultures were not used.

• Learning goals were not clearly understood by students. Teachers rarely referred to goals in lessons. The newly introduced learning goals lacked rigor, such as “learning to read better” or “write better” and were not generated from prior performance data. Students had little understanding of the direction or purpose of their learning.

• Student engagement in instruction was poor. Instruction did not build on students’ prior knowledge or identified needs, nor was it connected or applied to real life experiences. Although leaders indicated that they are aware of the problems, they do not systematically evaluate lessons with sufficient rigor to offer targeted support for teachers to enable them to develop and implement alternative instructional strategies.

• The quality of questioning was limited and did not challenge student thinking. Questioning was invariably closed and provided no opportunities for students to develop higher order skills. In some classes, teachers asked and answered their own questions.

• Classroom routines and procedures were rarely adhered to. Behavior in a significant number of lessons was disruptive. Students threw pencils, books, chairs and other smaller objects, cursed loudly and paid little attention to the teacher. Behaviors went unchecked in some classrooms, while in others control was lost. There was no consistency provided by leadership in enforcement of the behavior policy. This provided mixed messages to students about the consequences of their actions and, as a result, they frequently overstepped the boundaries of acceptable behavior.

• Interviews indicated that the bulletin boards were recently created and had not been common practice throughout the academic year. Students demonstrated a lack of pride in their work, as some bulletin boards were vandalized. The work in student notebooks lacked teacher comments, advice and next steps in learning.
• The use of technology is poor and not effectively integrated into classroom instruction. The use of SMART Boards was limited to projection of text. Teachers report that they lack confidence in SMART Board usage and are in need of additional PD. Student use of laptops was limited to simple word processing, directed by the teachers.

• Although there was a grading policy posted in most classrooms, the posted policy was in direct contradiction to the teacher grading policy. The dual system provided unreliable data to measure achievement and progress. Students stated that their marking period grade was based on the grading policy of the teacher.

Recommendations:
• School leaders should seek support from the Network to assist teachers in developing additional instructional strategies. Teachers should receive sufficient high quality PD that reflects individual needs so that strategies become embedded into instructional practice. School leaders should monitor rigorously to ensure the effective delivery of instruction.

• School leaders should provide additional training for teachers to become confident in implementing differentiated strategies. Teachers should understand what differentiated instruction looks like and successfully implement it. PD should also focus on the use of test and assessment data to guide planning and instruction to better match tasks to students’ abilities. School leaders should evaluate the effectiveness of training on teacher practice and the impact on student achievement.

• School leaders should reallocate existing funds or seek alternative funding to ensure that resources in each classroom meet the needs of the students.

• School leaders and teachers should be provided with training on developing strategies for effective co-teaching. These strategies should be consistently implemented across the school. School leaders should ensure that sufficient time is made for all teachers to plan together and jointly develop lesson plans. Co-teachers should ensure that they both play an equal part in the delivery and development of lessons and are held accountable for the progress and achievement of students.

• School leaders should request Network support in developing PD to enable teachers to understand pace and sequence of a lesson and the strategies needed to implement it. School leaders should monitor lessons to ensure that students are engaged and the pace of lessons is brisk.

• School leaders should review student transition procedures to maximize instructional time. The school community should develop rules and regulations that are consistently understood and implemented by all. School leaders should hold students and teachers accountable for exercising their responsibilities to ensure orderly transitions by assuming a higher profile during transitions and engaging the students. Teachers should monitor student arrival time at classes, and consistently implement consequences for lateness.

• Teachers and school leaders should promote a climate that recognizes and celebrates the cultural diversity of the student population. The Principal should ensure that there are sufficient learning resources that reflect cultural diversity.
• Learning objectives should be displayed for each lesson, linked to practical applications, referred to during instruction and assessed before the lesson ends. Teachers should ensure that individual student goals are challenging and specific.

• School leaders, with Network support, should urgently provide quality PD that enhances teachers' ability to engage students in learning. Teachers should quickly implement these learned strategies. Through formal and informal observations, the school leaders should identify when teachers are struggling to keep students engaged and provide swift and positive support and guidance or additional PD. The impact of the PD should be evaluated and future training developed that has an ongoing impact on student engagement.

• School leaders should make available external training for teachers on questioning techniques. Effective questioning strategies should be planned by teachers and monitored by school leaders so they become embedded in classroom practice. Teachers should increase the opportunity for students to work together to learn to develop respect for each others’ views, engage in problem solving tasks and apply their learning through critical thinking.

• School leaders with Network support should urgently provide PD on behavior management strategies and techniques for all teachers. A behavior policy with a clear set of rewards and sanctions should be developed by all the school's stakeholders. School leaders should monitor the implementation of the procedures, routines and protocols.

• School leaders should establish non-negotiable protocols for the marking and presentation of work in notebooks and bulletin boards. Rubrics should be used so students know what to strive for and what good work looks like. School leaders and teachers should ensure that written feedback for students states the next learning steps. All teachers should raise their expectations for outcomes so that students develop pride in their work.

• School leaders should provide additional training on the use of SMART Boards. Training should demonstrate the potential for SMART Boards to engage students in their learning. Greater use should be made of laptops as a resource for research and presentation of learning so that student thinking is widened and understanding enhanced.

• School leaders should ensure that one grading policy developed by all stakeholders is adopted and used consistently throughout the school. School leaders should ensure that parents and students understand the grading policy so they are able to monitor progress.

III. School Leadership

Findings:

• The expectations of school leaders for student achievement are low. The Principal has developed contradictory improvement targets. The CEP stated that all students will improve by five points, while the goals posted in the Principal’s office stated that 20 percent of the students will reach the benchmark on the NYS assessments.

• The school leader does not have an effective strategic plan to drive the school forward. Development is reactive and haphazard rather than planned. Consequently, teachers lack direction and student achievement is limited. The absence of a shared vision and lack of planning reflect the weak leadership of the school.
• The School Leadership Team (SLT) is ineffective. The SLT has little influence on the development of the school. They are recipients of information rather than being part of the decision-making process in setting goals. No monitoring takes place of current initiatives. SLT members stated that they have never been shown the budget, and they have no input in prioritizing resources. Teachers were provided with a draft of the Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP), but the finished document was not distributed, and teachers are not aware of the school goals.

• School leaders are overseeing a school environment that is dangerous and not conducive to learning. Five fights were observed and one student was arrested for a violent assault on a peer during the JIT review. There have been 110 serious behavioral incidents reported this year. Although the On-line Occurrence Reporting System (OORS) report states that problems most regularly occur in classrooms and hallways, the school leaders have not implemented effective strategies to address the behaviors. Students run along hallways and stairwells and use obscene and offensive language. Safety officers do not intervene in a positive fashion. Teachers in the hallways made little or no effort to engage the students. A fire alarm went off during the review, and although there was no announcement that it was a false alarm, teachers and students did not leave their classrooms.

• The school instructional program is poor and does not serve the students needs well. The school leader does not organize the school’s instructional schedule to provide opportunities for common planning within and across grades or curriculum areas. There is no time allocated for on-going articulation among support staff and classroom teachers. This prevents teachers from sharing ideas and developing continuity within the curriculum. The position is exacerbated when teachers lose their preparation time to cover for long term absences of colleagues.

• The building is programmed to accommodate block scheduling for ELA and mathematics. This decision led to the loss of common planning time. The impact of this decision has not been analyzed with regard to student gains in instruction in these core areas.

• The school leader has not ensured that the school has a well defined system for identifying at-risk students or providing appropriate staff programs and materials to support the unique needs of students with disabilities, ELLs and at-risk students. Voyager, a supplementary ELA instructional program is used as the sole program for supporting students with disabilities. Students in ESL classes receive a curriculum that is not effective at developing a wide range of literacy skills over time. There is no rationale for who is filtered in and out of the AIS schedules. Academic Intervention Services (AIS) are organized on a rotating two-month schedule and, as a result, students do not receive services for two months at a time. This prevents continuity and progress in student learning.

• The Principal has not ensured that there are sufficient support services available to meet the needs of all students. The guidance counselor has a caseload of 92 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) students but has insufficient time to provide counseling support to others in need without an IEP. Although he is charged with grade 8 high school articulation, he does not have the time to meet with those students as often as necessary. Students receive some guidance and career planning. The guidance counselor provides limited support for the high school application process but does explain the graduation requirements. Several IEPs stated a behavior intervention plan was needed, but none were developed. Several IEPs with behavior concerns did not have the
management needs section completed. This results in both teachers and students not having a consistent method of addressing issues. The Principal has advised teachers not to refer any additional students for evaluation because there were insufficient services available.

- ELL and special education teachers have no time to articulate with their general education peers. This absence of discussion prevents sharing of knowledge about students that is necessary for secure progress.

- The school leader does not make available sufficient financial, human, and material resources to effectively support the instructional program. There are four administrators and two deans to support 338 students. There is little evidence that the impact of their services is sufficient to justify the large allocation of the school budget to fund these positions. There is no ELA or mathematic coach. The AP responsible for mathematics is not certified in this content area. The absence of coaches to demonstrate and support lessons is having a detrimental effect on teachers’ abilities to acquire necessary skills to be effective teachers.

- Strategic planning to maximize human resources is poor and takes little account of student need. The AIS-ELA position was created this year. However, the school has not made AYP in ELA for several years. The afterschool and Saturday programs began at the end of January but there was no analysis of progress data to identify students who would benefit from attending.

- Lack of effective strategic planning, by the school leader, relating to disbursement of finances has resulted in the school not starting its Title III program despite receiving funding at the beginning of the school year.

- Parents are not actively involved in decision-making and little is done to survey parental views or involve them as co-educators other than the NYC Department of Education survey.

- The administration has not developed an effective strategic PD plan that identifies sequential pathways for school and student progress. Training and PD are rarely consolidated or embedded in practice and have had little impact on instruction. Teachers are bombarded with a series of initiatives, stating they are overwhelming. Initiatives are supported by PD opportunities, but the volume and lack of time allocated to them greatly dissipates their effectiveness.

- School leaders do not demonstrate that they have the capability or requisite skills to lead and develop instruction across the school. The systems for evaluating and improving teaching are weak and have minimal impact on instruction. There is no coherent plan to observe lessons. Documentation suggests that there has been a recent increase in the number of observations taking place but those that were conducted lack rigor. There is a significant behavior issue in classes throughout the school, but lesson observation documentation does not mention this. The commendations are often too generous and areas of weakness are not followed up or addressed through PD.

**Recommendations:**

- School leaders should raise their expectations for student outcomes and significantly increase their expectation of academic performance among all staff and students. All stakeholders should work together to establish a vision and mission for academic excellence. It is essential that the school develops and implements a strategic plan informed by all relevant evaluations and data.
• School leaders should, with the support of the Network, develop and implement a strategic plan that is focused on improving student achievement and behavior and creating a supportive and embracing school culture that supports learning, safety and personal and social development. School leaders should ensure that the goals in the plan are clear, with identified task completion dates identified and rigorous monitoring with success criteria to effectively increase student achievement. The present climate of low expectation in terms of academic achievement and behavior should be supplanted by a belief in high standards that are energetically enforced.

• The SLT should receive training so that they fully understand their roles, responsibilities and how to effectively exercise them. Staff should have increased opportunity to influence the direction of the school through a formalized consultation process. The SLT should ensure they monitor the progress towards goals so that timelines are met and the impact evaluated. The CEP should be shared with all school staff.

• The administration should have a much higher profile during transition times to support teachers and safety agents. They should increase their level of engagement with students so the presence of administrators is viewed in a positive way by students and not seen as punitive. The number of agents should be increased to minimize disruption. Administrators should review the behavior policy and ensure that teachers and students are aware of its content. Administrators and staff should rigorously enforce the policy so that there is mutual support and students are aware of the consequences of their actions.

• The administration should urgently review the school schedule and ensure that it provides for common planning time to impact on improving instruction and student achievement. School leaders should observe common planning time meetings and evaluate their impact in the classroom.

• Leaders should analyze the impact of block scheduling to ascertain whether it is improving student performance and make necessary adjustments, where necessary.

• The Principal should ensure that a system is in place for at-risk students to be identified for AIS and that it is provided on a regular rather than intermittent basis. School leaders should monitor and evaluate the quality of services provided for effectiveness in improving student outcomes.

• The Principal, in consultation with the Network, should seek to employ an additional guidance counselor to meet the needs of the students in terms of providing emotional support and also in providing career guidance and assistance with high school applications.

• The Principal should provide timely opportunities for teachers to meet and discuss lesson planning, especially those who are co-teaching and ELL and special education.

• The Principal should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of administrators. The Principal should assess the financial viability of having the present number of administrators for the number of students on roll. The school should employ coaches for mathematics and ELA so teachers receive adequate support, training and advice in these content areas. Their work should be closely monitored through observation of student outcomes to measure the impact they are having.

• The Principal should be more strategic, thus enabling the school to maximize the use of its funding by hiring appropriate staff and in ensuring that additional staffing is obtained in academic areas where the school is weakest.
• School leaders should evaluate the impact of spending decisions on student performance and ensure that the SLT play a part in this process.

• The Principal should reach out to parents in an attempt to engage them in the school to enable them to support their children’s learning. Parents’ views should be regularly sought to ascertain their satisfaction, to solve issues/concerns and to increase the communication channels.

• The administration should develop a strategic plan that enables new initiatives that address the school’s cited areas of weakness to be introduced in a measured way. Time and resources should be made available to ensure that all teachers can take advantage of PD associated with new initiatives. The administration should closely monitor the impact of training and ensure that actions learned become embedded in instructional practice to extend student learning.

• The school leaders should attend training designed to improve their classroom observation skills and their pedagogical understanding. Lesson observations should be regularly carried out. Feedback should be professional, honest and delivered with integrity to make it a developmental experience for staff. Targets set should be linked to PD and progress monitored. The impact on the quality of learning and teacher instruction should be evaluated and targets refined so there is a cycle of continuous personal development that is reflected in the progress of students.

IV. Infrastructure for Student Success

Findings:
• The learning environment is poor. The building is unwelcoming and not student centered. The hallways are loud with both student and adult noise. Student behavior in many classes is poor and is not addressed by staff. During the day classrooms and hallways become littered and this is not addressed by any staff members.

• There are no dedicated lab spaces. The recently awarded Magnet grant has enabled the school to provide science carts and equipment that has enriched student experiences.

• Opportunities for parents to influence decision-making in the school are poor. The SLT neither participated in the writing of the CEP nor are involved in the decision-making process of identifying school goals. The SLT does not have a full complement of parent members. The SLT is therefore ineffective in carrying out its strategic and monitoring role.

• Parents receive insufficient information on the progress of their children and, therefore, are not in a position to make timely interventions to support their learning. There are no interim progress reports provided to parents, and students only receive the minimum four report cards.

• Information provided to parents by the school is not provided in languages other than English.

• There are from 60 to 90 students late on a daily basis. There are from 30 to 40 students absent each day. Extended day attendance is not entered into the Attendance Tracking System (ARTS), and there are only sign-in sheets for students. Students get snacks before extended day begins and often leave the school and do not remain for instruction.
Recommendations:

- School leaders, through their example, should develop a climate within the school that fosters high expectations for students and staff in terms of academic excellence, conduct and relationships. School leaders should increase the level of positive communication techniques for student-to-student and adult to student relationships. The school community, including students, should devise a policy that defines acceptable classroom environment. School leaders should monitor its implementation and subsequent impact.

- The Principal should seek to reallocate existing funds or seek to access other funds to establish lab spaces that enable students to participate in valuable hands-on learning activities in science.

- School leaders, with the support of the Network, should access training to ensure that parents have the opportunity to play a full role in student education. The SLT should be empowered to effectively fulfill its obligations.

- School leaders should ensure that parents receive regular and timely information pertaining to student achievement and progress.

- School leaders should develop communication systems in the languages of the students that enable parents to express their views and be more involved in the school.

- School leaders should ensure that extended day attendance is systematically entered into ATS. They should seek the support of the Network to develop a comprehensive attendance plan that includes a minimum of one staff member who will conduct home visits for attendance and lateness.

V. Collection, Analysis, and Utilization of Data

Findings:

- Data does not form the basis for continuous schoolwide improvement. Although the school regularly collects and analyzes data, there is no system to use the data to improve instruction. Data is not used to monitor the impact or effectiveness of programs or school initiatives. The school has not measured the effectiveness of this year’s block programming of ELA and mathematics courses, the two day a week seventy-five minute extended day program or the AIS-ELA program that was newly instituted this year.

- The school’s Design Your Own (DYO) assessments are not measured against external standardized assessment to ensure their fidelity in measuring student performance outcomes. These assessments are created by individual teachers and are analyzed by class, gender, subgroup and the lowest third population. However, there was no evidence that instructional changes are applied or monitored for these subgroups.

- Data is not used to prioritize which students will receive AIS services during the course of the cycles, regardless of their level of academic need. Although the school tracks who is receiving AIS, there is no analysis undertaken to monitor the impact of these services. There is no time built into the school’s program for the AIS teachers to meet with content area teachers, and an absence of data use and analysis results in the school not knowing which initiatives are effective in improving student learning and achievement.
• The school’s current programming does not allow for common planning or articulation between the special education, ESL, AIS and content area teachers. The school was programmed this year with double blocks for the ELA and mathematics classes but programming has not been analyzed for its effectiveness and impact on student achievement.

Recommendations:
• School leaders should use data, with the support of the Network, to monitor the effectiveness of their programs and teacher impact and on student progress. Quantifiable data should be used when making plans regarding curriculum, instructional support, and programming decisions prior to starting new initiatives. Once the school begins a new initiative, school leaders should monitor the effectiveness of these programs by analyzing data to ensure projected outcomes.

• The school should compare the DYO to standardized external measures to ensure their fidelity in predicting student outcomes on standardized measures. Once the DYO assessments efficacy is demonstrated, the school should ensure that these assessments are aligned across the grades and within departments. Instructional leaders should provide PD on creating varied, research-based instructional strategies based on the DYO assessment data outcomes.

• School leaders should ensure that all eligible students receive AIS instruction and seek support from the Network to reallocate funding so that there are a sufficient number of AIS teachers to meet the needs of the students. The school, with the support of a data specialist and a literacy coach, should measure the progress of students who receive services and assist the AIS instructional staff in modifying and adjusting instructional practices to meet the needs of all students. The school program should be modified so that there are regular articulation periods for the AIS teachers to meet with the content area teachers.

• School leaders should evaluate the effectiveness of the block program to determine if the system is increasing student achievement. School leaders should survey the teachers to determine the extent of their need for common planning and articulation time. This time should be built into the school program. School leaders should seek the support of the Network to reprogram the building.

VI. Professional Development

Findings:
• There is insufficient rigor in the alignment of PD to teacher and student competencies. Teachers stated that there are too many initiatives necessitating training and insufficient time to embed learning into classroom practice.

• Teacher attendance at PD is variable, and there is little evidence to indicate that teacher attendance at PD offerings leads to any significant improvement in instructional practice or student performance.

• Systems and opportunities for teacher collaboration are poor, and this has an adverse impact on teacher development and sharing of professional expertise.

• There are no PD feedback mechanisms in place to adjust the PD design to meet the changing needs of students and teachers.
• Teachers are not held accountable for incorporating strategies learned in PD into their daily teaching. In instances when staff members attended outside PD, there was no time provided within the program for them to turnkey this information.

• There is no systemic approach to PD. The school has not identified key developmental needs in areas such as behavior and classroom management. Lesson observations are irregular and superficial and do not rigorously identify individual teacher needs to improve instruction. Insufficient follow-up and a lack of differentiated PD results in minimal improvement in the classroom.

• There is no PD available for teachers specifically designed to address strategies that can be employed to meet the needs of students with disabilities, ELLs or at-risk students. Similarly, teachers of general education classes have not received training relating to these students. Training on differentiation strategies has taken place, but the impact on instructional practice is minimal.

Recommendations:
• School leaders should evaluate the PD needs of the school, teachers and students and identify those needs that are most important. Subsequently, school leaders should develop a comprehensive strategic plan that provides training in a sequential and coherent manner, allows time for initiatives to become embedded and includes monitoring and evaluation of the impact on classroom practice and student achievement.

• School leaders should ensure that time is available for teachers to attend PD sessions. School leaders should ensure that training is from high quality. School leaders should observe lessons with a focus on assessing the impact of PD.

• School leaders should ensure that time is available for teachers to engage in joint planning, discuss student learning and share good practice. The outcomes of these meetings should be used to help improve instructional practices across the school.

• School leaders should ensure that there are opportunities for staff to evaluate and provide feedback relating to the quality and impact of PD. School leaders should also ensure that training is differentiated where necessary to meet individual teacher needs.

• School leaders should consistently monitor the impact of PD in terms of implementation and development of instructional practice. School leaders should use this information to modify the PD plan and hold teachers accountable for using new strategies so they become embedded in practice. School leaders should provide opportunities for teachers to do turn key trainings.

• School leaders should implement a plan that ensures regular observations of teachers. School leaders should use this information to provide training to meet individual teacher and whole school needs, such as behavior and class management.

• School leaders should ensure that PD is available for teachers to address strategies that can meet the needs of students with disabilities, ELLs or at-risk students. There should be more training on differentiation strategies, and school leaders should monitor their use through rigorous, timely observations.
VII. District Support

Findings:
- The Network has not adequately supported the school in the development of a strategic plan that is time bound and data driven with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities for all key stakeholders in the learning community. The Network has neither assisted the Principal in analyzing all accountability data nor helped the Principal to prioritize and develop a strategic and coherent plan that addresses both student performance and student progress.

- The Network has not provided adequate support to ensure that the school is effectively maximizing resources. The Network has not sufficiently assisted the Principal in examining the efficacy and cost/benefit of having four administrators for 338 students. Similarly, no analysis has occurred relating to the impact of the absence of content area coaches. There is only one ELA and one mathematics AIS provider for a student body where approximately 80 percent of the students are performing below benchmark.

- The Network has not adequately supported the school in effectively programming common planning, articulation and PD time into the school’s program. The Network has not provided the AP in charge of programming with yearly workshops or on-site support to program the school.

- The Network has not provided sufficient support in the area of ELA instruction and classroom management. There have been no regularly scheduled opportunities for PD both off and onsite in these areas. Although teachers do attend some of the PD offerings provided by the Network, the Network does not ensure that these offerings are targeted to meet the needs of the school or the teachers who attend them.

- The Network has not provided adequate support in the area of building usage and effective space planning. The Principal is unable to adequately plan for the use of classroom and shared spaces because the projections for enrollment in the charter school that shares the building are unclear and restrict forward planning.

Recommendations:
- The Network should assist the Principal in creating an effective comprehensive strategic plan for the school. This plan should be time bound with specific and data driven goals. Roles and responsibilities should be clearly delineated for all key stakeholders in the learning community. The Network should ensure that the schools goals are achievable, measurable and lead to the school making AYP in all areas of identification.

- The Network should support the Principal to effectively maximizing resources. The Network should assist in examining and conducting a cost/benefit analysis to determine if the current personnel configuration is the most effective use of resources.

- The Network should support programming the building more effectively by ensuring built-in common planning, articulation and PD time. The program chair should be provided with frequent workshops and onsite support. The Network should assist the school to study the effectiveness of its current block programming schedule.

- The Network should support the school in ELA instruction and classroom management and help provide regularly scheduled opportunities for PD both off and onsite in these areas. The Network
should have the ELA content area specialist regularly visit the school, provide feedback and provide demonstration lessons in the areas of classroom management and ELA instruction. The Principal, supported by the Network, should conduct walkthroughs to make certain that the instructional and management methods that are being introduced in these PD sessions are being implemented consistently and effectively. With guidance and support from the Network, the Principal should develop an observation methodology that monitors the effective implementation of techniques that the teachers have learned during these sessions.

- The Network should support the school in the area of building usage and effective space planning, and seek to establish the Charter school enrollment numbers so the Principal can better plan for the use of classroom and shared space within the building. All three schools should have access to the library and science labs every year. Arbitration needs to be leveraged by the Network when the Building Council is unable to resolve shared space issues equitably to benefit all three schools.

PART 3: OVERALL FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Overall Finding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Review Team Finding</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>The school has not made sufficient progress in identified areas, and is unlikely to make AYP without further significant change.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Overall Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Review Team Recommendation</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Phase-out - close the school.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The school will not meet AYP in its current configuration. The Principal and APs are ineffective in setting appropriate expectations or putting in place organizational structures that enable the smooth running of the school. A significant percentage of teaching is poor, and PD has had no impact on addressing this to date. In many classes, little learning takes place because of inappropriate behavior that is not addressed by staff. Transition times are very unruly and at times dangerous. Phasing-out the school over three years will not improve the learning for those students remaining under the present leadership and staffing.