



The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT EFFECTIVENESS (DTSDE)



BEDS Code	620600010014
School Name	John F. Kennedy Elementary School
School Address	107 Gross Street Kingston, NY 12401
District Name	Kingston City School District
School Leader	Dr. Paula Perez
Dates of Review	September 29-30, 2014
School Accountability Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus School
Type of Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SED Integrated Intervention Team (IIT)

School Information Sheet for John F. Kennedy Elementary School

School Configuration (2014-15 data)					
Grade Configuration	PreK-4	Total Enrollment	336	SIG Recipient	Yes
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes (2014-15)					
# Transitional Bilingual	0	# Dual Language	0	# Self-Contained English as a Second Language	0
Types and Number of Special Education Classes (2014-15)					
# Special Classes	3	# SETSS	0	# Integrated Collaborative Teaching	4
Types and Number of Special Classes (2014-15)					
# Visual Arts	1	# Music	1	# Drama	0
# Foreign Language	0	# Dance	0	# CTE	0
School Composition (most recent data)					
% Title I Population	82%	% Attendance Rate		92%	
% Free Lunch	76%	% Reduced Lunch		6%	
% Limited English Proficient	0	% Students with Disabilities		25%	
Racial/Ethnic Origin (most recent data)					
% American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	% Black or African American		22%	
% Hispanic or Latino	20%	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		1%	
% White	37%	% Multi-Racial		20%	
Personnel (most recent data)					
Years Principal Assigned to School	2	# of Assistant Principals		0	
# of Deans	0	# of Counselors/Social Workers		2	
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate	0	% Teaching Out of Certification		0	
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience	2	Average Teacher Absences		8.2	
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2013-14)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	16%	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4		18%	
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)	81%	Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (8th Grade)		N/A	
Student Performance for High Schools (2013-14)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	N/A	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4		N/A	
Credit Accumulation High Schools Only (2013-14)					
% of 1st year students who earned 10+ credits	N/A	% of 2nd year students who earned 10+ credits		N/A	
% of 3rd year students who earned 10+ credits	N/A	4 Year Graduation Rate		N/A	
6 Year Graduation Rate	N/A				
Overall NYSED Accountability Status (2013-14)					
Reward		Recognition			
In Good Standing		Local Assistance Plan			
Focus District	X	Focus School Identified by a Focus District		X	
Priority School					

Accountability Status – Elementary and Middle Schools

Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2012-13)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	Black or African American	N
Hispanic or Latino	-	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-
White	Y	Multi-Racial	-
Students with Disabilities	N	Limited English Proficient	-
Economically Disadvantaged	Y		
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics (2012-13)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	Black or African American	Y
Hispanic or Latino	-	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-
White	Y	Multi-Racial	-
Students with Disabilities	N	Limited English Proficient	-
Economically Disadvantaged	Y		
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science (2012-13)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	Black or African American	-
Hispanic or Latino	-	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-
White	-	Multi-Racial	-
Students with Disabilities	-	Limited English Proficient	-
Economically Disadvantaged	Y		
SCHOOL PRIORITIES AS WRITTEN BY THE SCHOOL:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raise the Achievement Bar by embracing a culture that is driven by data used by parents, students and staff 2. Engage families academically (beyond the bake sale) 3. Provide students with leadership opportunities 4. Implement curriculum and programs with fidelity (i.e. Core Investigations, Kingston Math Units, guided reading) 			

Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness Rating Matrix

Conceptual Framework 1: Vision (Leadership)					
	The potential ratings for this review are (H) highly effective = 4 pts., (E) effective = 3 pts., (D) developing = 2 pts., or (I) ineffective = 1 pt. The average scores that lead to the cumulating CF ratings are: highly effective (3.75 - 4.0), effective (2.75 - 3.74), developing (1.5 - 2.74), and ineffective (1 - 1.49).				
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.2	The school leader ensures that the school community shares the Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Results-oriented, and Timely (SMART) goals/mission, and long-term vision inclusive of core values that address the priorities outlined in the School Comprehensive Educational Plan (SCEP).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.2	The school leader ensures and supports the quality implementation of a systematic plan of rigorous and coherent curricula appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) that is monitored and adapted to meet the needs of students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2	School and teacher leaders ensure that instructional practices and strategies are organized around annual, unit, and daily lesson plans that address all student goals and needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.2	The school leader establishes overarching systems and understandings of how to support and sustain student social and emotional developmental health and academic success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.3	The school articulates and systematically promotes a vision for social and emotional developmental health that is aligned to a curriculum or program that provides learning experiences and a safe and healthy school environment for families, teachers, and students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.2	The school leader ensures that regular communication with students and families fosters their high expectations for student academic achievement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 1		Rating		D	
		Score		1.83	
Conceptual Frame 2: Systems and Structures					
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.4	The school leader has a fully functional system in place aligned to the district's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) to conduct targeted and frequent observation and track progress of teacher practices based on student data and feedback.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.5	Leaders effectively use evidence-based systems and structures to examine and improve critical individual and school-wide practices as defined in the SCEP (student achievement, curriculum and teacher practices; leadership development; community/family engagement; and student social and emotional developmental health).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.5	Teachers implement a comprehensive system for using formative and summative assessments for strategic short and long-range curriculum planning that involves student reflection, tracking of, and ownership of learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5.2	The school leader establishes overarching systems and understandings of how to support and sustain student social and emotional developmental health and academic success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.5	The school leader and student support staff work together with teachers to establish structures to support the use of data to respond to student social and emotional developmental health needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.5	The school shares data in a way that promotes dialogue among parents, students, and school community members centered on student learning and success and encourages and empowers families to understand and use data to advocate for appropriate support services for their children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 2		Rating			I
		Score			1.33

Conceptual Frame 3: Resources

#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.3	Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3	Teachers develop and ensure that unit and lesson plans used include data-driven instruction (DDI) protocols that are appropriately aligned to the CCLS and NYS content standards and address student achievement needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.3	The school articulates and systematically promotes a vision for social and emotional developmental health that is aligned to a curriculum or program that provides learning experiences and a safe and healthy school environment for families, teachers, and students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3	The school engages in effective planning and reciprocal communication with family and community stakeholders so that student strength and needs are identified and used to augment learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 3		Rating		D	
		Score		1.60	

Conceptual Frame 4: Common Core Learning Standards

#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.3	Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2	The school leader ensures and supports the quality implementation of a systematic plan of rigorous and coherent curricula appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) that is monitored and adapted to meet the needs of students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3	Teachers develop and ensure that unit and lesson plans used include data-driven instruction (DDI) protocols that are appropriately aligned to the CCLS and NYS content standards and address student achievement needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5	Teachers implement a comprehensive system for using formative and summative assessments for strategic short and long-range curriculum planning that involves student reflection, tracking of, and ownership of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	learning.				
4.2	School and teacher leaders ensure that instructional practices and strategies are organized around annual, unit, and daily lesson plans that address all student goals and needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.5	Teachers inform planning and foster student participation in their own learning process by using a variety of summative and formative data sources (e.g., screening, interim measures, and progress monitoring).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 4		Rating		D	
		Score		1.71	
Conceptual Frame 5: Collaboration					
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.4	The school leader has a fully functional system in place aligned to the district's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) to conduct targeted and frequent observation and track progress of teacher practices based on student data and feedback.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.4	The school leader and teachers have developed a comprehensive plan for teachers to partner within and across all grades and subjects to create interdisciplinary curricula targeting the arts, technology, and other enrichment opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.4	Teachers and students work together to implement a program/plan to create a learning environment that is responsive to students' varied experiences and tailored to the strengths and needs of all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.4	All school stakeholders work together to develop a common understanding of the importance of their contributions in creating a school community that is safe, conducive to learning, and fostering of a sense of ownership for providing social and emotional developmental health supports tied to the school's vision.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.4	The school community partners with families and community agencies to promote and provide training across all areas (academic and social and emotional developmental health) to support student success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 5		Rating			I
		Score			1.20
Conceptual Frame 6: Use of Data					
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.4	The school leader has a fully functional system in place aligned to the district's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) to conduct targeted and frequent observation and track progress of teacher practices based on student data and feedback.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.5	Leaders effectively use evidence-based systems and structures to examine and improve critical individual and school-wide practices as defined in the SCEP (student achievement, curriculum and teacher practices; leadership development; community/family engagement; and student social and emotional developmental health).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.5	Teachers implement a comprehensive system for using formative and summative assessments for strategic short and long-range curriculum planning that involves student reflection, tracking of, and ownership of learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.5	Teachers inform planning and foster student participation in their own learning process by using a variety of summative and formative data sources (e.g., screening, interim measures, and progress monitoring).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.5	The school leader and student support staff work together with teachers to establish structures to support the use of data to respond to student social and emotional developmental health needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.5	The school shares data in a way that promotes dialogue among parents, students, and school community members centered on student learning and success and encourages and empowers families to understand and use data to advocate for appropriate support services for their children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 6		Rating		I	
		Score		1.33	
Conceptual Frame 7: Professional Development					
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
2.4	The school leader has a fully functional system in place aligned to the district's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) to conduct targeted and frequent observation and track progress of teacher practices based on student data and feedback.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.2	The school leader ensures and supports the quality implementation of a systematic plan of rigorous and coherent curricula appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) that is monitored and adapted to meet the needs of students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.3	The school articulates and systematically promotes a vision for social and emotional developmental health that is aligned to a curriculum or program that provides learning experiences and a safe and healthy school environment for families, teachers, and students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4	The school community partners with families and community agencies to promote and provide training across all areas (academic and social and emotional developmental health) to support student success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 7		Rating		D	
		Score		1.50	
Conceptual Frame 8: Differentiated Instruction					
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
3.3	Teachers develop and ensure that unit and lesson plans used include data-driven instruction (DDI) protocols that are appropriately aligned to the CCLS and NYS content standards and address student achievement needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2	School and teacher leaders ensure that instructional practices and strategies are organized around annual, unit, and daily lesson plans that address all student goals and needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.5	Teachers inform planning and foster student participation in their own learning process by using a variety of summative and formative data sources (e.g., screening, interim measures, and progress monitoring).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAME 8		Rating		D	
		Score		1.75	

School Review Narrative:

Conceptual Frame 1- Leadership and Vision

CF Rating

Developing

Debriefing Statement: The school leader has identified facets of a vision addressing academics, school culture, and student emotional developmental health that the school community is beginning to understand and act on while addressing school improvement efforts.

Planning:

The school leader and teachers state that they have access to a few plans that guide their work in the school such as the School’s Survival Guide and School Comprehension Education Plan, and the school leader shared drafts of other plans during staff meetings. The plans address the ways in which staff members should use the curriculum, instruct, support students, and include families as active entities of the school community. Upon review and discussion of the plans, reviewers found that some of the written and articulated plans lack explicit short- and long-term goals that can guide staff members’ understanding and prioritization of the plans.

Implementation:

Evidence gathered from staff interviews and a review documents show that the school leader has initiated programs or developed concepts that align to the vision and address a need in the school. However, during discussions with the Integrated Intervention Team (IIT or “review team”) teachers and support staff made comments that reflect a lack of clarity about the purpose and intent of the programs, as well as the tasks associated with implementing the various initiatives. Although several of the teachers interviewed by the IIT indicated that they participated in the Building Leadership Team(BLT) meetings dedicated to revising the school’s vision, when asked about the vision for student achievement, teachers’ interpretation of the vision varied with some prioritizing academics and others prioritizing social and emotional achievement. Some teachers stated they were uncertain about the school-wide goals, because they and others did not attend the BLT meeting in August or in September when the vision was introduced to the school community. Parents interviewed by the IIT, were also unable to articulate the vision and only one in the group of four said they knew it. Based on classroom visits and meetings with teachers, the school leader has not ensured alignment between the district’s curriculum and the school’s vision and plan for instruction. Although the school leader articulated that there are clear expectations aligned to achieving the school’s vision for delivering quality instruction, promoting positive behavior from students, and including parents in improving academic achievement, classroom visits demonstrated that teachers struggled with effective follow through of all these expectations. The IIT saw examples of teachers reading the curriculum as a script and inconsistently using Classdojo.com, the student support program, to promote positive behavior. Several teachers and the school leader shared with the IIT that the vision of Classdojo.com was to have students earn points for positive behavior so they could retrieve rewards from the school store. However, the review team’s observations of teachers taking points away from students not following directions as well as the students’ description of the ways they earn points indicate that the use of the program is misaligned with the vision of student support. The inability to achieve the school’s vision is aligned to the staff’s lack of ownership of the vision and the initiatives in place to achieve it. One example is the school’s initiative to get parents involved in their children’s academic achievement by engaging the parents in a reading goals initiative. In effort to increase parent involvement, the school leader said that she created a protocol for teachers to meet with parents and instruct

parents on writing reading goals for their children. During discussions with the IIT, both teachers and parents confirmed that the initiative did not achieve its objective. Teachers described parent frustration during the school’s Open house when parents were asked to write measurable goals for their children. One teacher said, “I felt sorry for the parents. It reminded me of when you first go to college and you are put on the spot because you do not know the answer. During the parent meeting, a parent stated, “Are they going to follow-up with us? It was a good idea, but I do not really understand. It was hard.” Evidence gathered from staff interviews demonstrate that supports for these initiatives aligned to the school’s vision are not explicitly provided, but teachers are expected to use the Teacher Survival Guide, a handbook created by the school leader for clarity around the vision and implementation of the programs.

Monitoring and Revising:

With no explicit goals attached to the various programs and initiatives, teachers make very little adjustments to practice. Although the district-provided Scholastic Guided Reading books and the school leader identified guided reading as a priority, the school leader continues to allow teachers to use reading material that she does not believe is appropriate to address the reading needs of the students. Based on staff and parent interviews the IIT determined that the school leader minimally adjusts practices or holds staff members accountable for adjusting their practice. For example, the school leader reported that she arranged for a conference call to inform the parents of the information discussed during the meeting, but did not consistently take attendance of who participated on the call. The school leader shared that she discovered that the time of the meetings caused the parents’ absence. However, the IIT did not find evidence of her adjusting the meeting time adjustment to ensure parents’ involvement. During discussion with the IIT, the school leader stated that she provides her staff with things to think about rather than directives aligned to implementing the initiatives and programs.

Impact:

The lack of clear goals and priorities that all staff, parents, and students know and understand hinders the school leader and staff from implementing initiatives that align to the vision, which limits school-wide progress towards achieving the vision toward realizing the school’s vision.

Recommendation:

The school leader should use the available meeting times to arrange support to staff members aligned to the initiatives intended to help the school achieve its vision.

Conceptual Frame 2- Systems and Structures	CF Rating	Ineffective
---	------------------	--------------------

Debriefing Statement: The school leader and some staff members have created various structures, aligned to their articulated values, to focus attention on practices that can address school initiatives, but they have not created or implemented systems created from flexible strategies.

Planning:

The school leader does not have a system in place to support teacher observations, the review and adaptation of curriculum, the provision of student social and emotional developmental health services, and family and community engagement. Although the school leader has recently established initiatives, such as Friday Check-Ins, PLCs, grade level observation meetings, open house for parents and the Academic Parent Teacher Team(APTT), these structures are not yet interconnected. The school leader has not prioritized the planning and development of a system to connect these key school improvement efforts.

Implementation:

During the school leader interview and from the self-assessment document the school leader described conducting weekly walk-throughs and the use of a carbonless memo to write limited suggestions to teachers aligned to what she notices in the classrooms. The IIT noted that the comments provided to teachers primarily focused on compliments of teachers' practice and minimally focused on teachers' instructional practices aligned to prior feedback or academic expectations. Teachers who struggle to implement the guided reading program and have not included in their plans ways to address the goals created by parents for their children have not received direction from the school leader due to her concern of overwhelming teachers. The school leader said she has shared videos of best instructional practices with teachers whose instructional strategies did not meet the outlined expectation for instruction. However, the primary plan of direct support and guidance is to rely on the district coaches when they visit the school. A schedule for this support depends upon the coaches' availability and when that availability connects to the time teachers are scheduled to meet. The school leader reported that she and the coaches plan to discuss the informal class visits and teachers' reactions to the videos. When interviewed by the IIT, parents and students were asked how supports were provided to students. Some parents identified organizations they believe operate within the school but could only provide limited details of the programs' purpose and how students were admitted into the programs, and students identified ClassdoJo.com. However, the reviewers noted that teachers do not implement Classdojo.com in the same way across classrooms, and therefore students minimally benefit from the programs offered by the organizations the parents identified and the existence of Classdojo.com.

Monitoring and Revising

While the school leader is currently using a Friday check-in system to monitor how teachers are using the Core Investigations curriculum, the review team found that these meetings only monitor the use of the curriculum by requiring teachers to report on their instructional plans. Although there is concern about teachers' implementation of their plan, the school leader has not revised the protocol for Friday check-ins to include a system for addressing the concern. The IIT noted that, during a teacher meeting, while the teachers focused on reviewing assessments and ways to identify additional strategies to scaffold learning and supports for students with disabilities, teachers did not discuss or monitor their goals or the parents' goals for students. The teachers articulated that they needed support with connecting the school's expectations and the supports students' needs. The school leader's lack of explicit monitoring of and participation in these meetings results in unmet the teachers' needs.

Impact:

The school leader does not have a robust system in place to observe teachers and to assess the quality and rigor of the instructional practices teachers use daily, which inhibits her ability to articulate trends and patterns aligned to areas for improvement for her teachers and leaving teachers with minimal direction on how to improve their practice.

Recommendation:

The school leader should develop a system, centered on a formalized observation schedule to note academic and student support strategies teachers use in the classroom, to provide targeted feedback aligned to school-wide targets and priorities.

Debriefing Statement: The school leader has arranged for staff members to have access to resources that align to several initiatives to achieve the school's vision; however, the ability to capitalize from these resources is impeded by the staff's inconsistent use and the lack of a shared vision around the purpose of the resources.

Planning:

The school leader and staff members are beginning to identify ways to use time, material, and programs as resources to address initiatives in the school. The school leader stated that there is dedicated time for monthly, bi-weekly, and weekly classroom teacher meetings to discuss and learn about the appropriate use of data. The school has created and fully adopted the use of programs such as Clasdojo.com, APTT, and the district-created English language arts and mathematics curriculums to address student behavior and achievement. However, the school leader and staff members have not prioritized and connected the use of fiscal and human capital as resources to achieving success in the school's initiatives.

Implementation:

A schedule exists for teachers to meet and collaborate several times a month. The school leader stated that monthly meetings will focus on the theories presented in the book *Data Wise*, and although the teachers and school leader believe teachers need a lot of support to understand how to use data effectively, bi-weekly and weekly meetings also focused on data have no formal format, explicit goals, or planned facilitation. The APTT and newly changed district-led curriculums are also programs where the fidelity of the implementation is inconsistent. School leader statements corroborated by classroom visits demonstrated that not all teachers are using the district purchased guided reading materials that have the ability to challenge students greater than the online *Reading A-Z* book program used in some classrooms. When asked about the use of the A-Z books observed in classrooms and the misaligned connections to challenging students academically, the school leader stated, "That material gets teachers to focus on minimum and not reaching the highest standards." During the teacher meeting, teachers shared mixed responses about the usefulness of and the implementation of the APTT. Throughout the visit, staff articulated and reviewers noticed that Clasdojo.com, the resource aligned to supporting students, is used differently within classrooms across the school. Where the use of fiscal capital could have been helpful to strengthen parent engagement in the Building Leadership Team, by using existing funding to pay teachers on the team to meet during non-school hours, the school leader had not connected the potential request for using Title 1 funding to provide options for flexible meeting times for parents. The school leader agreed that since one of the school's identifications as a Focus School is due to their economically disadvantaged students the appropriate use of Title I resources was paramount. The school leader has asked the district coaches to work more closely with teachers by visiting classes and attending teacher meetings when possible, however, a schedule to ensure coaches are expected to meet with teachers and the goals attained based on these meetings are not identified. The school leader has not prioritized the strategy of developing teacher leaders who can develop the knowledge and skills necessary to guide teacher teams to successful collaborations.

Monitoring and Revising:

There have been very little adjustments made pertaining to the resources available in the school and the ways in which staff members use those resources. Two separate discussions took place at the school with teachers and the school leader about the curriculum used in the school focused on the guided reading groups and materials. Although the teachers assess students to determine their individual reading levels in the beginning of the school year for the purposes of guided reading grouping, the curriculum calls for banding the DRA

reading levels (i.e. DRA levels 6-10) to a single guided reading instructional level. Teachers and the school leader could not explain how the banding of reading levels would affect students who were at the two extremes of a banded level and who may need further support or enrichment. When asked what the school planned to do to adjust for those needs, of the answer offered was “I didn’t think about that.” Furthermore, in response to plans to adjust to the Building Leadership Team meetings to encourage and allow for more parents participation, the school leader stated there are no plans to make adjustments or to prioritize providing a framework or explicit goals to meeting times and teams.

Impact:

The approach to using available resources, poor implementation of programs and materials, and the lack of adjustments to plans focused on improving the outcome of initiatives has led to tasks with no clear end-points and stagnant results.

Recommendation:

The school leader should create protocols for using materials and engaging in school initiated programs with fidelity, and should develop a system for a feedback loop that staff can use to identify when to make timely adjustments to tasks and practices.

Conceptual Frame 4- Common Core Learning Standards

CF Rating

Developing

Debriefing Statement: The school adopted Core Investigations, the district created curriculum, and adapted EngageNY Mathematics Modules, as a primary driver for delivering instruction. However, staff members have taken little ownership for ensuring the materials align to the needs of all students.

Planning:

The school leader’s professional development (PD) plan includes using Data Wise, JaRa consultants, and district PD opportunities. The school is at the beginning stage of establishing a balanced literacy school, where teachers are expected to model lessons, track student-reading levels, group students into small groups, and provide students with books on their instructional level. Although the school leader sent the teachers to district PD sessions, teachers are not infusing their knowledge and there is inconsistency in implementation. The school leader shared that the *Survival Guide* that was distributed to the staff includes academic information as well as information on APTT expectations about professional learning communities and grade level meetings participation, a PD calendar with dates and times, an article on *Data Wise*, and four essential questions aligned to professional learning communities (PLC). The school leader reported that district coaches, who work at the school once every six days, are planning to provide support around Common Core alignment. Thus far, they have provided teachers with materials to implement Common Core aligned lessons and the school leader asked the coaches to focus on helping teachers examine and analyze student work.

Implementation:

During the classroom visits, the review team observed teachers implementing lessons from the district adopted Core Investigations and the adapted EngageNY mathematics modules. However, most of the lessons were teacher directed and whole group with little evidence of adjustments to the curriculum. The review team noted that teachers used different approaches to guided reading, but across the school, teachers taught mathematics in a whole class format with very little group work. In some classes, the review team saw students reading *Reading A-Z* books independently and responded to a quiz after reading the book. During

guided reading, students read aloud in unison and after each page read, the teacher asked, “What do you notice?” and “What do you wonder?” If a student responded with a noticing instead of a wondering, the teacher said, “That’s a noticing. What do you wonder?” Most teachers did not collect data on students reading habits while students were working in groups reading or doing other work, which the school leader articulated was a focus for instruction. During class visits, the IIT found that mathematic lessons, across grades, focused on place value with grade two and grade three classes focusing on the same place value numbers. During discussions with the IIT, students shared their work by describing it and reflecting on the assignment the teacher provided. Students shared that their teachers give them topics so they do not have to think about what they would like to write about or work on in class. During the teacher meeting, some teachers expressed that, in general, they find that the curriculum is excellent. However, some teachers shared that while the curriculum allows for differentiation, the end-of-unit writing assessment did not meet the needs of all learners, particularly students with disabilities. To address this concern, one teacher said she changed the assessment last year, but she indicated she did not share her assessment with other teachers on the grade. Some teachers shared that they are discussing ways to modify the assessments. Although the school is using Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) in the beginning of the year to identify reading levels, teachers do not have other formal protocols to use for determining reading progress or ways to make decisions about when to move a student from one level to another between the administering of the quarterly assessment. In addition, the IIT found that the classroom libraries are not leveled.

Monitoring and Revising:

Across the school, there are scheduled times for teacher meetings, but there are no systems for collecting and analyzing data in a manner that will help teachers differentiate or make instructional decisions to meet the needs of the students. Teachers state that they are modifying the mathematics units with overarching questions to drive and anchor the units and they are using Fountas and Pinnell to target groups during enrichment and re-teaching periods. However, in one class, the teacher indicated that a group of students struggled with a reading assignment and they would be with her during the re-teaching period, but when the students arrived to the class, the teacher decided to teach a mathematics lesson to the group. When the IIT asked teachers about the students’ struggles with writing and how it affects the credibility of the assessments, they admitted to their frustrations and concerns, but did not have a plan to address the problem. At the teacher meetings, teachers struggled with identifying strategies to support the varying needs of their students. Although, the school leader expects teachers to spend 180 minutes on literacy, teachers inconsistently differentiate instruction or use data to inform their pedagogical decisions. Feedback to students about academic progress is limited and the school leader’s feedback to teachers is dependent upon what teachers are teaching and since generic topics teachers list on their class schedules, there is no way to determine when discreet topics are taught and to ensure teachers are held accountable for effective instruction. Although the school leader is aware that teachers are struggling with assessing reading progress, the lack of specificity in class schedules impede proper accountability, and there are no plans to adjust current practices.

Impact:

The lack of training, systems for ways to use available data and meeting times, and support aligned to providing targeted instruction to students results in inconsistency of strategic pedagogical approaches that address the needs of all students.

Recommendation:

To ensure that teachers implement a highly rigorous common core curriculum with fidelity, the school leader should use the opportunity to conduct informal class visits and identified meeting times to provide PD aligned to the vision for instruction and hold teachers accountable for student learning.

Conceptual 5- Collaboration**CF Rating****Ineffective**

Debriefing Statement: Although the school is at the beginning stages of identifying structures for constituents to meet and collaborate around learning opportunities for students and adults, there are no systems, explicit goals, or clear expectations for the outcomes of these collaborative opportunities.

Planning:

Although the school leader created a schedule for teachers to collaborate during common meeting times, the school leader stated that there are no explicit expectations for the ways in which teachers should share data or conduct meetings, but she emailed suggested protocols to teachers. She has not assigned a facilitator for these meetings and did not have a system in place to assess outcomes. In addition, teachers use Core Investigations as the basis for interdisciplinary curriculum because the curriculum addresses social studies and science. However, during visits to classrooms, the IIT did not observe teachers implementing instruction social studies and science. When asked about ways to ensure teachers dedicate the appropriate time to these areas, the school leader indicated a need to create a more explicit plan to ensure instruction in social studies and science took place and was effective. The school has a music, art, and computer teacher who provide instruction to students. However, the school leader has not scheduled a common planning time for these teachers to meet with classroom teachers during grade meetings to discuss ways to intentionally connect their curriculum. The school leader has incorporated the APTT approach for parent-teacher conferences, where parents create academic goals for their students, and developed some partnerships with external agencies such as Animals in the classroom, Therapy dogs, Classdojo.com, SAM's club, Alcoa and Girls, Incorporated to address the social emotional developmental health of students. However, the student support team was unable to articulate how the school leader connected the initiatives as a comprehensive support program from which students and families can benefit. One partnership with a church provides items for students to purchase with their Classdojo.com points, but the use of the program varies from class to class.

Implementation:

Although there are opportunities for collaboration, there is a lack of guidance from the school leader. While the school leader conducted walkthroughs and met with teachers for their weekly Friday check-ins to collect information, the school leader has not provided direct feedback that influences what teachers are discussing or planning. The school leader expressed that her concern about how much the teachers can handle as the reason she consciously provides positive feedback with very little directives. When asked about teachers whose instructional practice was of concern, the school leader was able to provide several names, but then admitted that none of those teachers had a Teacher Intervention Plan. The school leader expressed concern about the ways points accumulate for year-end evaluations, but also admitted that informal plans for supports did not exist for teachers of concern. Some parents interviewed by the IIT expressed concern about the collaboration between teachers and parents. One parent stated, "I understand that you have to lock the doors as this is Kingston but you are also locking the parents out." Another parent stated, "they (teachers) want the kids to stand on their own. The teachers should be more nurturing and not less nurturing."

Monitoring and Revising:

The school leader is in the beginning stages of working with teachers to improve their practice. When the school leader noticed, during the review process, that one of the teachers had not started guiding reading groups despite articulating an explicit timeline to teachers for beginning these groups earlier in the school year, the school leader said she would talk to the teacher later in the week. The school leader planned to ask the teacher, “Does she have the levels of students? Has she broken the kids into guided reading groups? Does she have the appropriate materials?” After further discussion, about how the school leader planned to collaborate with the teacher to improve reading experiences for the students in this class, the school leader stated she planned be more directive about starting guiding reading. The school leader also decided that she could better support teachers if her Friday check-ins focused on how teachers differentiated instruction. The school leader also stated that during the review process, she found that there was a need to provide teachers support with using the student support programs available in the school. To increase collaboration among the staff, the school leader contracted with JaRa Consultants who provided PD focused on a communication strategy that encourages “generous explanations,” a method of communicating with one another by offering extensive clarification for what is being said and why it is being stated. The strategy encourages staff to give each other the benefit of the doubt and not assume the worst during meetings.

Impact:

The lack of a systematic approach to feedback as well as clear direction and expectations aligned to goals lead to inconsistent collaborations among staff members, which reduces opportunities for students to experience interdisciplinary curricula.

Recommendation:

The school leader should adjust the teacher meeting schedule to ensure teachers across the content areas meet regularly guided by a clear vision for protocols to structure meetings and an outline of tasks teachers need to accomplish, so that interdisciplinary instruction increases in the classrooms and teachers practice effective strategies for collaboration.

Conceptual 6- Use of Data**CF Rating****Ineffective**

Debriefing Statement: There is an emphasis on collecting summative student achievement and student behavior data; however, staff members have not prioritized collecting formative data on student progress and parent engagement to make timely decisions.

Planning:

The school leader has articulated the importance of using data in the school guide and during monthly PD sessions to teachers. According to the school leader, the collection of data should help teachers identify and understand what to re-teach and how to assess a student’s learning in the content. The school is adopting *Data Wise* as a mechanism for data analysis and is beginning to train on the *Data Wise* during the in-service time. During the teacher meeting, teachers described the various data sources they have access to such as writing rubrics, DRA quarterly assessments, and mathematic units. Student support staff members stated they do not have a routine way to collect and compare data.

Implementation:

The use and analysis of data and goal-setting based on the data are areas that the staff, students, and parents struggle with implementing in the school. Teachers articulated that students with special needs have difficulty with the writing assessments and that it is difficult to determine if the students have mastered the content

because of their struggles with writing, but the writing assessments are the only type of assessments used at the time. The review team attended a grade level subject meeting where teachers discussed student data. The review team found that teachers struggled with using data to scaffold learning activities for various learners, and that teachers' dialogue fell short in generating research-based strategies to address the learning needs of the students with disabilities. During the student group meeting, only two of the nine students could identify their reading levels. Of the two students, one student knew the Developmental Reading Assessment level and the other knew her Fountas and Pinnell level, but did not know the correct way to select a book for independent reading because, she said, "The teacher gives me my books to read." Other students interviewed during classroom visits, could not articulate their reading levels. Some teachers and parents also expressed ambivalence about the ways in which the school is trying to share data with them. For example, during the parent focus group meeting, parents expressed confusion about the goal-setting activity they participated in during the open house. One parent stated that the school did not communicate a clear sense for ways to follow-up with the assignment. Teachers also acknowledged that the parents needed greater support and guidance with the development of a measurable goal, but because they were uncertain about the initiative, they were not sure how to support parents. The school leader reported that based on the walk-throughs she conducts, she has found that the use of data, including those aligned to the goals set by the parents, is not systemic. In addition, the most consistent use of data is used to assign guided reading groups in some classes. During the classroom visits, the IIT saw few examples of teachers using formative data to inform their instructional decisions. In addition, with the exception of Classdojo.com points for student behavior, the IIT found that that most feedback provided during class and on student, work did not align to academic expectations.

Monitor and Revising:

The school leader conducts a Friday check-in that provides her with an overview of how the teachers in the school are implementing the curriculum and although it is evident that teachers are not differentiating instruction the school leader has not made changes in the ways instruction is monitored and providing feedback to teachers. The school leader reported that to address teachers' inconsistent use of data to inform instruction, she asked the District coaches to show teachers how to conduct an item analysis, examine student work, and conduct running records. The school leader acknowledged that the plans for support have not started and she is still mapping out when and how the support meetings will take place, but acknowledged she has not put an interim plan in place to address the shortcomings of instruction. Teacher interviews reflect that Data Wise training and plans for the district coaches to provide instructional supports are in the elementary stages. Class visits showed that teachers have not taken ownership of the data to inform instructional planning or delivery. For example, in one class, the teacher told the IIT, that a group of students struggled with a reading assignment and they would be with her during the re-teaching period, but when the students arrived to the class, the teacher decided to teach a mathematics lesson to the group.

Impact:

While there is evidence of available data for teachers and parents to use to examine and analyze, a lack of timely training to respond to teacher struggles with using the data and parent confusion about understanding the data has resulted in students not benefitting from instruction that address their academic levels and needs.

Recommendation:

Create an explicit plan that outlines a follow-up session for families concerning student goals and when and

how teachers will receive timely PD aligned to the collection, use, and analysis of data so that students receive database instruction and feedback that addresses their academic needs.

Conceptual 7- Professional Development

CF Rating

Developing

Debriefing Statement: Professional development offered to teachers focuses primarily on the use of data and does not address teachers’ needs and requests for pedagogical practices and content knowledge support.

Planning:

The school leader provided teachers with a menu of PD opportunities in the school’s Survival Guide that the school and district office are sponsoring. Through numerous conversations with staff, the review team learned that save for attendance at PD sessions focused on data, teachers’ attendance at PD sessions are voluntary. When teachers expressed that the school’s curriculum was modified from the year before and there were new components to it that they were unfamiliar with teaching, a conversation ensued focused on the types of PD available aligned to overall instructional practices and understanding of the curriculum. When asked if teachers had access to PD to assist with their instructional practices, one teacher replied, “Not yet, it is supposed to start in October but she (the school leader) has no plan for it.” In the absence of more definitive information, the other teachers appeared to accept the answer. Despite the articulated need, there are no plans at this time to provide additional PD aligned to the Classdojo.com program or for addressing parents’ understanding of student data and goal setting.

Implementation:

The school staff members have not participated in PD aligned to academic strategies and ways to implement Classdojo.com. During discussions with the IIT, teachers shared that limited PD has been provided to support student social and emotional health. Teachers have been able to participate in weekly meetings to address their needs and questions about the curriculum, but other than one grade where one of the teachers is a former district coach, teachers are meeting alone and do not have appropriate support to facilitate their meetings. The school leader shared that the staff participated in a PD session that provided strategies for being more collegial. The school leader stated that she believes the staff benefitted greatly from the experience and are beginning to use the strategies learned during the session.

Monitoring and Revising:

In response to a question about the remaining concerns aligned to teacher’s use of data, the school leader stated, “Professional development is important because the use of data is inconsistent with some teachers not using it at all. Some teachers use data to see what they should re-teach. Some are using data to determine that one kid got it and the other kid did not.” The IIT found minimal evidence to show how PD is planned and/or modified to address a wide range of teachers’ instructional needs.

Impact:

The school has plans to offer PD opportunities, but the lack of alignment of those sessions to the needs of the teachers, families, and students limits the effectiveness of the sessions. As a result, teachers struggle with delivering instruction, understanding the curriculum, and using data to address students’ needs.

Recommendation:

The school leader should develop and implement, immediately, a multi-tier PD plan, during available teacher

team meeting times, which school leaders will monitor and adjust for the purposes of elevating teacher content knowledge and practice by using existing human capital that builds teacher understanding across the curriculum.

Conceptual 8- Differentiation

CF Rating

Developing

Debriefing Statement: The use of guided reading is the school's only method of differentiated instruction, but it is not implemented school-wide and where practiced does not address the specific needs of all students.

Planning:

Teachers have access to formative and summative assessments such as Reading and Analyzing Non-Fiction, Teacher Tracking Forms, STAR Assessments, DRA, Core Investigations, and Running Records, which they can use to adjust instructional practices. The school has a plan for addressing individual student needs via guided reading, but reviewers learned that not all teachers are implementing this strategy at this time. Scheduling opportunities exist to allow teachers to select students for re-teaching sessions based on timely data. There are also outlined suggestions for small group instruction for enrichment and interventions embedded in the district developed curriculum.

Implementation:

Although opportunities and materials are available for teachers to deliver differentiated instruction to students, classroom visits showed that other than guided reading, teachers delivered instruction via whole group instruction. The IIT noted some inconsistencies between planned activities and enacted lessons. For example, in one class, although the teacher told reviewers that she selected and grouped students based on reading needs, when a group of students went to music so that the classroom teacher could work with this small group of students, the teacher focused on mathematics and not reading. In addition, during classroom visits, the reviewers noticed that many teachers used lesson plans duplicated directly from the original district created curriculum. Most teachers did not modify the lesson plans to allow for easy access to small group work aligned to student data.

Monitoring and Revising:

Across the school, there was an absence of consistency in teacher lesson plan modification based on the CCLS shifts. Teachers do not utilize the multiple entry points embedded in the New York State EngageNY units to build student knowledge while scaffolding sequenced skills. Some teachers state that they use summative and formative assessments to inform instructional modifications in the classroom, but during class visits, the IIT did not find evidence of teachers collecting, analyzing and using data to drive instructional decision in the classroom. During discussion with the IIT, one teacher stated, "We are working on revising the modules after using them verbatim last year. We condensed lessons in some respects and moved the modules. For the most part we are following the modules and we added assessments." The IIT found that the modifications teachers made to the curriculum are at the whole class instruction level and do not target small group or individual students.

Impact:

Teachers primarily employ a singular method of instructional delivery to students, which does not address the needs of all students and limits overall student achievement.

Recommendation:

The school leaders should create a schedule for teachers to observe district coaches modeling differentiated instruction using the district created curriculum to address small group instruction in all academic areas and follow-up these opportunities with professional development.