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

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT EFFECTIVENESS (DTSDE)

BEDS Code	332300010178
School Name	P.S. 178 Saint Clair McKelway
School Address	2163 Dean Street, Brooklyn, NY 11233
District Name	NYCDOE CSD 23
School Leader	Joseph Henry
Dates of Review	March 3-4, 2015
School Accountability Status	☒Focus School
Type of Review	☒SED Integrated Intervention Team (IIT)

23K178 School Information Sheet Key

School Configuration *(2014-15)*					
Grade Configuration	**PK,0K,01,02,03,04,05,06,07,08**	**Total Enrollment**	**403**	**SIG Recipient**	**N/A**
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes *(2014-15)*					
# Transitional Bilingual	**N/A**	**# Dual Language**	**N/A**	**# Self-Contained English as a Second Language**	**N/A**
Types and Number of Special Education Classes *(2014-15)*					
# Special Classes	**N/A**	**# SETSS**	**N/A**	**# Integrated Collaborative Teaching**	**N/A**
Types and Number of Special Classes *(2014-15)*					
# Visual Arts	**N/A**	**# Music**	**N/A**	**# Drama**	**N/A**
# Foreign Language	**5**	**# Dance**	**N/A**	**# CTE**	**N/A**

School Composition *(2013-14)*			
% Title I Population	**84.7%**	**% Attendance Rate**	**87.6%**
% Free Lunch	**88.0%**	**% Reduced Lunch**	**1.5%**
% Limited English Proficient	**5.9%**	**% Students with Disabilities**	**18.7%**
Racial/Ethnic Origin *(2013-14)*			
% American Indian or Alaska Native	**1.5%**	**% Black or African American**	**78.9%**
% Hispanic or Latino	**17.2%**	**% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander**	**0.4%**
% White	**1.7%**	**% Multi-Racial**	**N/A**
Personnel *(2014-15)*			
Years Principal Assigned to School (2014-15)	**7.17**	**# of Assistant Principals (2014-15)**	**1**
# of Deans (2014-15)	**N/A**	**# of Counselors/Social Workers (2014-15)**	**2**
Personnel *(2013-14)*			
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate (2013-14)	**N/A**	**% Teaching Out of Certification (2013-14)**	**9.6%**
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience (2013-14)	**0.1%**	**Average Teacher Absences (2013-14)**	**6.76**
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools *(2013-14)*			
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	**13.2%**	**Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4**	**17.6%**
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)	**57.9%**	**Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (8th Grade)**	**36.0%**
Student Performance for High Schools *(2012-13)*			
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 *(2014-15)*			
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	**N/A**	**Black or African American**	**YES**
Hispanic or Latino	**YES**	**Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**	**N/A**
White	**N/A**	**Multi-Racial**	**N/A**
Students with Disabilities	**YES**	**Limited English Proficient**	**N/A**
Economically Disadvantaged	**YES**		
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics *(2012-13)*			
American Indian or Alaska Native	**N/A**	**Black or African American**	**YES**
Hispanic or Latino	**YES**	**Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**	**N/A**
White	**N/A**	**Multi-Racial**	**N/A**
Students with Disabilities	**YES**	**Limited English Proficient**	**N/A**
Economically Disadvantaged	**YES**		
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science *(2012-13)*			
American Indian or Alaska Native	**N/A**	**Black or African American**	**YES**
Hispanic or Latino	**N/A**	**Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**	**N/A**
White	**N/A**	**Multi-Racial**	**N/A**
Students with Disabilities	**N/A**	**Limited English Proficient**	**N/A**
Economically Disadvantaged	**NO**		

SCHOOL PRIORITIES AS WRITTEN BY THE SCHOOL:

1. The school did not provide any current goals or priorities.

Information about the review

- The review was co-led by an Outside Educational Expert (OEE) and a representative from the New York State Education Department (NYSED). The team also included a district representative and a Special Education School Improvement Specialist (SESIS) representative.
- The review team visited a total of 28 classrooms during the two-day review.
- Reviewers conducted focus groups with students, staff, and parents.
- Reviewers examined documents provided by the school, including curriculum maps, lesson plans, school-wide data, teacher feedback, and student work.
- The school provided results of a student survey that 122 students (81 percent) completed.
- The school provided results of a staff survey that 33 staff members (97 percent) completed.
- The school provided results of a parent survey that 202 parents (57 percent) completed.

Tenet 2 - School Leader Practices and Decisions: Visionary leaders create a school community and culture that lead to success, well-being and high academic outcomes for all students via systems of continuous and sustainable school improvement.

#	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).	☐	☐	☒	☐
2.3	Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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).	☐	☐	☒	☐
	OVERALL RATING FOR TENET 2:			**D**	

Tenet 3 - Curriculum Development and Support: The school has rigorous and coherent curricula and assessments that are appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) for all students and are modified for identified subgroups in order to maximize teacher instructional practices and student-learning outcomes.

#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐

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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	OVERALL RATING FOR TENET 3:			**D**	

Tenet 4 - Teacher Practices and Decisions: Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn, so that all students and pertinent subgroups experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking, and achievement.

#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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).	☐	☐	☒	☐
	OVERALL RATING FOR TENET 4:			**D**	

Tenet 5 - Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health: The school community identifies, promotes, and supports social and emotional development by designing systems and experiences that lead to healthy relationships and a safe, respectful environment that is conducive to learning for all constituents.

#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	OVERALL RATING FOR TENET 5:			**D**	

Tenet 6 - Family and Community Engagement: The school creates a culture of partnership where families,

community members, and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being.					
#	Statement of Practice	H	E	D	I
6.2	The school leader ensures that regular communication with students and families fosters their high expectations for student academic achievement.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	OVERALL RATING FOR TENET 6:			**D**	

Tenet 2 - School Leader Practices and Decisions: Visionary leaders create a school community and culture that lead to success, well-being, and high academic outcomes for all students via systems of continuous and sustainable school improvement.	**Tenet Rating**	**D**

The school has received a rating of ***Developing*** for Tenet 2 – School Leader Practices and Decisions.

- Although a school vision is in place, reviewers found that it was not well known, nor focused on data to bring about sustained school improvement. The school leader reported he created the school vision without support of the district or network, that it was reviewed by the school leadership team, and shared with the school community. However, teachers, parents, and support staff were not able to fully describe the vision or any of the school goals. Parents in the focus group stated the vision was to have a safe learning environment, while student support staff stated the vision was to engage students in learning within a safe environment, as well as engaging parents.
- While the school leader has made some strategic decisions to bring about school change, programmatic decisions are not clearly aligned to school-wide goals; this limits the school leader's ability to make progress toward student improvement. The school leader has put in place an extended day program, offered twice a week, where students performing close to or below standard are targeted for extra help in English language arts (ELA) and math. While visiting these classes, reviewers noted very low attendance with only three to four students in most classes; reviewers also noted that this was occurring in a school where 88 percent of students are reading below level. Reviewers learned the school leader has instituted an advisory period for grades seven and eight that targets struggling students in both ELA and math; however, reviewers noted that students are taken out of other subject areas to attend advisories and consequently missed math, Spanish, science, or technology content. When asked how many students regularly attend advisory, the school leader did not know and could not refer to a document containing information or evidence showing the effectiveness of this and other programs.
- Teachers informed the review team that the school leader conducts classroom observations using the Danielson model and rubric; the school leader also performs follow-up visits to check that recommendations for improvement identified in the observation process are implemented. During a review of completed observation documents, reviewers noted that reports showed no evidence of feedback for teachers rated as effective. Recommendations examined on other observation reports were generic in nature; for example, "keep up the good work," and ''good job" were noted by reviewers. In addition, all reviewed observation reports rated teachers as effective in the area of using assessment in instruction, even though this is an identified school-wide area for improvement.
- Reviewers found that systems for analyzing and improving the success of school-wide and individual practices are variable in quality and effectiveness. Although the school leader performs teacher observations, they are not directly leading to sustained improvements in instruction. Members of the school intervention team reportedly work collaboratively and share appropriate data to ensure that the social and emotional developmental health needs of students are being met; however, reviewers learned that attendance is not deeply analyzed to inform decisions about intervention plans, especially for those students who are chronically absent. In addition, the advisory program is not formally monitored or analyzed to make sure its goal to improve the achievement of students is met.

Recommendation:

The school leader should make sure that:

- feedback from classroom observations and walkthroughs is focused on specific areas for improvement for all teachers and should initially include already identified weaknesses, such as questioning technique, meaningful student engagement, and on-going assessment; and
- teachers use one of the taxonomies, such as Bloom's Taxonomy, Costa's Levels of Questioning, or Webb's Depth Of Knowledge (DOK), in developing their questioning.

The school leader should schedule monthly visits to check for progress and improvement.

Tenet 3 - Curriculum Development and Support: The school has rigorous and coherent curricula and assessments that are appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) for all students and are modified for identified subgroups in order to maximize teacher instructional practices and student-learning outcomes.	**Tenet Rating**	**D**

The school has received a rating of ***Developing*** for Tenet 3 – Curriculum Development and Support.

- The school leader and teachers stated that professional development (PD) on the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) has taken place and that the school leader is drawing up a more formalized plan for the consistent implementation of CCLS. The school leader and teachers stated that Generation Ready consultants provide teachers with PD on questioning and discussion technique twice monthly. However, in a review of documents, the Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) found no evidence of a formalized PD plan for the school year that is monitored and focused on the CCLS, instructional shifts, and instructional practices designed to identify and meet individual and subgroup needs. Teacher and school leader interviews provided evidence that school leaders do not regularly or rigorously monitor the implementation of CCLS through an evaluation of teacher planning or by observing classroom instruction to ensure that curricula meet the needs of all students.
- Formative assessment, although written into lesson and unit plans, was not consistently implemented in classrooms visited by reviewers. Strategies such as fist of five and thumbs up were planned for and used, but observations showed that this was at the expense of the use of alternative strategies, such as academic vocabulary and accountable talk stems. Some reviewed lesson plans showed student groupings based on task, reading level, and comprehension of lesson skill or strategy, but the same plans did not regularly integrate key components of the CCLS, such as differentiation and data-driven instruction (DDI). Discussions with teachers and an evaluation of planning revealed that few teachers regularly monitor or adjust curricula to support the CCLS instructional shifts. Reviewers found that adaptations of lessons, the use of complex materials, and higher-order questioning are also not routinely present in unit and lesson plans for all students.
- Reviewers found no evidence of a plan to form partnerships to create interdisciplinary curricula, which interviewed teachers confirmed. Opportunities are not provided for teachers to collaborate to explore strategies for providing integrated learning opportunities for students in all grades. Classroom visits carried out by reviewers produced no evidence of learning that incorporated the arts or technology or presented exciting and innovative opportunities for students to put their literacy and math skills to use across different content areas.
- Teachers informed reviewers that they are at an early stage of using data to make or inform curricular

decisions. This was reflected in curriculum planning documents evaluated by reviewers. The school leader and teachers reported the use of a benchmark exam, state tests, and teacher-developed tests as summative assessments. However, the IIT found little evidence of purposeful grouping or differentiated instruction, especially in classes with subgroups, or cooperative learning strategies that clearly indicated DDI. Discussions with students showed that few teachers provide them with feedback from assessments that outline what they need to improve on or aspire to in order to achieve at a higher academic grade or level**.**

Recommendation:

In grade-level meetings, teachers should:

- review and revise CCLS-aligned unit plans to strengthen lessons that reflect a unified understanding of the overarching essential question, which must lead to strategies for differentiation, data-driven grouping, varied formative assessments, and specially designed instruction for students with disabilities.

School leaders should monitor this process on a weekly basis.

Tenet 4 - Teacher Practices and Decisions: Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn, so that all students and pertinent subgroups experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking, and achievement.	**Tenet Rating**	**D**

The school has received a rating of ***Developing*** for Tenet 4 – Teacher Practices and Decisions.

- Evidence from an evaluation of planning documents and classroom observations showed that most teachers plan lessons that incorporate some CCLS and instructional shifts; however, in practice, instruction does not reflect student needs by incorporating specific strategies or varied instructional groupings that address different learning styles, interests, and abilities. In 28 class visits, reviewers noted only one class where the teacher differentiated instruction for Individualized Education Program (IEP) students. Classroom observations revealed a great deal of teacher-directed, teacher-dominated lessons that incorporated auditory learning only and not multiple access points for all learners.
- Reviewers found that teachers are at an early stage of using data to drive instruction and that goal setting for different groups of students is not embedded across the school. Evidence from class visits, planning materials, and discussions with students showed that instructional delivery directly linked to lesson plans including CCLS strategic instruction and aligned to student need informed by data is lacking. At the time of the review, only one of five visits to special education classes showed teachers using strategies that addressed visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles through videos, song, read aloud/think aloud, and modeling; standard practices for students with disabilities. In most classes visited, reviewers found that teachers had not modified instruction by adapting levels of text and providing a scaffold, such as a graphic organizer, to aid students in showing their understanding. In general, the IIT found the predominant practice was whole group instruction with limited purposeful student grouping. In classroom visits carried out by reviewers, lessons often featured questions focused on knowledge and recall that only required one-word answers. Higher-order questioning was only evident in nine of the 28 classes visited. In the student focus group, students stated that teachers did most of the talking, suggesting teacher-dominated lessons. Visitations further showed that not all students were engaged in work that offered a variety of activities and experiences, multiple entry

points, and consistent and frequent collaboration. Students also stated that few opportunities were provided for them to share ideas, values, and opinions in discussions or debates that promote the importance of student voice and recognize different values and perspectives.

- Teachers are beginning to analyze data from summative and formative assessments, as seen in student work folders and portfolios, but this information is not yet effectively used to drive instruction or group students by ability. Class visits demonstrated that few attempts have been made to use data to provide learning tasks matching the needs and abilities of students performing above standards. In the majority of observed classes, no formal lesson closure included an assessment of learning, such as exit tickets as a means of formative assessment. Reviewers found that the quality of student feedback was inconsistent and not geared to encouraging students to take ownership of their own learning. Reviewers noted that some feedback on finished written work consisted of post-it notes with "glow and grow" statements, but too little feedback provided actionable next steps to guide students on ways to improve their work. For example, some post-its indicated "good job," "clear and descriptive," or "engaging" for rubric scores of two or three; and one piece of student work was posted with an incorrect solution, but no feedback was provided by the teacher.

Recommendation:

During each lesson, teachers should:

- use higher order thinking questions to ensure student-to-student discussions, with a variety of checks for understanding and formal closure strategies, such as summaries and exit slips.

The school leader should check that these strategies are effectively implemented while engaging in walkthroughs and classroom observations.

Tenet 5 - Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health: The school community identifies, promotes, and supports social and emotional development by designing systems and experiences that lead to healthy relationships and a safe, respectful environment that is conducive to learning for all constituents.	**Tenet Rating**	**D**

The school has received a rating of ***Developing*** for Tenet 5 – Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health.

- The school leader has begun to implement systems and processes to meet the social and emotional needs of students; however, these are a work in progress and not yet promoting academic and social success for all students. The school leader has implemented weekly meeting time for the school intervention team to discuss referrals made by teachers and follow up on previous referrals, but the impact of this system on meeting the social and emotional needs of students has not been evaluated by the school leader. IIT discussions with students showed that they feel safe in school and all interviewed students stated that, although there is no formal mechanism, they could name the person they would go to with any personal concerns or worries.
- Although the school does not have a specifically designed curriculum to support the teaching of social and emotional developmental health, the school leader launched a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program as a key component of achieving the school's goals for students' social and emotional developmental health. According to staff, PD was provided at the start of the school

year to support the PBIS initiative; reviewers found that the program has had a positive impact on the tone of the school. However, despite the fact that the school leader has also introduced an anti-bullying campaign, students told the IIT that there are occasional incidents of bullying, especially in the cafeteria or in classrooms when teachers turn their back to the class. A small number of students stated that the school's response to bullying is inconsistent and incidents are not always dealt with as swiftly as they could be. Discussions with the school leader and staff showed that further training is needed to better equip staff with the skills needed to meet the wider social and emotional needs of students beyond behavioral issues.

- Discussions with students, staff, and parents revealed that they are not fully aware of the school's stated mission and vision as it relates to the social and emotional health of all students. In addition, reviewers discovered that these members of the school community lacked an understanding of the roles they play in making sure that all students and staff learn and work in a safe and secure learning environment. Reviewers found that staff and students demonstrate a desire to create such an environment, but are unclear about how they can work together to make this a reality.
- The school has had variable success in how it collects and analyzes data to meet both the academic and social-emotional needs of all students. The school leader analyzed data from the 2013-14 Online Occurrence Reporting System (OORS) report, and subsequently added a dean and an additional security officer based on the results. Consequently, reviewers learned that the number of behavioral incidences has decreased significantly, as measured by data from the current OORS report. However, the attendance rate has fallen below 90 percent (89.6 percent in 2013, 87.6 percent in 2014 and under 90 percent to date) and chronic absenteeism (45.2 percent in 2012-13) is a concern. Reviewers learned that the school leader is aware of this concern, but did not find evidence that attendance data is collected and reviewed with an analysis of student cohorts, particularly those who are chronically absent. Reviewers found little evidence that staff uses data from a range of different sources to inform social and emotional health discussions that lead to specific strategies aimed at better meeting the needs of students in the classroom.

Recommendation:

- Continue the anti-bullying campaign by having school leaders visit and speak to all classes about how students treat each other in and out of school. Follow up with a poster campaign that involves all students, with a culminating celebration including families and community.

Tenet 6 - Family and Community Engagement: The school creates a culture of partnership where families, community members, and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being.	**Tenet Rating**	**D**

The school has received a rating of ***Developing*** for Tenet 6 – Family and Community Engagement.

- Discussions with parents and documentary evidence revealed that opportunities are missed for the school leader to convey the school's expectations for academic excellence through newsletters, workshops, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings, and other channels by which the school communicates with parents and families. Parents confirmed that individual teachers often relay

academic expectations to families, but this method relies on the teacher, rather than a school-wide, cohesive plan.

- The school has made some efforts to develop effective channels of communication with parents and families, but success has been variable. Parents and staff reported very low turnouts to all parent workshops, meetings, and events offered by the school. The school leader has not yet evaluated reasons for this lack of participation. For example, a workshop designed and offered by the parent coordinator and IEP team to increase parent understanding of the IEP process was attended by only one parent. Although the school leader provided the IIT with notices of workshops and PTA meetings, there were no agendas or sign-in sheets detailing topics or parent turnout. Students and parents stated that all parents receive the school's Parent-Student Handbook, which contains necessary information about the school; however, they reported information is provided only in English. Parents and members of the school intervention team told reviewers that not all information sent home with students is translated into pertinent languages, unless it comes directly from the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE).
- Discussions with the school leader and staff revealed that no PD has taken place to train staff in how to build and sustain strong partnerships between home and school, nor is any planned. Discussions with parents and the school leader showed no systematic plans in place to provide parents with guidance, support, or tips on how they can support their child's learning in the home. During the parent focus group meeting, parents reported little understanding of the CCLS, but stated they wanted to know more; parents also expressed interest in learning how to support their child's academic development. Reviewers found there is limited family participation in school-wide events that support an understanding and awareness of what students need to be successful; and reviewers discovered no evidence to show the school has a plan to increase parental involvement in their children's learning.
- School efforts to inform parents of their children's progress are developing. In addition to teachers calling parents, monthly progress reports are distributed to students to take home to inform parents of student strengths and weaknesses. However, reviewers learned that progress reports are distributed only in English. The school is in the process of making better use of Skedula's PupilPath, an online tracking tool, to more directly involve parents in their children's progress. However, evidence from the PD calendar showed that school leaders have not used opportunities when all staff members are available to establish strategies for sharing data with parents or explaining what the data means.

Recommendation:

- All information, including monthly progress reports to families, should be translated in the home language of families.