



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

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT EFFECTIVENESS (DTSDE)



BEDS Code	460500010005
School Name	G. Ray Bodley High School
School Address	6 Wiliam Gillard Drive, Fulton, NY 13069
District Name	Fulton City School District
School Leader	Donna Parkhurst
Dates of Review	April 12-13, 2016
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 G. Ray Bodley High School

School Configuration (2015-16 data)					
Grade Configuration	9-12	Total Enrollment	1130	SIG Recipient	Yes
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes (2015-16)					
# Transitional Bilingual	0	# Dual Language	0	# Self-Contained English as a Second Language	3
Types and Number of Special Education Classes (2015-16)					
# Special Classes	13	# SETSS	0	# Integrated Collaborative Teaching	27
Types and Number of Special Classes (2015-16)					
# Visual Arts	10	# Music	0	# Drama	0
# Foreign Language	17	# Dance	0	# CTE	33
School Composition (most recent data)					
% Title I Population		1.1%	% Attendance Rate		86.2%
% Free Lunch		55.7%	% Reduced Lunch		9.1%
% Limited English Proficient		0.9%	% Students with Disabilities		13.6%
Racial/Ethnic Origin (most recent data)					
% American Indian or Alaska Native		0.4%	% Black or African American		2.2%
% Hispanic or Latino		3.6%	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		1.2%
% White		91.7%	% Multi-Racial		0.9%
Personnel (most recent data)					
Years Principal Assigned to School		4	# of Assistant Principals		2
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate		0%	% Teaching Out of Certification		3%
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience		5%	Average Teacher Absences		5.4
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2014-15)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4		N/A	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4		N/A
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (Grade 4)		N/A	Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (Grade 8)		N/A
Student Performance for High Schools (2014-15)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4		94.8%	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4		73.9%
Global History Performance at levels 3 & 4		74.7%	US History Performance at levels 3 & 4		90.5%
4-Year Graduation Rate		70.6%	6 Year Graduation Rate		73.7%
Regents Diploma w/ Advanced Designation		24.6%	% ELA/Math Aspirational Performance Measures		38.1%
Overall NYSED Accountability Status					
In Good Standing			Local Assistance Plan		
Priority School			Focus School		X
<p>SCHOOL PRIORITIES AS WRITTEN BY THE SCHOOL:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase Graduation Rate (LAP) 2. Goal-setting for all students 9-12 (QIP) 3. Utilize RtI Toolbox to increase student achievement (CDEP) 4. Trauma Informed School Response (LAP) 5. 40 Developmental Assets (Search Institute) (LAP) 					

School Identification Status		
The school was identified for not meeting the subgroup performance minimum cut point for the following subgroups in 2014-15:		
Subgroup	School's Performance	Minimum Cut point
Economically disadvantaged students	114	116.5

Purpose of the visit

This school was visited by the State Education Department Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) because of its low performance.

The purpose of this review is to provide the school with feedback regarding the practices across the school and to provide a number of actionable recommendations to direct the school's work in the immediate future.

This report is being provided as a feedback tool to assist the school and to help identify areas for improvement. These areas can address the subgroups identified or they may be broader and cover additional subgroups or the entire school. NYSED recognizes that there are dedicated staff members at the school committed to the success of the students. The report below provides a critical lens to help the school best focus its efforts.

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. The team also included a district representative, a district-selected OEE, a Special Education School Improvement Specialist (SEIS) representative, and a representative from the Regional Bilingual Education Resource Network (RBERN).
- The review team visited a total of 80 classrooms during the two-day review.
- The OEE visited six classrooms with the school leader during the review.
- Reviewers conducted focus groups with students, staff, and parents.
- Reviewers examined documents provided by the school, including curriculum maps, lesson plans, schoolwide data, teacher feedback, and student work.
- In advance of the review, the school provided results of a student survey that 399 students (39 percent) completed.
- In advance of the review, the school provided results of a staff survey that 60 staff (64 percent) completed.
- In advance of the review, the school provided results of a parent survey that 113 parents (15 percent) completed.

The Review Team concluded that the school's current systems and practices most closely align with Stage One on the DTSDE Rubric.

SUCCESSSES WITHIN THE SCHOOL THAT THE SCHOOL SHOULD BUILD UPON:

1. The school leader modified the schedule to allow common planning time for professional learning communities. This time is being used to establish common assessments in all curriculum areas.
2. The school has established routine assessment protocols using the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) system. This information is being used to help students understand their current reading levels, assign students to intervention classes during Academic Intervention Services (AIS), and monitor students' progress.
3. Smaller class sizes have allowed teachers more opportunities to provide individual attention to students, particularly in the alternative and special education programs. The IIT noted that student engagement in some of these classrooms was high.

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.

Recommendation for Tenet 2 – School Leader Practices and Decisions:

Beginning on May 2, 2016, department chairs should ensure that teachers provide interventions for students in need and monitor student progress using available data to ensure that the school meets its specific,

measurable, ambitious, results-oriented, and timely (SMART) goals to improve graduation rates. Assistant principals should ensure that department chairs implement the strategies outlined in the Tenet 3 recommendation. School leaders should:

- coordinate guided study hall to ensure that students who need multiple interventions are accommodated;
- hold department chairs accountable for meeting with students weekly and monitoring the impact of effectiveness of the interventions; and
- ensure that department chairs make adjustments to improve the effectiveness of these interventions.

Rationale that led to the recommendation:

- The school leader has not ensured that identified students receive appropriate interventions and support. The school leader reported that she used the 25-week data generated by the school data toolbox to identify seniors at risk of not graduating and then informed teachers and staff to give these students high priority. The Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) found that there are few systems in place to help adults identify the needs of and provide appropriate supports to all student subgroups, especially economically disadvantaged students. The school leader acknowledged that many identified students had not received appropriate support and that not all counselors had met with these students to check on their progress. The IIT examined the 30-week data drawn from the school toolbox, which showed that these students had made little improvement in academic achievement. Additionally, although school leaders made academic interventions available to students after school, school leaders did not keep track of students' attendance.
- The review team found that the school leader has not deployed assistant principals and department chairs effectively in order to facilitate school improvement. Reviewers learned that assistant principals are responsible for the implementation of the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program. During the review, the IIT noted that teachers were not implementing aspects of the PBIS program with fidelity, and the IIT found little evidence that the assistant principals were actively monitoring this program. Additionally, department chairs do not have a defined role in ensuring that teachers provide intervention and support for students during guided study hall. During class visits, the IIT noted that while some teachers used guided study hall periods to review with students their progress on attending intervention sessions and meeting assignment deadlines, other teachers minimally interacted with students. Some teachers reported that there was inconsistency in the practices teachers used during guided study hall. Teachers also indicated that department chairs and other school leaders had not established clear expectations for guided study hall and did not regularly observe teachers.

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.

Recommendation for Tenet 3 – Curriculum Development and Support:

Beginning on April 18, 2016, the school leader should ensure that department chairs:

- analyze the 30-week data to identify the courses students are at the highest risk of not passing and consequently not graduating;
- ensure that professional learning community (PLC) teams use this information to group students

according to skill needs and deficits and determine groups for intervention during guided study hall. Members of PLCs should ensure that interventions are tailored to address individual student needs/deficits, not content; and

- ensure that PLC teams use existing PLC collaboration protocols to identify goals for these students and supervise the full implementation of the intervention program.

Rationale that led to the recommendation:

- School leaders have not provided teachers with strategies for modifying the curriculum to meet students' diverse learning needs. The IIT found that while teachers clearly know the topics and content students need to master, they do not always express an understanding of students' skill deficits, background weaknesses, and learning styles. The school leader has created a data analysis protocol, but has not ensured that department chairs use it effectively to identify and address students' strengths and needs. Department chairs are conducting a preliminary data analysis, but are not yet using data to target support for identified students. For example, during a grade-level meeting, the IIT observed department chairs using data to identify the courses students needed to pass in order to meet graduation requirements; however, the department chairs did not identify the types of support that will be provided to students.
- The IIT found that not all students receive support that is differentiated according to their needs. For example, the review sessions offered prior to unit assessments are the same for all students, including students at risk of failing the course and students achieving at high levels. The school leader told the IIT that teachers conducted most review sessions using the same resources in the same way as in the classes the students attended.
- Forty-seven percent of the teachers who responded to the 2015 survey agreed that there was little scaffolding of the curriculum to meet diverse student needs. Class visits showed that most teachers relied upon prepared learning packets during instruction. The IIT found that teachers did not adjust the content and learning activities in these packets to meet the needs of students at different levels of achievement. Teachers told the IIT that the range of difference in student attainment in most classes was too wide to be accommodated, especially because the learning packets were the same for all of the students.

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.

Recommendation for Tenet 4 – Teacher Practices and Decisions:

From May 2, 2016, the school leader should deploy one school leader as an instructional coach to work with staff to form instructional groups in order to promote student collaboration. The guidance given to teachers should address the following components and provide support in:

- re-configuring the physical space so that it is conducive to group instruction and collaborative learning;
- using data to organize instructional groups composed of students with similar learning needs;
- implementing agreed-upon protocols for successful student collaboration, including roles and interactions;
- facilitating group discussion about the lesson topics and supporting materials using academic language

in order to achieve the learning objectives; and

- checking for understanding and adjusting instruction to meet students' needs.

Rationale that led to the recommendation:

- The school leader has not established a clear understanding of the components of high quality instruction, and school leaders do not monitor the quality of teachers' instruction regularly to ensure that teachers engage students and are responsive to their needs. Teachers told the IIT they had not received actionable feedback to improve their instruction because school leaders rarely conducted learning walks and classroom observations. Although the lesson-planning template prepared by school leaders contains elements such as curriculum standards and identified resources, the leadership team has not provided guidance to help teachers scaffold the planned learning activities to support the achievement of all students. Students reported in interviews that there was little opportunity for exploration, discovery, and self-determined projects in their classes. During discussions with the review team teachers and staff attributed the school's high absence and tardiness rates to students' lack of motivation rather than the quality of the instruction. However, staff did not indicate any systematic strategies that are in place, to address this concern.
- In most classes visited, teachers used the lecture mode during instruction, and there were few opportunities for students to discuss the lesson content with teachers and peers. Teachers rarely checked for student understanding and adjusted instruction based on their responses. Forty-nine percent of the students who responded to a survey conducted prior to the review indicated that there was little time for them to discuss their learning in groups and to learn effectively from each other, and 44 percent indicated that they did not feel comfortable asking for clarification in class. Forty-two percent of the teachers who responded to a survey said that there was not a cooperative relationship between students and teachers. In several observed classes, students were wearing headphones, using mobile phones to send messages, and napping; teachers did not challenge students to engage with the class. Forty-five percent of parents who responded to a survey said that they did not think that their children were growing into confident learners.
- The IIT learned that the school leader is developing a leveraged leadership approach that enables the school leader to delegate certain responsibilities to the building leadership team. In support of this approach, the school leader has provided professional development training sessions for the leadership team on conducting effective learning walks. The school leader stated that the evidence from the initial learning walks revealed weaknesses in questioning techniques, maintaining student engagement, and establishing and monitoring the accomplishment of lesson objectives.

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.

Recommendation for Tenet 5 – Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health:

For the fourth quarter goal-setting session in guided study hall, the assistant principals should prepare a G.Ray Bodley "Redflick" (school video) presentation about students' responsibility for learning in accordance with PBIS expectations. This presentation should be viewed by and discussed with students during guided study hall so that students understand how to set personal targets and achieve their top priority goal. The assistant principals should ensure that teachers assigned to guided study hall sections deliver these planned sessions

and that subsequent student successes are communicated to parents.

Rationale that led to the recommendation:

- The school leader has not ensured that all staff have a common understanding of how PBIS promotes students' social and emotional developmental health. The school leader reported that many teachers and staff believe that PBIS is an inappropriate tool for high school students and are therefore not applying the principles of respect, responsibility, and safety to build positive relationships with all students. Parents commented on teachers' lack of respect for students, and during the review, the IIT heard some teachers using derogatory terms in reference to individual students. When asked, school leaders said that they were not aware of these references.
- The IIT found little evidence to show that teachers consistently demonstrate a commitment to high academic success for all students, especially economically disadvantaged students. School leaders reported that they prepared target-setting materials to guide students in identifying areas of strength and the means for meeting personal targets. The IIT found that teachers did not fully implement the success plans prepared for economically disadvantaged students who were at risk of failure. In interviews, teachers were unable to demonstrate that they were meeting routinely with students to monitor their progress in fulfilling their success plans and encouraging them to take responsibility for their own learning. Student attendance at the school is low, and, staff, parents; and students interviewed by the IIT indicated that teachers did not reach out to engage students with low attendance when these students were in class.

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.

Recommendation for Tenet 6 – Family and Community Engagement:

At the (grade 8 to 9) Grade Transition Night on May 3, 2016, the school leaders should ensure that all families are provided with personalized information about communication with the school concerning their children. This information should be translated into the home language of the family. This information should include the name of the adult to be contacted with questions and concerns about grades and achievement, participation in extracurricular activities, behavior, attendance, special education and English language learning programs, and student concerns in general. This information should also include information about opportunities for parents to volunteer on behalf of the school, such as through the site-based team.

Rationale that led to the recommendation:

- The school leader has not established effective reciprocal communication with the families of all student subgroups. Many parents interviewed by the IIT said that they did not know how to advocate for their children. Some students reported that their parents did not know how to advocate for their gaining access to the honors program although they had demonstrated the ability to attend these classes. Forty-eight percent of families who responded to the survey reported that they are not engaging in conversations about their children's needs with the school. The IIT found that the school is not utilizing school events effectively to build strong home-school relationships. For example, comments made by parents indicated that the school did not make effective use of grade eight to nine transition events to secure an initial connection with the students joining the school. Parents added that this had an impact on their child's attitudes toward the school. Students confirmed that it took

them some time to build relationships with adults at the school.

- Parents told the reviewers that it is not clear how they should communicate with the school about their children’s social and emotional developmental health needs. For example, parents interviewed by the IIT said that the school did not explain why email communications were forwarded to different staff members when parents raised concerns. This meant that parents did not understand the roles of the individuals involved. Some parents stated that they were not aware of the goal-setting protocols at the school and that they rarely received information about their children’s successes. Teachers reported that they contacted parents most often to convey concerns about negative behavior and poor achievement. The IIT found that school leaders are not fostering a strong relationship between home and school in order to support the students in greatest need. For example, teachers told the IIT that while parents are requested to sign-off on the success plans created for students with social and emotional concerns, they were not asked to contribute to the development of these plans.
- Some parents reported that they were unaware of the site-based team, the decision-making team that includes school leaders and parents. Parents on the site-based team explained that membership is more often by recommendation than by open invitation.

ADDITIONAL AREAS TO ADDRESS

- The school leader does not have a procedure for disaggregating all student performance data by subgroup, which limits the school leader in her ability to identify the particular needs of each subgroup, especially the large economically disadvantaged subgroup. In the future, the school leader should establish protocols to ensure that all staff members understand how to analyze and interpret the data generated through the 5-weekly assessments by student subgroup so they are better able to provide effective support and instruction.
- The school leader has not clearly defined the responsibilities of the school leaders on the building leadership team. The recommendations in this report may further require changes to existing roles. In the future, the school leader will need to define and communicate school leaders' roles and responsibilities and ensure school leaders establish effective support and monitoring protocols that promote and sustain school improvement.