



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

**DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT EFFECTIVENESS (DTSDE)**



<b>BEDS Code</b>	331600010309
<b>School Name</b>	P.S. 309 George E. Wibecan Preparatory Academy
<b>School Address</b>	794 Monroe Street, Brooklyn, NY 11221
<b>District Name</b>	NYCDOE CSD 16
<b>School Leader</b>	Ms. Nicole Perry
<b>Dates of Review</b>	February 9-10, 2016
<b>School Accountability Status</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus School
<b>Type of Review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SED Integrated Intervention Team (IIT)

## School Information Sheet for PS 309 George E. Wibecan Preparatory Academy

School Configuration (2015-16)			
Grade Configuration	PK,OK,01,02,03,04,05	Total Enrollment	189
		SIG Recipient	No
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
# Foreign Language	N/A	# Dance	N/A
		# Drama	N/A
		# CTE	N/A
School Composition (2014-15)			
% Title I Population	87%	% Attendance Rate	93.66%
% Free Lunch	84.3%	% Reduced Lunch	N/A
% Limited English Proficient	9%	% Students with Disabilities	26.1%
Racial/Ethnic Origin (2015-16)			
% American Indian or Alaska Native	1%	% Black or African American	67.4%
% Hispanic or Latino	24.5%	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	6.1%
% White	0.4%	% Multi-Racial	0%
Personnel (2015-16)			
Years Principal Assigned to School	2.9	# of Assistant Principals	1
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate	N/A	% Teaching Out of Certification	N/A
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience	6.9%	Average Teacher Absences	7.4
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2014-15)			
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	12.0	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	18.2
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)	80%	Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (8th Grade)	N/A
Student Performance for High Schools (2014-15)			
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	N/A	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	N/A
Global History Performance at levels 3 & 4	N/A	US History Performance at Levels 3 & 4	N/A
4 Year Graduation Rate	N/A	6 Year Graduation Rate	N/A
Regents Diploma w/ Advanced Designation	N/A	% ELA/Math Aspirational Performance Measures	N/A
Overall NYSED Accountability Status (2015-16)			
Reward	No	Recognition	N/A
In Good Standing	No	Local Assistance Plan	No
Focus District	Yes	Focus School Identified by a Focus District	Yes
Priority School	No		

### Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

#### Elementary/Middle School

Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2014-15)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	NO
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	ALL STUDENTS	NO
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics (2014-15)			
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	YES	ALL STUDENTS	N/A
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A
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	YES	ALL STUDENTS	YES

#### High School

Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A
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	N/A	ALL STUDENTS	N/A
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A
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	N/A	ALL STUDENTS	N/A
Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Graduation (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A

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	N/A	ALL STUDENTS	N/A

**SCHOOL PRIORITIES AS WRITTEN BY THE SCHOOL:**

1. Teachers will make meaningful decisions using the CCLS and student data when planning for instruction in mathematics and ELA to raise the cognitive complexity of student learning and increase the number of students meeting or exceeding standards in math and ELA according to school-wide assessment results.
2. The school community will promote more parent and student voice in decision-making using the SLT, Student Council, and peer mediators in order to increase students' abilities to press towards academic achievement.
3. Teachers and teacher teams will collaboratively analyze and revise assignments and assessments to increase the cognitive complexity and alignment to standards and create opportunities that challenge students to perform at higher levels of learning.
4. Administrators will continue to provide targeted and differentiated professional development to teachers and staff based on teacher observations in order to elevate teacher practice.
5. Teachers will increase the number of contacts designed to inform parents of what their children are learning by using methods such as Class Dojo, our School Website, notices home, our school-wide calendar, email, and telephone calls home; and conduct workshops that allow parents to participate in sample activities that reflect the learning process that their children are engaged in.

**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 Special Education School Improvement Specialist (SEIS) representative, and a representative from the Regional Bilingual Education Resource Network (RBE-RN).
- The review team made 57 classroom visits 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 staff survey that 28 teachers (93 percent) completed.
- The school provided results of a parent survey that 159 parents (79 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	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
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"/>
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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
<b>TENET 2 OVERALL STAGE:</b>				<b>2</b>	

**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	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
3.4	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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>TENET 3 OVERALL STAGE:</b>				<b>2</b>	

**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	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
---	-----------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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"/>
<b>TENET 4 OVERALL STAGE:</b>				<b>2</b>	

**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	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
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 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"/>
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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>TENET 5 OVERALL STAGE:</b>					<b>1</b>

**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	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<b>TENET 6 OVERALL STAGE:</b>				<b>1</b>

<b>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.</b>	<b>Tenet Stage</b>	<b>2</b>
---	--------------------	----------

The school is at **Stage Two** for Tenet 2 – School Leader Practices and Decisions.

- The school leader reported she has a clear vision for the school’s work, but the review team found that she has not effectively articulated that vision in order to bring about increased student achievement and measurable school improvement. During interviews, staff and parents expressed the perspective that the school leader has improved the school’s culture during her four-year tenure at the school. However, teachers, support staff, and parents were not able to articulate a clear vision regarding students’ learning and social-emotional development. Teacher and parent groups also noted that they were not part of a collaborative effort to develop a school vision/mission and/or specific, measurable, ambitious, results-oriented, and timely (SMART) goals. The school leader’s lack of communicating a sense of urgency for school improvement and not uniting all members of the school community to set goals and share a common vision minimizes efforts at promoting student success.
- School leaders reported they have attempted to use limited resources strategically to improve student outcomes through scheduling and enrichment programs. However, the review team did not find evidence that the school leaders developed a comprehensive plan for allocating resources and for monitoring progress or that their initiatives have led to continuous school improvement or increased achievement for all students. Although most classes are small, the review team observed little differentiation of instruction by teachers during class visits. The school leader reported that she instituted daily “grand conversation” sessions, during which time students are expected to discuss social-emotional issues. However, the Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) found that the school leader has not ensured that these sessions are implemented effectively. The school leader also reported she secured funds from outside sources for initiatives and programs such as peer mediation, African dance, a hydroponics installation, an after-school program, and a Saturday Academy. Students’ scores in State assessments in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics declined in 2015. However, the school leader noted to the review team that 51 of 74 students’ scores on school-administered close reading and short response writing rose from September 2015 to January 2016.
- Although school leaders reported they have provided teachers with support and targeted feedback, the review team found that these efforts have not consistently improved teachers’ instructional practices throughout the school. The school leaders use walk-throughs, observations, and Advance reports to identify trends in instructional practices and to inform decisions regarding professional development (PD) sessions. However, the IIT observed during classroom visits that the reported group PD that focused on topics such as higher-order questioning and differentiation has not had sufficient impact on teachers’ practices. The IIT’s review of observation reports showed generally detailed lesson-specific feedback with recommendations but without dates for return visits by the school leaders to monitor implementation of the recommendations. The school leaders noted that they provided teachers with a common planning period during which teachers meet by grade level with a school leader present. However, teachers shared that they need additional opportunities to meet with colleagues who teach other grades to improve instructional coherence.
- The school leader stated that school leaders and staff do not collect and analyze data to inform

strategic decisions to modify implementation of school initiatives. Although some individual teachers use data to group their students and differentiate instruction, these data are not analyzed to identify trends and share best practices. The school has implemented several reading initiatives, but data are not collected to determine the effectiveness of the various programs and whether they work well together. Additionally, school leaders have no system in place to evaluate the school’s impact on the achievement of students who have been in the school three or more years, or a system to collect data on student referrals or parent outreach efforts. The lack of data collection and analysis hinders the ability of the school leader to move the school forward and improve student achievement.

**Recommendation:**

- By February 29, 2016, the school leader should ensure that a spreadsheet report is created that contains assessment data for students who have been in the school for three or more years. These data should be analyzed to determine program effectiveness. Going forward, the school leader should gather and analyze these data a minimum of three times annually, in September, February, and June.

**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 Stage**

**2**

The school is at **Stage Two** for Tenet 3 – Curriculum Development and Support.

- The school leader reported that her vision for a rigorous and coherent curriculum addresses students’ needs and prepares students for future success. She noted she introduced literacy initiatives, such as Reading Plus, myON, guided reading, and Ready assessments. However, the review team found less focus by the school leader on efforts to support the Go Math curriculum. The school leader stated, and a review of teacher plans confirmed, that the school leader has provided little guidance and support in developing unit and lessons plans that are consistently aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). In addition, the review team found little evidence that the school leader regularly monitors and evaluates lesson plans to ensure that plans are CCLS-aligned and include adaptations for English language learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities. The IIT’s review of curriculum maps and lesson plans showed that some plans were modified for subgroups, but other plans were downloaded from commercial sites without any adaptations to address student needs. The review team did not find evidence that the school leader provides guidance for collaborative planning of curricula to meet the needs of ELLs.
- Some teachers’ lesson plans include Reading Plus benchmark data that addresses student needs, higher-order questions, and complex materials; however, these lesson plan strategies are not used consistently throughout the school. During interviews, teachers stated they use baseline and formative data to group students and plan instruction. Approximately one-half of the plans reviewed by the IIT included scaffolding for ELLs, supports for subgroups, vocabulary review, higher-order questions, and other modifications to address diverse student needs. Teachers and the school leader reported that teachers are infusing additional writing support in their lesson plans to supplement the ReadyGEN ELA curriculum. The school leader stated that teachers need to develop outcome-based planning skills so

that goals for each lesson are established with pathways to accomplish those goals.

- Although teachers use content-based reading materials as part of the ReadyGEN curriculum, which may incorporate different subjects, there is no school-wide expectation or plan for teachers to collaborate to create thematic units that connect subjects. The review team found no evidence of thematic units or lesson plans that were collaboratively developed and that explicitly connected different subject areas, and the school does not provide PD on interdisciplinary planning. Any efforts at connecting subjects were through the initiative of individual teachers, such as some informal initiatives between the dance and computer teacher with other classroom teachers. The minimal activities that connect curricula across subject areas limit student engagement and hinder a deeper understanding of subject matter.
- Some teachers reported that they use Reading Plus and CCLS practice test baseline and formative assessments to guide curriculum planning and provide students with targeted feedback to promote students’ ownership of learning. However, this was not the typical practice used by most teachers. The review team found that some student work, which was displayed in classrooms, included teacher and classmates’ feedback followed by the student’s response to the feedback. The school leader stated that teachers do not use data consistently to create goals and action plans for their classes and students. The IIT observed the grade five horizontal team analyzing the district’s mathematics benchmark examinations and conducting an item analysis in order to adjust lesson planning to address students' problem areas. The review team also observed some students completing computer-based Reading Plus assessments that they may use to monitor their progress. However, teachers do not consistently plan lessons with modifications for subgroups that lead to increased achievement as measured by State assessments.

**Recommendation:**

- At the February 29, 2016 extended session, teachers should receive training in creating outcome-based lesson plans and pathways to reach identified student outcomes by the end of the lesson. By March 15, 2016, teachers should implement outcome-based planning. School leaders should monitor and record implementation to evaluate impact on learning, make modifications, and provide feedback and support as needed.
- During the spring semester, the school leader should ensure that teachers receive training in creating goals and action plans for classes and individual students utilizing assessment data. During the first three weeks of September 2016, teachers should develop class goals and collaboratively develop individual student goals accompanied by action plans. Progress monitoring via individual conferences should take place a minimum of mid-year and the end of the school year.

<p><b>Tenet 4 - Teacher Practices and Decisions:</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Tenet Stage</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>
--	---------------------------	-----------------

The school is at **Stage Two** for Tenet 4 – Teacher Practices and Decisions.

- The school leaders stated that they promote teacher practices that use data and reflect students’ needs. However, this has not led to high levels of student engagement and achievement across all

grades. The school leader noted she scheduled common planning periods during which teachers review student work and modify instruction. For example, the IIT observed the grade five team discuss results of the January literacy assessment to plan instructional strategies to address students' areas of weakness. However, minimal time was designated for collaboration between the English as a second language (ESL) teacher and content area teachers. Teachers stated and the school leader acknowledged that there has been insufficient support at staff-wide PD sessions to help teachers implement strategies such as modifications for subgroups and the use of higher-order questions. The school leader has not often provided for inter-visitations across grades for demonstration lessons and for follow-up debriefing sessions to ensure that best instructional practices are identified and implemented throughout the school.

- About one-third of the teachers observed by the IIT during classroom visitations used best practices such as posing higher-order questions, using complex texts, and providing multiple opportunities for students to learn. The review team observed use of best practices aligned to CCLS expectations most often in grades three to five. Although the ReadyGEN curriculum incorporates complex text, during classroom visits the review team found few attempts by teachers to scaffold instruction for student subgroups with the exception of the Integrated Collaborative Teaching (ICT) classes. In these classes, the review team observed effective use of parallel and station teaching. All students studied the same content; however, different strategies were used to teach students with disabilities. The review team found the typical learning experience for students with disabilities was better aligned to their needs than the experience for many general education students.
- Students reported feeling safe in classrooms, and the IIT observed that students were generally well behaved although instruction was sometimes interrupted by students assigned to crisis paraprofessionals. The typical student experience did not include intellectual discovery and rigorous thinking on a regular basis. The review team's classroom visits showed that there were typically few opportunities for students to engage in inquiry-based discovery and rigorous thinking leading to rich discussions. During interviews, teachers indicated that they implement few instructional practices to modify instruction for subgroups in non-ICT classes. In more than one-half of the classrooms observed by the IIT, teachers did not faithfully implement the 20-minute period designated for student-centered "grand conversations." These discussions in many cases were teacher-centered or did not take place at all.
- During the review team's 57 classroom visits, about one-half of the teachers used baseline data and assessments to inform instructional practices and close to one-third promoted students' self-evaluation through feedback and conferencing. The IIT observed purposeful grouping in many upper-grade classrooms. However, teachers often used high achievers as supports for their classmates rather than have them participate in enriched or accelerated activities. The review team viewed some feedback of student assignments that included student responses to teacher and classmate feedback on their work. Approximately one-third of students interviewed by the review team stated that they participated in one-on-one conferences that provided feedback and identified their deficiencies. However, the review team saw minimal evidence of goal setting for individual students at these conferences or at other times. Teachers of ELLs shared that they had not seen New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) data, were not aware of their students' English proficiency levels, and did not adapt instruction to address their needs.

**Recommendation:**

- By March 7, 2016, the school leaders should ensure that all teachers include:
  - a minimum of one highly engaging student activity in every lesson such as think-pair-share, rich discussion, and opportunities for students to build on other students’ responses through the use of accountable talk stems; and
  - a minimum of three higher-order questions in every lesson based on the Depth of Knowledge model.

School leaders should monitor and record implementation to evaluate impact on learning, make modifications, and provide feedback and support as needed.

**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 Stage**

**1**

The school is at **Stage One** for Tenet 5 – Social and Emotional Developmental Health.

- The school leader reported she has a vision for students’ social-emotional growth; however, the review team found the vision has not been clearly articulated to the school community. Staff, student, and parent statements showed that they do not have a shared understanding of desired social-emotional outcomes in areas such as coping skills, resilience, and self-efficacy. School leaders have introduced programs such as peer mediation. However, school leaders have not implemented systems to monitor, evaluate, and modify social and emotional developmental health services to meet the needs of all students. Members of the student support team expressed varying viewpoints about how peer mediation services are provided, as the school leader has not developed clearly defined protocols for how students receive mediation services. Mediation is only provided informally at the time of the conflict. The review team observed, and the school leader acknowledged, that the daily “grand conversation” sessions during which students are to discuss social and emotional issues was not monitored effectively and did not fulfill its stated purpose.
- Although the school leader introduced the “4 Rs” and peer mediation programs, the school has not developed and implemented a comprehensive curriculum that addresses the social-emotional developmental health needs of all students. The school collaborated with the Morningside Center for Teaching Social Responsibility to introduce the peer mediation program and the “4 Rs” program -- Reading, Writing, Respect, and Resolution. Although students read and write about aspects of respect and resolution every Monday morning, teachers and students reported that these periods occur in isolation, without carryover to the remainder of the school day. While students recite the “Promise Pledge” every morning that centers on students taking responsibility for their actions, students interviewed by the review team did not connect the pledge with the bullying they noted occurs at the school. Students reported that bullying occurs frequently during lunch periods despite peer mediators’ presence in the cafeteria.
- The work of school stakeholders has not been coordinated so that members of the school community are aware of how each other’s efforts connect to serve students’ social-emotional needs. Although the student support team meets monthly, statements by students and staff members showed that there is

little coordination between the school’s efforts within the school with those of external agencies. The IIT found from a document review and staff interviews that the school leader has provided minimal PD that focuses on the identification of students’ needs and the development of students’ social-emotional skills. Some staff members noted that four staff members were recently trained in therapeutic crisis intervention in schools but that the training has not been shared with the rest of the school community. They also noted that there is little collaboration with families to support students’ needs.

- Student support staff and the school leader reported the school has not developed a strategic plan to use data to systematically address students’ social-emotional needs and has not implemented a formal referral process for students to receive services. Staff do not collect data to determine whether services are having the desired effect. Although staff cited the school’s transient population as having especially challenging needs, they did not provide data regarding the numbers of transient students, the services they receive, and the effectiveness of those services. The review found that the peer mediation program does not generate data that identifies the students involved in conflicts, the frequency of incidents, and the recidivism rates for these students. The lack of a coordinated effort to collect and analyze data hinders efforts to identify and address students’ social and emotional needs.

**Recommendation:**

- By March 1, 2016, the daily “grand conversation” session should be devoted to a topic regarding students’ social-emotional growth. Teachers should have flexibility in implementing the “grand conversation” during any 20-minute block during the school day. One of the first sessions should be devoted to deconstructing the “Promise Pledge” and having students discuss what the pledge looks like in action in their lives. Further, the Monday morning four “Rs” lesson may be extended into the “grand conversation.”
- By March 1, 2016, staff should develop a compendium of developmentally appropriate discussion prompts that may be used as springboards for the “grand conversation.”

School leaders should monitor and record implementation to evaluate quality of the discussions, make modifications to the implementation plan, and provide feedback and support as needed.

<b>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.</b>	<b>Tenet Stage</b>	<b>1</b>
--	--------------------	----------

The school is at **Stage One** for Tenet 6 – Family and Community Engagement.

- The school leader has not developed and implemented a plan for family engagement. The school leader reported she has established generally positive relationships with the school community; however, the review team found little evidence that this has translated into shared high expectations for students’ academic achievement or increased levels of parent involvement. Parents stated the few academic workshops that have been offered were scheduled during the school day, making it difficult for working parents to attend. The school leader stated that the role of the recently hired parent coordinator has not been clearly defined, which minimizes efforts at increasing parent engagement.

During the school review, the IIT observed parent tours taking place as part of the school's effort to attract new students. However, enrollment efforts have been unsuccessful as student enrollment continues to decline. Although all staff members acknowledged that parent engagement has been a longstanding issue, they shared that the school leader has not made a strategic effort to address parents' lack of involvement, which hinders efforts at promoting student success.

- The school does not provide many opportunities for reciprocal communication to increase families' understanding of their children's needs and how to support their academic success. The school leader and staff reported that they do not monitor efforts during the Tuesday afternoon parent outreach session to evaluate their success, and they do not tabulate teacher and parent coordinator phone logs to allow analysis and to determine modifications that need to be made to increase communication. Some teachers use the ClassDojo instant messenger application to update parents about an incident or assignment; however, students and parents reported that communication is infrequent. Parents stated that important documents are translated into Spanish. However, they also stated that the school does not provide translation services at school events.
- Staff and parents stated that the school has not provided training to parents and staff to ensure strong home-school partnerships that support student achievement. The IIT's review of PD documents and statements by the school leader also showed that the school has not provided training specifically devoted to creating and sustaining home-school partnerships. The minimal number of parent workshops offered by the school have been poorly attended. For example, six parents attended the Reading Plus workshop that was intended to train parents in supporting their children's growth in language development. The newly assigned parent coordinator and school leader stated, and a review of documents confirmed, that the school has not offered monthly parent workshops to address parent needs, and existing resources of the health clinic and parent coordinator have not been effectively utilized.
- The school does not share data with families in a way to further their understanding of student needs. Parents and students expressed confusion about how many report cards and progress reports are distributed annually. Staff reported that the school does not monitor which families receive reports or make multiple attempts to share report data with parents. Staff have not sufficiently disseminated log-on and account information regarding the parents' "mystudent.nyc" account so that parents can access student data, and parents in their focus group were not aware of the existence of the portal. Other student data have not been disseminated nor has the school provided parents with workshops on understanding and analyzing data. The absence of a strategic plan to help parents understand student data limits their ability to support student learning and advocate for support services for their children.

**Recommendations:**

- By February 29, 2016 and weekly thereafter, the parent coordinator should tabulate parent outreach efforts by all staff and create a spreadsheet report that indicates the outcome of these efforts. The school leader should analyze these data to inform decisions regarding improving parent outreach.
- By June 1, 2016, the parent coordinator should manage the creation of a videotape of school life that can be used as a marketing tool for attracting new students. The videotape should be posted on the school website.