



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

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



<b>BEDS Code</b>	261600010007
<b>School Name</b>	Virgil L. Grissom School 7
<b>School Address</b>	31 Bryan Street, Rochester, NY 14613
<b>District Name</b>	Rochester City School District
<b>School Leader</b>	David Lincoln
<b>Dates of Review</b>	January 26-28, 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 Virgil L. Grissom School 7

School Configuration (2015-16 data)					
Grade Configuration	K-6	Total Enrollment	607	SIG Recipient	No
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes (2015-16)					
# Transitional Bilingual	0	# Dual Language	0	# Self-Contained English as a Second Language	0
Types and Number of Special Education Classes (2015-16)					
# Special Classes	5	# SETSS	0	# Integrated Collaborative Teaching	4
Types and Number of Special Classes (2015-16)					
# Visual Arts	0	# Music	3	# Drama	0
# Foreign Language	0	# Dance	0	# CTE	2
School Composition (most recent data)					
% Title I Population			92%	% Attendance Rate	93%
% Free Lunch			86%	% Reduced Lunch	2%
% Limited English Proficient			9%	% Students with Disabilities	19%
Racial/Ethnic Origin (most recent data)					
% American Indian or Alaska Native			0%	% Black or African American	60%
% Hispanic or Latino			22%	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	6%
% White			13%	% Multi-Racial	<1%
Personnel (most recent data)					
Years Principal Assigned to School			6	# of Assistant Principals	2
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate			0%	% Teaching Out of Certification	0%
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience			0%	Average Teacher Absences (Principal SPA Data)	9%
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2014-15)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4			5%	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	11%
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)			71%	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 (2014-15) List from Judy Schuster					
Reward				Recognition	
In Good Standing				Local Assistance Plan	
Focus District				Focus School Identified by a Focus District	x
Priority School					

### Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2013-14 No)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	Black or African American	x
Hispanic or Latino	x	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	---
White	x	Multi-Racial	---
Students with Disabilities	x	Limited English Proficient	---
Economically Disadvantaged	x	ALL STUDENTS	x
DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics (2013-14 No)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	Black or African American	x
Hispanic or Latino	x	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	---
White	---	Multi-Racial	---
Students with Disabilities	x	Limited English Proficient	---
Economically Disadvantaged	x	ALL STUDENTS	x
DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science (2013-14 No)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	Black or African American	x
Hispanic or Latino	---	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	---
White	---	Multi-Racial	---
Students with Disabilities	---	Limited English Proficient	---
Economically Disadvantaged	---	ALL STUDENTS	x

#### SCHOOL PRIORITIES AS WRITTEN BY THE SCHOOL:

**Instructional Priority #1:** All students will show measurable growth in genre and evidence based writing using grade level rubrics. All staff will implement common instructional techniques (Four Square graphic organizer, conferencing, common rubrics/checklists) during common core instruction and through writer's workshop.

**Instructional Priority #2:** All students will show measurable growth in their individual area of need with targeted differentiated instruction. All staff will use performance data to determine individual programming and instruction through 5 week data cycle analysis. Students will track their own goals as a class and as individuals. Teachers will track student progress through differentiated technology (i-Ready, AIMS webCompass and Lexia).

**Instructional Priority #3:** All staff will have time for focused professional development and collaboration with colleagues through academic meetings, planning days, staff led professional learning and peer observations/feedback.

**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 and a Special Education School Improvement Specialist (SEIS) representative.
- The review team visited a total of 45 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, schoolwide data, teacher feedback, and student work.
- One of the schools’ two assistant principals (AP) is a temporary replacement.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3	Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.5	Leaders effectively use evidence-based systems and structures to examine and improve critical individual and school-wide practices as defined in the SCEP (student achievement, curriculum and teacher practices; leadership development; community/family engagement; and student social and emotional developmental health).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>TENET 2 OVERALL STAGE :</b>					<b>1</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.4	The school leader and teachers have developed a comprehensive plan for teachers to partner within and across all grades and subjects to create interdisciplinary curricula targeting the arts, technology, and other enrichment opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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>1</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.4	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>1</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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>
<b>Tenet 6 - Family and Community Engagement:</b> 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>	<b>Statement of Practice</b>	<b>Stage 4</b>	<b>Stage 3</b>	<b>Stage 2</b>	<b>Stage 1</b>
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 student success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.5	The school shares data in a way that promotes dialogue among parents, students, and school community members centered on student learning and success and encourages and empowers families to understand and use data to advocate for appropriate support services for their children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>TENET 6 OVERALL STAGE :</b>					<b>1</b>

<b>Tenet 2 - School Leader Practices and Decisions:</b> 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>Tenet Stage</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>The school is at <b>Stage One</b> for Tenet 2 – School Leader Practices and Decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school leader reported that the school vision was rooted in the long-established school motto “Safety, On-task, Achievement, and Respect (SOAR).” Although school leaders and teachers said that SOAR was driving school improvement, they were unable to specify the results. The School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP) includes some Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented, and Timely (SMART) goals; however, teachers, parents, and students interviewed by the Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) said that they were not involved in the goal setting and were unable to state any of the school improvement goals. During discussions with the review team, the school leader indicated that he did not frequently monitor the school’s progress toward achieving the SCEP goals.</li> <li>• The school leader is beginning to use resources to respond emerging needs, but does not have an explicit and formal plan for connecting resources to SCEP goals and the school vision. The school leader reported that he appointed a lunchtime aide when an analysis of data showed a high incidence of behavioral referrals during lunchtime and re-configured space to provide additional self-contained classrooms when the school enrollment increased. However, the review team found no evidence, in discussions or document reviews, to indicate that the school leader has clear plans to address SCEP goals, and, as a result, there is no plan to strategically deploy resources to address identified improvement goals.</li> <li>• The school leader stated that he had not abided by the walk-through schedule and teachers told the IIT that the school leader had not observed them frequently and provided detailed developmental feedback to help them improve their instruction. The IIT’s review of feedback forms confirmed that feedback provided by the school leader was not instructive and actionable. During discussion with the IIT, teachers shared that they informally have conversations at lunch or in the hallways, but do not consistently meet in formal settings. The school leader and teachers reported that professional development is offered during Tuesday meetings; however, attendance at these sessions and at grade level meetings is voluntary under the provisions of the teachers’ contract. Classroom visits by IIT demonstrated that most teachers’ did not provide challenging activities or differentiated instruction to address all students’ learning styles and abilities. School leader and teacher interviews indicated that the school leader did not routinely check what teachers used to support the curriculum or evaluate the quality of supplementary instructional materials.</li> <li>• The review team found that although school leaders review student attendance and behavior data, the IIT did not find evidence of coherent or systematic protocols that school leaders use to monitor school-wide practices. As a result, school leaders did not always have enough information to evaluate overall school effectiveness. For example, teachers and the school leader reported that there is no formal monitoring of staff’s implementation of the school-wide SOAR program. In addition, the support team reported that there is no monitoring of the impact of the recommended</li> </ul>		

strategies to address the needs of identified at-risk students.

**Recommendation:** By February 12, 2016, the school administrative team should develop a tool that will enable them to audit any materials, apart from the State CCLS units (Core Knowledge, Expeditionary Learning modules and EngageNY math modules) currently being used by teachers to plan instruction.

**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**

**1**

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

- The school leader stated that he expects teachers to adapt and modify curriculum documents such as Core Knowledge, Expeditionary Learning modules and EngageNY math modules to meet the needs of all students. Teachers said that school leaders did not review their lesson plans regularly in order to provide direction, guidance, and support. In observed classes, teachers used materials such as “A-Z” worksheets and resources from a variety of websites to supplement the curriculum. However, these materials were not always of high complexity and aligned with Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). Most teachers’ planned lessons that had all students working on the same content and using the same materials. In addition, few teachers’ plans included provisions for a range of abilities. The IIT did not find evidence that the curriculum contained accommodations for the needs of students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs).
- Through interviews with the school leader and a review of lesson plans, the IIT found that teachers do not use student performance data routinely to plan their lessons. Most lesson plans examined by the IIT did not include scripted higher-order questions, multiple activities that aligned with CCLS, or complex materials. Most lesson plans consisted of lists of topical content and brief annotations about materials, activities, and assessments. Few lesson plans reviewed by the IIT included clearly planned student groupings. Although differentiation of instruction is a SCEP goal, most lesson plans did not include specific instructional strategies to meet diverse learning needs.
- The school leader stated that there is no plan for interdisciplinary learning and the school leader and teachers stated that there are no structured and formal opportunities for teachers to collaborate to develop interdisciplinary lessons and units. As a result, most observed lessons did not include interdisciplinary content to deepen and extend student learning, and increase engagement.
- Teachers discuss aimsweb and North–West Education Association (NWEA) assessment data, but lack the training and supervision to use it effectively to plan a curriculum that accommodates the learning needs of all students. The IIT observed a preliminary discussion of NWEA data at a grade level meeting. While teachers understood the meaning of the data, the meeting was not structured or focused enough to result in clear instructional strategies arising from the data analysis. As a result, teachers’ lesson plans and instruction do not consistently include clear data-driven strategies for different learning needs. The IIT found that teachers inconsistently provide students with rubrics to guide their work and timely feedback intended to help them develop ownership of their learning

and raise their achievement. Data walls and charts in hallways and classrooms provide students some information about their performance. For example, posters showed students their progress through the year on the NWEA tests. However, teachers do not usually provide students with enough specific next steps guidance to help them understand how to improve. Student work examined by the IIT did not typically include detailed feedback. Teacher feedback typically consisted of a percentage or score and a “smiley-face” sticker to acknowledge progress.

**Recommendation:** School leaders should immediately implement the school improvement goal relating to differentiation as identified in the school professional development plan with a clear focus on establishing a shared understanding of effective differentiation practices to support good Tier 1 teaching. School leaders should schedule professional learning to start during the week beginning February 22, 2016.

**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.

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

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

- The IIT found that the school leader has not effectively communicated his vision of high-quality instruction. In interviews, teachers gave different definitions of the school’s expectations for high-quality instruction and said that they needed more training to use data effectively. In addition, teachers reported that the school leader does not review teachers’ lesson plans or conduct frequent walk through to monitor teachers’ instructional practices. In classes visited, the IIT found that teachers did not use a range of instructional strategies to address a variety of student needs and learning styles. For example, in classrooms where students were working in structured groups, they were typically all working on the same content at the same level, using the same materials.
- In observed classes, teachers did not typically use higher-order questions to extend student learning, use complex texts, or provide multiple opportunities for learning. Most teachers posed factual, recall questions and sometimes furnished the answers themselves without allowing sufficient wait-time. The IIT noted a few examples of students were working on tasks designed to meet a range of individual needs through different learning modalities in some grade Kindergarten classes. However, this was not typical. In most observed classes, students worked on the same tasks in the same manner, and teachers provided few challenging activities that promoted higher levels of engagement and motivation. While most students completed tasks and complied with teacher directions and requests, few actively participated in group discussions and almost none asked their own questions, or volunteered information.
- In most classrooms visited by the IIT, teachers and students interactions were positive and respectful; however, most teachers did not implement instruction that meet the diverse needs of all learners. Most student interviewed by the IIT said they felt comfortable asking their teachers for help and taking risks to answer questions even when they were uncertain of the correct answer. However, the review team saw little evidence of students actively participating in their lessons. In addition, most teachers did not use strategies to promote increased engagement, rigorous thinking, or intellectual discovery by students. The IIT saw few examples of teachers using strategies to

accommodate the learning needs of ELLs and students with disabilities such as scaffolding learning, or providing specific support. Some student said that they felt physically safe, while others expressed concern about the poor behavior of a small number of students, but said they were not afraid of them. Although the school has an established school-wide behavioral program, the review team found that most teachers did implement strategies from this program address positive or negative student behaviors.

- Teachers stated they used data from the aimsweb and NWEA tests to compose groups of students with similar needs; however, the IIT found that teachers did not differentiate the learning activities for these groups. The IIT observed the school leader helping teachers to analyze student performance data at a grade level team meeting; however, he did not ensure that these discussions resulted in modified instructional strategies for teachers to use in lessons. Students and teachers told the review team that student and teacher conferences were usually focused on a review of report cards and occurred only two or three times each year. As a result, students have limited opportunities to receive feedback or to discuss and evaluate their learning and progress.

**Recommendation:** Starting February 1, 2016, school leaders should implement the existing walk-through schedule with fidelity and make sure that teachers receive specific, detailed and actionable feedback that will support teachers to improve their instructional practice.

<p><b>Tenet 5 - Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health:</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Tenet Stage</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>
--	---------------------------	-----------------

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

- The school leader stated that the school-wide vision to establish a culture supportive of students’ social and emotional developmental health needs was based primarily on the SOAR motto and the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) program. School support staff and the school leader stated that they identified individual students making unsatisfactory progress because of behavioral, attendance and learning problems based on analysis review of achievement, disciplinary, and attendance data and made plans to address their needs. However, the IIT found that the school lacks a systematic process for developing more comprehensive social-emotional developmental health programs and services to respond to and address the needs of all students.
- Based on class visits and staff interviews, the IIT found that although the school has a PBIS program, few staff use the program to reinforce or reward expected behaviors. The review team found that, apart from PBIS, the school does not have other comprehensive programs, curricula, and materials to meet a wider range of student’s social-emotional needs. The school leader and teachers stated that the professional development program did not provide training to help staff identify and address students’ social-emotional needs. The IIT found little evidence of teachers responding effectively to students’ social-emotional needs in observed classes. For example, teachers used reactive rather than preventative approaches. The IIT observed groups of students misbehaving within some classrooms and in the hallways with no response or intervention from adults, indicating a lack of close supervision in these areas.

- The school leader stated that there was no organizational plan to help student support staff communicate effectively and efficiently with each other and coordinate their work to avoid duplication and confusion. During discussion with the IIT student support staff members reported that they worked informally with each other, but did not describe formal structures for communication and collaboration. While the school has a whole-school behavior program, the IIT observed that teachers did not always use the PBIS program consistently. For example, teachers did not use incentives such as SOAR tickets effectively to recognize and reinforce good behavior and effort of students, especially students with disabilities.
- The school leader reported that the school did not have a strategic plan for the collection and analysis of data on students' social- emotional developmental health needs. The school leader and support staff described reactive procedures such as behavior referrals and Notice of Concern forms designed to document concerns about students' behavior and achievement. The school leader was unable to describe proactive approaches to support the personal development of all students. While the school SOAR system of rewards is well established, school leaders and the support team stated there is no system to enable school staff to monitor and evaluate the consistent use and effectiveness of SOAR strategies.

**Recommendation:** Beginning on February 1, 2016, the PBIS team should review and re-design the existing SOAR ticket system, so they are able to monitor and analyze the use and impact of PBIS rewards across the school.

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

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

- The school leader reported that he communicates high expectations through newsletters, information nights, Robo-Calls, and the school website; however, parents interviewed by IIT stated that they did not feel well-informed about the leaders' expectations for academic achievement and personal development. In addition, parents reported that they did not fully understand the school's vision and were unfamiliar with the goals in the SCEP. The IIT found that the school leader's communications and relationships did not ensure that the whole-school community was aware of his expectations for student success and the support the school provides to families in order to help students reach these expectations.
- The review team found that the school does not provide a variety of opportunities for two-way communication between school and home. As a result, staff and families are not always able to work together to enhance student success. For example, some parents told the IIT that their children often brought work home without guidance about how to complete it, which meant that they did not understand how to support their children's' learning. In addition, many parents were unaware that student folders with examples of work and homework tasks were intended to go home every day.

Some parents stated that they did not know how the school's SOAR reward system worked and were unaware that teachers are supposed to use the live ClassDojo system to reward students and to keep share information with parents. The IIT examined informational documents for parents that described the curriculum in reading and mathematics and found that the materials were out of date and did not reflect CCLS expectations and learning shifts. Parents told the IIT that the school leader was sometimes unapproachable or inaccessible. The IIT found that the school did not routinely translate communications into all home languages.

- The school leader and the support staff team told the IIT that there was no plan or program to train staff and parents to develop home-school partnerships. Parents stated the school did not offer any support sessions to help them become partners in their children's learning and development, and teachers and staff said that building home-school partnership was not an aspect of the professional development program.
- The school does not collect and use data to identify and address the common needs of families in order to provide a focus for student support services. The school shares achievement, behavior, and attendance data when teachers or parents raise concerns about individual students. However, there is no system to ensure that teachers keep all parents current about the performance and needs of their children. The IIT found through document reviews and parent interviews that while parents receive report cards four times annually, they rarely receive any other information about student progress. Parents also reported that the school did not provide information on the social and emotional developmental needs of their children.

**Recommendation:** By February 12, 2016, school leaders and teachers should, reinforce and share, for example through newsletters translated into home languages and Robo-Call, the school-wide expectation that students take home folders regularly (daily or weekly). Starting on February 22, 2016, folders should be sent home and should contain information about student academic and social emotional progress.