

**NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Accountability**

Differentiated Accountability - School Quality Review (SQR)

SCHOOL QUALITY REVIEW REPORT

DBN:	02M580
District Name:	District 2
School Name:	Richard R. Green High School of Teaching
School Address:	7 Beaver Street, New York, New York 10004
Principal:	David Raubvogel
Accountability Phase/Category:	Improvement (year 1) Comprehensive
Area of Identification:	English Language Arts - All Students; Hispanic Students; Economically Disadvantaged Students
Dates of On-site Review:	March 20-21, 2012

PART 1: MISSION STATEMENT

“The mission of the Richard R. Green High School of Teaching is to ensure the future of the teaching profession by educating all its students in an inclusive environment that sets high standards by placing an emphasis on excellence. To ensure our success, teachers, support personnel, parents, students, collaborative institutions and community stakeholders will work together to create an educational environment that centers on the individual students’ cognitive and social development and engages all students creatively and actively in the process of learning. To that end, the school will provide in-school and external experiences that stimulate thinking and encourage students to be informed and responsible citizens.”

PART 2: SCHOOL STRENGTHS:

- The school transitioned into a historic building at the beginning of the 2011-12 school year where school personnel ensure a safe, disciplined, and pleasant learning environment.
- Based on interviews with parents and students, the review team found there is a sense of community within the school.
- Parents appreciate the frequent communication about their children’s progress and the prompt responsiveness of school leaders and staff to requests for information about relevant school matters.

PART 3: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND UTILIZATION OF DATA

FINDINGS:

- The school's staff collects data, including Regents results, credit accumulation, graduation rate and subgroup data, from multiple sources. However, there is limited evidence based on interviews and document reviews conducted by the review team that collected data is being analyzed by teachers to identify the gaps in student performance and to make the needed changes in instructional programs to address the individual needs of students.
- Based on document reviews and interviews with staff, the review team found limited evidence that teachers consistently use formative, interim, or summative data to plan instruction, monitor student outcomes and track individual student progress. In addition, there is limited evidence that English language arts (ELA) item analysis is conducted and used by teachers to identify students' strengths and weaknesses or the specific needs of individual and groups of students in order to make changes and improvements in the instructional program.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- School leaders should provide staff with professional development (PD) on how to disaggregate data and identify trends to inform instruction. Plans should be developed to address these needs at the school, grade, and class levels to ensure that the identified areas are a focus for teaching and learning. The school leaders should monitor this analysis to ensure that improvements are made.
- The school should administer formative, interim, and summative assessments at all grade levels throughout the school year. The school should create a system for data disaggregation and analysis to focus more closely on the specific needs of students, classes, and subgroups in addition to whole school and grade monitoring. A plan should be created and monitored to ensure that all teachers incorporate item skills analysis to inform their instruction in all testing grades. Particular attention should be given to monitoring the development of student skills as students move from grade to grade to check for vertical alignment in curriculum programs in each content area.

II. TEACHING AND LEARNING

FINDINGS:

- Classroom observations conducted by the review team indicated that much of the instruction is teacher-directed whole group instruction, with little variety in the use of instructional strategies. Observations by the review team also indicate that students have few opportunities to discuss concepts learned with peers or to work in pairs or with different groups of students.
- Based on classroom observations, the review team found that some classes use shared reading activities to develop student literacy skills. In other classrooms, however, teachers were observed by the review team using the read-aloud strategy as the primary mode of reading instruction. There

was little evidence of the use of independent reading activities to further develop student literacy skills.

- Classroom observations conducted by the review team indicated that some student work was displayed within classrooms. There was limited evidence, however, that posted student work included specific and concise feedback or clearly indicated what students needed to do to improve their work and reach the next level.
- Classroom observations conducted by the review team revealed limited evidence that tasks were differentiated to the varying ability levels of the students or that data was used to group students according to learning needs.
- Based on classroom observations, the review team saw limited evidence of the consistent use of higher-order questioning techniques in instructional practices. Questioning skills varied among teachers, with a majority of questions requiring factual recall and one-word answers.
- In some classrooms observed, the review team determined that instructional activities were not challenging and did not engage the interest of students. Additionally, in some classes there were limited opportunities for students to interact or work collaboratively. Consequently, students were not consistently active participants in the learning process throughout all classrooms.
- Document reviews conducted by the review team indicated that the school developed unit plans in ELA through grade 10. There was limited evidence, however, that the school had curriculum maps that were moving towards alignment with the new P-12 Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). In addition, some plans did not include explicit teaching points, strategies, or daily lessons to guide teachers in delivering instruction.
- Based on classroom observations, the review team found that teachers' use of academic language during instructional delivery was limited.
- In some classes observed, the review team found that student writing took the form of short responses to questions on worksheets. Most writing prompts did not require students to elaborate beyond the recall of basic facts found in texts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- School leaders should provide PD to introduce teachers to a wider range of student-centered instructional strategies that can be used in the classroom to ensure greater student participation in the learning process. Teachers should be expected to implement these strategies, and school leaders should monitor the effectiveness of the implementation and provide targeted feedback and additional PD for teachers when necessary.
- School leaders should provide PD to teachers on how to effectively teach reading strategies to students. This PD should focus on helping teachers to develop reading instruction strategies that include explicit standards-aligned teaching points. Additionally, teachers should consistently provide opportunities for independent reading practice where students are reading text appropriate for their reading level.

- School leaders should ensure that teachers provide feedback to a student that includes the next steps for improvement. School leaders should also ensure that rubrics are used as an integral tool in planning and assessing assignments. Teachers should participate in PD activities that model the use of rubrics to provide teacher feedback, peer feedback, and student self-assessment. School leaders should monitor student work in books and displays to evaluate the quality of the feedback provided to ensure that it helps students improve and move to the next level.
- The school leaders should provide PD opportunities for teachers to identify strategies to differentiate instruction. The focus of the PD should be on using data to drive lesson planning and instruction, as well as ensuring that tasks match the academic needs of identified subgroups. School leaders should regularly monitor teachers' planning and instructional practice to check that differentiated activities are in place throughout the school. Ongoing PD should be provided for teachers who continue to need support with using data to match work to the individual students.
- School leaders should provide PD in developing a variety of questioning techniques aimed at fostering critical thinking and using problem solving skills appropriate to student development. Teachers should ensure that strategies in which training is provided are implemented in their daily instruction. School leaders should make questioning techniques a focus for observation and teacher feedback.
- School leaders should use the professional learning communities' (PLCs) time to ensure that teachers collaborate to provide students with work that is appropriately challenging and promotes higher order thinking skills. Teachers should provide regular opportunities for students to work cooperatively and to discuss issues with peers so that they become more proactive learners. The school leaders should carry out regular observations of lessons to monitor that this is consistently occurring.
- The school should develop curriculum maps that are aligned with the CCLS that include explicit teaching points and strategies for engaging all students in learning. These curriculum maps should provide support for teachers in delivering daily instruction and be vertically aligned across grades to ensure consistency of content delivery within grades in the ELA department.
- Teachers should provide greater opportunities for student interaction and monitor student use of academic language during peer-to-peer conversations.
- The school should develop standards-based curriculum maps for writing instruction. Students should begin with collecting, thinking and drafting, and then conclude with publication of written work. Students' written responses to literature should incorporate critical thinking analysis and application.

III. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

FINDINGS:

- Document reviews and interviews demonstrated to the review team that the school has provided PD to teachers. There is limited evidence, however, that there are structures in place to ensure that teachers implement strategies learned in PD sessions.
- Based on document reviews and interviews conducted by the review team with the school leader, the review team found limited evidence that the analysis and use of assessment data by teachers for instructional planning was evaluated during formal and informal observations.
- While the school leader has set and communicated a clear instructional policy and expectations, there is limited evidence that there are defined strategies to achieve the school's goal of making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- School leaders should use the observation process to ensure that teachers incorporate all of the skills developed within PD activities into their instructional delivery.
- School leaders should monitor the analysis and use of assessment data by teachers for instructional planning during informal and formal observations.
- School leaders should revise the Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) to include a schoolwide plan to improve achievement in ELA. The plan should include goals, actions, and timelines. School leaders should monitor the implementation of the CEP and periodically review its effectiveness.

IV. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

FINDINGS:

- Based on interviews with staff, the review team observed that the school does not have a formal Pupil Personnel Team (PPT) that meets regularly to discuss students' academic, emotional, and social issues.
- Teachers report that they value collaborative planning time that occurs within PLCs; however, there is limited evidence that common planning time is used to review the most current student data to inform instruction.
- Document reviews and interviews conducted by the review team indicate limited evidence that the school has a school-wide grading policy that is consistently used by all teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The school leader should create a formal Pupil Personnel Team (PPT) that consists of guidance counselors, a social worker, related service providers, teachers, and administrative staff. This team should meet on a regular basis to discuss students' academic, emotional, and social issues.

- The school leader should ensure that the purposes and outcomes of each common planning meeting are documented. School leaders should attend these meetings to ensure that the focus of the meetings is central to improving instruction and student outcomes and is informed by the most current student data. School leaders should also monitor classroom instruction to ensure that strategies agreed upon are implemented in the classroom.
- School leaders and teachers should establish a schoolwide grading policy that is easily accessible to students to ensure consistent grading practices throughout the school. School leaders should review the policy during department meetings and monitor its implementation as part of their observation process.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FINDING:

Document reviews and interviews conducted by the review team provided limited evidence that the school's PD plan is comprehensive or aligned with school goals.

RECOMMENDATION:

School leaders should develop a detailed PD plan that focuses on improving teaching and learning to better meet the needs of students and teachers in ELA. In developing this plan, school leaders should create a self-assessment survey for teachers. Additionally, the school leaders should use results of formal and informal observations, as well as an analysis of student data, to identify additional teacher needs that can be addressed through PD. This information should be aggregated, with common needs identified and addressed through a comprehensive PD plan. The school leadership should also ensure that this PD plan is aligned with the school's CEP goals and that interim benchmarks are used to monitor its impact on teaching and learning.

VI. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

FINDING:

Based on the review team's observations of the resources and books in the library, the team concluded there are minimal resources available to meet the learning needs of students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs).

RECOMMENDATION:

The school leaders should seek the support of the Network in finding grants and supplemental funding to evaluate and upgrade the collection of resources to better support the learning needs of all students. Grade level literature should be available to meet the needs of all student groups.

PART 4: CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The findings and recommendations noted in the report are intended to guide the school's inquiry, planning, and the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) for school year 2012-13. The staff, administrators and Network are already aware of many of the issues raised in this report. It is anticipated that the report recommendations will help to effect change aimed at improving student achievement. The school should also continue its efforts in the implementation of the following Regents Reform Agenda initiatives: P-12 Common Learning Standards, Data Driven Instruction and the Annual Professional Performance Reviews for teacher effectiveness.