



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

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



<b>BEDS Code</b>	441600010006
<b>School Name</b>	GAMS High Tech Magnet School
<b>School Address</b>	300 Gidney Avenue Newburgh, NY 12550
<b>District Name</b>	Newburgh Enlarged City School District
<b>School Leader</b>	Melinda Lamarche
<b>Dates of Review</b>	November 3-4, 2015
<b>School Accountability Status</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Assistance Plan
<b>Type of Review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SED Integrated Intervention Team (IIT)

## School Information Sheet for GAMS High Tech Magnet School

School Configuration (2015-16 data)			
Grade Configuration	Kindergarten – 8	Total Enrollment	886
		SIG Recipient	
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes (2015-16)			
# Transitional Bilingual	6	# Dual Language	0
		# Self-Contained English as a Second Language	0
Types and Number of Special Education Classes (2015-16)			
# Special Classes	3	# SETSS	1
		# Integrated Collaborative Teaching	2
Types and Number of Special Classes (2015-16)			
# Visual Arts	2	# Music	3
		# Drama	0
# Foreign Language	2	# Dance	0
		# CTE	2
School Composition (most recent data)			
% Title I Population	84	% Attendance Rate	95
% Free Lunch	73	% Reduced Lunch	11
% Limited English Proficient	26	% Students with Disabilities	12
Racial/Ethnic Origin (most recent data)			
% American Indian or Alaska Native		% Black or African American	28
% Hispanic or Latino	54	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2
% White	14	% Multi-Racial	2
Personnel (most recent data)			
Years Principal Assigned to School	5	# 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	7	Average Teacher Absences	10
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2014-15)			
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	11	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	13
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)	90	Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (8th Grade)	NA
Student Performance for High Schools (2014-15)			
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4		Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	
Global History Performance at levels 3 & 4		US History Performance at Levels 3&4	
4 Year Graduation Rate		6 Year Graduation Rate	
Regents Diploma w/ Advanced Designation		% ELA/Math Aspirational Performance Measures	
Overall NYSED Accountability Status (2014-15)			
Reward		Recognition	
In Good Standing	X	Local Assistance Plan	X
Focus District		Focus School Identified by a Focus District	
Priority School			

### **Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2013-14)			
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)			
American Indian or Alaska Native		Black or African American	X
Hispanic or Latino		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 Science (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native		Black or African American	
Hispanic or Latino		Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	
White		Multi-Racial	
Students with Disabilities		Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged		ALL STUDENTS	

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

1. Align lessons to CCLS and instructional shifts.
2. Develop a system of using data to inform instruction.
3. Develop a professional learning community to support teacher practice and student achievement.

## 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 (SESIS) representative and a district shadow with expertise in bilingual and limited English Proficient (LEP) education.
- The review team made a total of 66 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, schoolwide data, teacher feedback, and student work.
- The school provided results of a student survey that 273 students (32 percent) completed.
- The school provided results of a staff survey that 47 staff members (100 percent) completed.
- The school provided results of a parent survey that seven parents (less than one percent) completed. The parent response rate was too low to have statistical significance.
- The school is a Local Assistance Plan (LAP) school as it was designated as a “school in good standing” during the 2014 – 15 school year. This review was undertaken when the original focus school, Horizon on the Hudson Magnet School, was allowed to leave the DTSDE review process and the district identified GAMS High Tech Magnet School as benefitting from the review.
- The school has transitioned from a grades kindergarten to five elementary school to a grades kindergarten to eight elementary and middle school. The 2015-16 school year is the first year in which all nine grades are housed at the school. This year’s addition of grade eight has brought the school an experienced horizontal team of teachers, an assistant principal, and a guidance counselor.

### 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: 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	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: 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>1</b>
---	--------------------	----------

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

- Although the school leader has developed vision and mission statements, the vision is not widely understood by the school community. Additionally, the school lacks Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Result-Oriented, and Timely (SMART) goals to drive school improvement efforts. The Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) found that the goals included in the modified School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP) were generic and vague and did not include specific indicators to measure progress toward achieving. The school leader indicated that the Building Leadership Team (BLT) formulated the goals; however, the BLT had no parent or student representatives, and there was no evidence that these goals were developed with input from a cross section of community members. During focus group meetings, although students, teachers, and parents referenced elements of the vision, they did not articulate a clear understanding of the school’s vision and mission/goals. Students, teachers, and parents stated the school’s mission was to “prepare its students for the future.” The IIT found little evidence of school wide instructional practices that align with this intent. For example, during class visits, few teachers implemented instruction that included data driven protocols to meet the needs of students. The IIT found that the school leader has not developed a shared understanding and culture that embraces high expectations for all students.
- The school leader has not made strategic decisions concerning human resources. Although the school leader scheduled common planning time for grade level horizontal teams, the meetings are voluntary and not all teachers participate, which limits opportunities for collaboration. In addition, the review team found no evidence to show that the school leader monitors or directs these meetings to ensure that teachers address school-wide priorities. The school leader did not have regularly scheduled meetings with the instructional coach to determine the best use of coaching time. During a horizontal team meeting, the IIT noticed that the instructional coach missed opportunities to guide teachers in planning instruction to meet the needs of students, particularly subgroups. The IIT found that the school leader has not made the best use of staff time. For example, the review team noted that some staff assigned to work with students minimally provided direct support to students. In addition, the school leader took on tasks such as gathering students for the focus group meetings instead of delegating this responsibility to one of the assistant principals. Many of the students did not arrive on time for the meetings, and the assistant principals were not visibly present in hallways and classrooms to monitor students while they transitioned from class to class.
- The school leaders have insufficiently developed the staff’s instructional capacity through collaboration, support, and quality feedback to ensure high-quality instruction throughout the school. Although the observation reports reviewed by the IIT included names of observers and observation dates, the reports lacked specific information what school leaders observed during instruction. This limited the school’s ability to base professional development (PD) on identified instructional needs. Although the school leader reported that PD had been provided at staff conferences on such topics as collaborative student activities, the IIT did not find evidence of a system in place to implement, tailor,

and monitor support to address teachers’ needs. School leaders told the team that they did not use the StaffTrac online application to analyze patterns of deficiencies among teachers in order to provide targeted PD. The team found that no data had yet been entered into StaffTrac for the 2015-16 school year. A review of observation reports showed that not all reports included specific and actionable feedback, and the feedback provided focused on collection protocols, rather than the quality and content of the lesson. As a result, teachers did not receive specific recommendations for modifying and improving their instructional practices.

- School leaders have not established coordinated systems to ensure that staff use available data to inform their decisions. The IIT found little evidence that staff do a deep analysis of data to plan professional development for teachers and to improve outcomes for students. For example, while New York State English as a Second Language Assessment Test (NYSESLAT) data is available, the school leaders have not disseminated the information to staff to use in support of students. School leaders have not required teachers to create data walls and to explain data to students. Although the school leader reported that she personally met with grade three teachers to analyze student assessment data and plan instruction, she has not implemented this practice with all other grade levels. The school leader has not established systems to regularly monitor all aspects of the school in order to make informed decisions that foster continuous improvement.

**Recommendation:**

Beginning immediately, the administrative cabinet should meet weekly to establish systems and protocols for planning, monitoring, and evaluating lesson plans, observations, and professional development. By January 2016, the school leaders should establish a presence as an instructional leadership team by developing and communicating school wide protocols for continuous school improvement that promote a data-based culture of shared expectations for high student achievement and appropriate social-emotional development.

**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.

- School leaders have not communicated a vision of a coherent curriculum that allows teacher some creativity and autonomy within the CCLS framework and meets the needs of all students. Teachers reported that they have minimally participated in the development of the curriculum and do not feel a sense of ownership of the curriculum. Although the school leader stated that collaborative student learning was a school priority, the lesson plans reviewed by the IIT did not reflect this priority. In addition, there was no evidence of the school leader monitoring and providing supervision to support collaborative learning. While some lesson plans reviewed by the IIT contained evidence of scaffolding for students with disabilities and English as New Language learners (ENLs), most lesson plans reviewed did not reflect planning for instruction that addressed students’ varying needs. The school leaders

have not ensured that teachers develop and offer a rigorous curriculum.

- Plans typically lacked varied and complex instructional strategies and were not modified to meet all students' need. The IIT noted that the lesson plans submitted prior to the school review were modules from EngageNY and did not include original plans created by teachers. The plans reviewed by the team during the visit, were handwritten plans that included mostly copied elements from the online plans. When interviewed by the IIT, teachers reported that they minimally developed or modified plans. Teachers also stated that they felt constrained by directives to implement EngageNY modules. The IIT attended a horizontal team meeting and noted that the teachers did not connect their analysis of student work to any rubric or the CCLS. In addition, the protocol for looking at student work did not lead to a deep discussion of the implications to inform planning.
- Teachers generally do not collaborate to connect the curriculum across subject areas. Although, grades six to eight teachers had horizontal planning time, there was no evidence of interdisciplinary planning. There was some evidence of planning for interdisciplinary connections in the elementary grades. For example, the team observed a grade two interdisciplinary lesson on Greek mythology connecting literacy, history, and science and examined an art teacher's plan for a lesson integrating art, social studies, science, and ELA. However, such integration was not typical. Although, teachers said that they preferred curriculum maps to the CCLS EngageNY modules, they did not make use of the maps available on the Rubicon Atlas to promote interdisciplinary planning. Thus, teachers minimally provide students opportunities to engage in activities that promote an understanding of the interconnectedness of knowledge.
- There is no school-wide system in place to ensure that teachers use a range of assessments to plan instruction. Although, the school has DataMate, an online application that provides an array of student data including an item analysis of state assessment data, teachers stated they were not aware that these data were available. Most lesson plans reviewed by the IIT lacked data-driven protocols and did not include mechanism to ensure that students receive actionable feedback. The review team saw no evidence of data walls, and students reported that teachers generally do not share data with them. A few samples of student work contained feedback; however, the rubrics developed to assess the quality of student work were generic. Most teachers did not use assessments to plan or modify their curriculum or provide students with feedback, which limits opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning.

**Recommendation:**

Effective immediately, school leaders should communicate to the school staff that the opportunity exists to collaboratively modify and adapt EngageNY modules as long as new units, lessons and materials are grade and student-appropriate, aligned with achievement performance indicators and the Common Core Learning Standards. Teacher-created curriculum utilizing the Rubicon Atlas template and process should be submitted on the online Rubicon Atlas repository. By January 2016, school leaders and lead teachers should participate in training on using the template for curriculum development.



<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>1</b></p>
<p>The school is at <b>Stage One</b> for Tenet 4 – Teacher Practices and Decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school leader has not communicated clear expectations and provided adequate support to teachers to ensure they have a shared understanding of how to implement best practices in the classroom. The school leaders have not ensured that teachers systematically use data to establish instructional goals and action plans for individual or groups of students. During classroom visitation, many teachers did not differentiate tasks for student based on data. When interviewed by the IIT, teachers reported that they primarily implement teacher-directed instruction because of students’ skill deficiencies and background weaknesses. While some teachers stated that their students were capable of higher-order thinking, the review team saw few examples of teachers asking higher-order questions. Although teachers and the school leader reported that many students were not sufficiently engaged in their learning, most teachers did not use a variety of instructional strategies to increase students’ engagement levels. The school leader reported that many teachers lacked the necessary skills to plan and implement collaborative student learning activities.</li> <li>• The review team found that most teachers’ instructional practices did not promote high levels of student engagement. The review team visited 66 classes and noted that the majority of teachers asked recall questions without providing wait time for students to think and respond, and in some instances, teachers answered their own questions. In most classes visited by the IIT, teachers did not integrate text complexity in their instruction or provide scaffolding for students with disabilities. Resource room services were sometimes improperly implemented when students were pulled from the major subject integrated collaborative team (ICT) teaching classes mandated in their Individualized Education Plans (IEP). The IIT saw minimal integration of the instructional shifts. In many classes visited teachers read to students rather than engaging students with activities that promoted critical thinking.</li> <li>• While some students reported that they felt safe and felt comfortable asking teachers and other staff for help, the review team saw few examples of students being intellectually challenged or participating in rich discussions. Most teachers’ lessons were not student-centered and did not promote intellectual discovery and rigorous thinking. In most classes visited by the IIT, students did not build on other students’ responses, and teachers did not utilize their knowledge of students’ diverse backgrounds to increase engagement. Teachers generally did not use a variety of strategies to involve disengaged students. Consequently, most teachers’ instructional practices did not meet the diverse needs of their students</li> <li>• Staff do not have a shared understanding of the purpose of assessment and of how to use data to inform instruction and provide students with feedback. The IIT found that student work on display generally lacked actionable feedback with next steps to promote self-reflection and ownership for their learning. Students reported that they did not know their assessment scores, and teachers interviewed</li> </ul>		

by the IIT said that informing students about their scores would have a negative impact because the scores were so low. As a result, teachers did not use the scores to set achievement goals with students. Teachers reported that they were unaware, until recently, that they had access to student assessment scores via an online application. Although the grade eight teacher team developed an online portal that provides students with school grades and class assignments, students in the other grades do not have similar access.

**Recommendation:**

School leaders should support teachers to increase student engagement by having teachers incorporate a collaborative student activity a minimum of once every three lessons and incorporate a minimum of two to three higher-order questions in every lesson. School leaders should monitor implementation during lesson plan reviews, walk-throughs, and observations and maintain a record of their schedule, notes and feedback. This recommendation should be implemented no later than December 4, 2015.

**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 leaders have not effectively established systems to identify, address, and monitor services and supports to promote students’ social emotional developmental health. The review team did not see evidence of a system to address the social-emotional needs of all students. Although the behavioral intervention team, which consists of the social worker and psychologist, met to discuss student referrals, other support staff reported that they were unfamiliar with the referral procedure and did not know which students had been referred. In addition, staff reported that the BIT only discussed a maximum of two referred students every six weeks, and team members projected a two-month delay in addressing any new referrals because of a backlog.
- Although the school has the Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies (PBIS) program, the review team found limited evidence of how the program is used to meet students’ needs. The school leader reported that the PBIS program was being modified to incorporate a middle school population. In addition, the school leader and student support team stated that the school’s Response to Intervention (RtI) program also needed to be strengthened. Teachers interviewed by the IIT did not have a shared understanding of behavioral expectations for students. For example, only some teachers confiscated student cell phones despite a school policy prohibiting cell phones. Staff members reported that they have received minimal PD to build their capacity to manage student behavior and to address students’ social and emotional developmental health. Pupil personnel services staff reported that they work reactively, rather than proactively to address students’ needs.
- The school has not strategically organized its work with the school community to develop a shared

understanding of how to address students’ social-emotional needs with consistency. The pupil personnel services team members told the IIT that they did not meet regularly to coordinate and evaluate the effectiveness of their actions. Although, the clinicians described a thorough referral and monitoring process, very few students benefited from these efforts because the frequency of the meetings did not match the referral rate. In addition, other support staff were unaware of the student behavioral referral process. Parents interviewed by the IIT, reported that they could not easily access special education and other related services for their children. The school lacks a coordinated system to monitor how groups work together to support student social and emotional developmental health. As a result, not all students receive the support they need to learn at optimal levels.

- Although there is some data analysis, the school has not developed a comprehensive strategic plan utilizing data to address all students’ social-emotional needs. Pupil personnel services staff monitor attendance, referral, and recidivism rates. However, there is not a coordinated effort to use these data proactively to address all students’ social-emotional needs. The school’s scheduling of middle school core classes for the first period succeeded in reducing morning referral rates; however, school staff reported that 60 percent of middle school referrals now occurred after lunch and it was not clear what would be done to address this. Student and staff statements indicated that many students did not respect their teachers. Survey results showed that 69 percent of secondary school students disagreed with the statement that students respect their teachers and 52 percent of elementary students disagreed with the statement that their teachers are interested in their lives. Yet, there was no evidence that the school has addressed these findings. The school’s limited use of social-emotional data hinder staff in their ability to remove barriers to learning.

**Recommendation:**

Beginning immediately, the school leaders and pupil personnel services staff should identify developmentally appropriate behavioral and social-emotional outcomes and expectations for each grade level, consistent with Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies (PBIS). A shared understanding of these outcomes and expectations should be used to expand the school wide Response to Intervention (RTI) and grade-level team processes in order to incorporate a tiered system of support to meet all students’ social-emotional and academic needs. School leaders should monitor and evaluate implementation and impact, monthly.

**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 has not identified and communicated school-wide expectations to create a culture of high expectations for students and to provide families with supports to help students achieve at higher levels. Teachers and parents indicated in interviews that the leader has not shared a clear vision for high expectations and rigorous instruction for all students. During discussions with the review team

the school leader and teachers indicated that the school staff has increased outreach efforts to parents; however, the review team found no evidence of protocols in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of these outreach efforts. For example, although a parent survey was administered, only seven parents completed the school survey and the school did not gather sufficient information to address parents' concerns.

- While the school has different methods to communicate parents, the school staff have not closely monitored or evaluated outreach efforts to ensure all parents are able to support their children. Staff reported that the school communicates with parents through the online parent portal, an open door policy, a school-parent communication log, student agendas, and parent-teacher conferences. Staff indicated that all documents sent home are translated into Spanish. While some teacher have met with parents to discuss the academic progress of their children and any behavioral concerns, this practice is not consistent across the school. Parents interviewed by the IIT, praised the school's responsiveness to their phone calls and requests for assistance. Some parents reported that attendance at parent events varied widely. For example, "Take Your Father to School Day" was attended by 150 parents, while "Literacy Night" was attended by only three parents. Parents stated that the major obstacle to attending school events was conflicts with parents' schedules, which the school has addressed with limited success. The review team found little evidence of how the school staff review their communication and outreach to parents to modify and make adjustments.
- The school leader has not developed a plan to train staff on ways to build and sustain strong home school partnerships. Teachers and parents interviewed by the IIT stated that most parents were unable to help their children achieve at high levels, and the review team saw little evidence of the school's efforts teach parents ways to support student learning and growth. Parents and teachers expressed that the school's parent engagement efforts needs improving as not all subgroups of parents are involved in school activities. Although staff shared that the school collaborates with the Boys' and Girls' Club to offer after-school homework help for students, the IIT did not find evidence of other existing partnerships that promote and provide training for parents and staff.
- Although the school has made efforts to share some data with school constituents and to inform families of student progress, the school has not shared relevant data in a way that promotes parents' understanding of how to advocate for services that address student needs. The school leader and some parents interviewed by the IIT reported that the school staff share information with parents via online portals, backpack letters, robo-calling, report cards, and progress reports. However, the review team did not find evidence to show how the school ensures that all parents have increased parents' understanding of data and have promoted parents' ability to advocate for services for their children. Some parents reported that they were not aware of the online parent portal and were unclear about when they would receive report cards and progress reports. The review team found that the school does not share data in way that that empower all members of the school community to take action to support student-learning, leading to higher student achievement.

**Recommendation:**

In order to increase parent engagement and understanding of their children's education among families of all student sub-groups, by January 2016, the school leader should work with representatives of the school community to create a family and community engagement plan that capitalizes on previously well-attended parent events. Future events should incorporate an instructional component, such as student-led parent-teacher conferences, solving mathematics problems, conducting science experiments or students showcasing their work.