



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

**Office of School Quality
Division of Teaching and Learning**

Quality Review Report

2014-2015

**Granville T. Woods School for Science and
Technology**

Middle School K584

**130 Rochester Avenue
Brooklyn
NY 11213**

Principal: Gilleyan Hargrove

**Date of review: January 26, 2015
Lead Reviewer: Evelyn Santiago**

The School Context

Granville T. Woods School for Science and Technology is a middle school with 128 students from grade 6 through grade 8. The school population comprises 84% Black, 13% Hispanic, 2% Asian, and 1% American Indian students. The student body includes 6% English language learners and 35% special education students. Boys account for 45% of the students enrolled and girls account for 55%. The average attendance rate for the school year 2013-2014 was 90.0%.

School Quality Criteria

Instructional Core		
<i>To what extent does the school...</i>	Area of:	Rating:
1.1 Ensure engaging, rigorous, and coherent curricula in all subjects, accessible for a variety of learners and aligned to Common Core Learning Standards and/or content standards	Celebration	Proficient
1.2 Develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best that is informed by the instructional shifts and Danielson Framework for Teaching, aligned to the curricula, engaging, and meets the needs of all learners so that all students produce meaningful work products	Focus	Developing
2.2 Align assessments to curricula, use on-going assessment and grading practices, and analyze information on student learning outcomes to adjust instructional decisions at the team and classroom levels	Additional Findings	Developing
School Culture		
<i>To what extent does the school...</i>	Area of:	Rating:
3.4 Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students, and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations	Additional Findings	Developing
Systems for Improvement		
<i>To what extent does the school...</i>	Area of:	Rating:
4.2 Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning	Additional Findings	Developing

Area of Celebration

Quality Indicator:

1.1 Curriculum

Rating:

Proficient

Findings

The school has aligned curricula to the Common Core Learning Standards and teachers engage in the use of data analysis to plan tasks for all learners.

Impact

The school's curriculum planning is building coherence and curricula alignment. The use of data to plan academic tasks that emphasize higher order thinking is enhancing cognitive engagement for all learners.

Supporting Evidence

- The school has created curriculum maps that align to the Common Core in English language arts (ELA) and math and is in the process of creating pacing calendars for the units of study from the New York City Scope and Sequence in science and social studies.
- As a result of data outcomes, the school has identified academic vocabulary and questioning as areas of focus to promote student engagement in rigorous tasks. For example, in a science class students engaged in an experiment using balloon rockets to make connections between Newton's laws of motion and the motion of the rockets. Students documented and shared findings with the class using science vocabulary. In another class, students worked in pairs to respond to the question, "How does the character in the story add to your understanding of aboriginal culture and family life?"
- Teachers plan units of study using summative and formative assessment outcomes such as item analysis of the State and end of unit tests in ELA and math to inform curricula decisions and plan academic tasks to promote engagement of all learners. For example, in several classes observed, visuals and manipulative materials were used to support the learning for students requiring additional help. In an ELA class, the English as a second language teacher (ESL) used a push in model and State assessment data to work with a group of English language learners (ELLs) to support their learning.

Area of Focus

Quality Indicator:

1.2 Pedagogy

Rating:

Developing

Findings

The school has begun to align pedagogy with the Danielson Framework for Teaching and some instructional supports are provided. However, the emphasis on higher order thinking skills and the use of varied entry points that would promote in-depth analysis, deep student engagement, and rich class discussion are inconsistent.

Impact

Teachers are beginning to align practices to the curricula and implement academic supports to yield meaningful student work products. However, opportunities for all learners, including student subgroups, to engage in high level discussions and create meaningful work products are not evident in several classrooms.

Supporting Evidence

- The school's beliefs of how students learn best, informed by the Danielson Framework for Teaching, include teachers modeling exemplars of expected lesson outcomes and students working in small groups engaged in peer discussions and sharing that deepen the level of thinking. However, these practices are not implemented consistently across classrooms. For example, in some classrooms observed, student engagement consisted mainly of reading excerpts from texts and answering teacher-directed questions with few opportunities for students to interact. In other classrooms, lessons did not consistently include demonstrations of expected outcomes and learning.
- Appropriate scaffolds and challenge for student subgroups were not evident in some classrooms. For example, during a math lesson observed, the lesson presentation was conducted for the whole group and consisted mainly of teacher-to-student interactions with few opportunities for students to discuss, practice and share their learning with their peers.
- Bulletin board displays in the halls contained samples of student work and learning in content areas with teacher feedback. However, in a number of classrooms there were few samples of student work products that reflected high levels of thinking. For example, in one classroom work samples reflected a completed series of math exercises with little evidence of application or problem solving contexts.

Additional Findings

Quality Indicator:	2.2 Assessment	Rating:	Developing
---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	-------------------

Findings

The school has begun to use common assessments and classroom checks for understanding to track student progress towards goals, gauge student understanding, and inform curricula and instructional adjustment.

Impact

The school determines student learning and progress through data analysis and during instruction. However, these practices do not consistently inform adjustments that meet students' academic needs, thus hindering student mastery of learning objectives.

Supporting Evidence

- The school uses summative and formative assessments that include results from State tests, Measures of Student Learning and unit tests to inform instructional goals for teaching and targeting skills in ELA and math. However, the school has not yet gathered information from these assessments to monitor individual student progress in all content areas for all learners.
- Although teachers gather information that includes formative assessments, student work and end of unit test results to determine levels of student learning in ELA and math, the use of this data to inform adjustments in instruction is inconsistent across classrooms. For example, in a math class, the teacher sat with a group of students having difficulty completing word problems in order to further illustrate the math concepts and increase student mastery. In another class, however, the teacher taught the lesson to the whole group with little evidence of modifications made to address the needs of students based on classroom data, and the lesson's "Do now" indicated some students had already mastered the lesson objectives.
- Classroom checks for understanding such as questions and answers, individual student and group share outs and student self-assessments, do not always lead to instructional adjustments that support all learners, including ELLs and students with disabilities. In one class, the teacher presented the lesson concepts using an interactive white board and asked questions to determine levels of student understanding. However, when a few students asked questions pertaining to the topic, they received minimal responses that did not fully address the questions asked.

Quality Indicator:	3.4 High Expectations	Rating:	Developing
---------------------------	------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

Findings

Although the school uses the Danielson Framework to inform instructional expectations to staff and provides information to students and families on the Common Core and student progress, systems of accountability for these expectations are not yet fully developed.

Impact

The absence of structures to ensure implementation of classroom expectations and communication of progress to students and families diminishes opportunities for students' continued growth and for families to support their children towards a clear path of higher achievement and college and career readiness.

Supporting Evidence

- The principal uses the Danielson Framework for Teaching focused on Domain 3 to communicate instructional expectations to teachers and staff at professional development workshops and during one-to-one teacher conferences. However, there is little evidence that the school has established a system of accountability for expectations of classroom practices as demonstrated by the low percent of completed observations and lesson feedback to teachers.
- The school publishes a parent newsletter monthly that includes curricular topics in all subject areas. In addition, parents have access to their children's performance outcomes through Jupiter Grades, a computer program used to track student progress in ELA and math. However, structures for providing ongoing information and guidance to students and families on the expectations of the Common Core Learning Standards connected to a path of college and career readiness are not yet fully established.
- While several teachers provide students verbal and written feedback on their work with comments and next steps for growth, this practice is inconsistent across the school. In some classrooms feedback consisted mainly of check marks with minimal guidance supports for students' academic growth.

Quality Indicator:	4.2 Teacher teams and leadership development	Rating:	Developing
---------------------------	---	----------------	-------------------

Findings

Teachers meet in professional collaborations and analyze assessment outcomes during team meetings. However, opportunities for input on key instructional decisions throughout the school are limited.

Impact

Inquiry-based teacher team work is beginning to build teacher capacity leading to academic progress for some students. The school's few structures for distributive leadership, however, hinder staff collaboration to enhance pedagogical skills and improve student learning.

Supporting Evidence

- Teacher teams meet weekly across grade levels to review student work and identify areas of need. However, the teams have not yet identified a target population for their inquiry work to improve teaching and learning. Discussions of student work samples did not reflect a specific instructional focus for analysis over time.
- While teacher teams analyze and discuss assessment data outcomes, their collaborations that include planning units of study in the content areas and looking at student work to assess and improve instructional strategies have not yet yielded notable progress and achievement for all students.
- Teachers have met with the principal to discuss and plan professional development activities. However, there is little evidence of structured opportunities for teachers to build their leadership capacity and have input on key decisions affecting student performance school-wide.