



**Department of  
Education**  
*Carmen Fariña, Chancellor*

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

# **Quality Review Report**

## **2014-2015**

**Community School 92**

**12X092**

**700 East 179th Street  
Bronx, NY 10457**

**Principal: Cheryl Hall**

**Date of review: December 17, 2014**

**Lead Reviewer: Rafaela Espinal**

## The School Context

Community School 92 is an elementary school with 492 students from grade pre-kindergarten through grade 5. The school population comprises 18% Black, 78% Hispanic, 1% White, and 1% Asian students. The student body includes 20% English language learners and 23% special education students. Boys account for 50% of the students enrolled and girls account for 50%. The average attendance rate for the school year 2013-2014 was 89.0%.

## School Quality Criteria

<b>Instructional Core</b>		
<i>To what extent does the school...</i>	<b>Area of:</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
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	<b>Additional Findings</b>	<b>Developing</b>
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	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Underdeveloped</b>
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	<b>Additional Findings</b>	<b>Underdeveloped</b>
<b>School Culture</b>		
<i>To what extent does the school...</i>	<b>Area of:</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
3.4 Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students, and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations	<b>Celebration</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Systems for Improvement</b>		
<i>To what extent does the school...</i>	<b>Area of:</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
4.2 Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning	<b>Additional Findings</b>	<b>Developing</b>

## Area of Celebration

<b>Quality Indicator:</b>	<b>3.4 High Expectations</b>	<b>Rating:</b>	<b>Developing</b>
---------------------------	------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

### Findings

School leaders consistently communicate high expectations to the entire staff and are developing training and a system of accountability for those expectations. School leaders are developing systems to provide feedback to families.

### Impact

As a result, the school is developing systems that are connected to a path to college and career readiness and beginning to provide supports to achieve high expectations.

### Supporting Evidence

- The school is developing systems to provide feedback to families. Parents have access to the computer lab twice a month to review their child's current level of performance. Parents are also invited to all school activities including trips, special programs and performances. Parents are beginning to have resources aligned to Common Core to support their children at home.
- The schedule for the day along with instructional expectations is posted on the board outside the main office. Furthermore, school leaders communicate urgent matters, school-wide policies, and celebrate achievements through a newsletter that is distributed once a month to the staff. These methods of communicating high expectations to staff are emerging into a system of accountability.
- The principal, parent coordinator and teachers inform the school community about current curricula topics through monthly newsletters that are created by each grade-level team. Additionally, a school-wide calendar is distributed each month with information regarding parent workshops, educational trips and school activities. Parents stated that they are informed. These methods of communicating high expectations to parents are becoming connected to a path of college and career readiness.

## Area of Focus

**Quality Indicator:**

**1.2 Pedagogy**

**Rating:**

**Underdeveloped**

### Findings

Across classrooms, teaching practices are not typically aligned to the curricula and do not reflect a set of beliefs about how students learn best. Across classrooms, student work products and discussions reflect a general lack of student thinking and participation.

### Impact

As a result, teaching practices are hindering all learners, including English language learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities to achieve mastery of content standards and students are not producing meaningful work products.

### Supporting Evidence

- The principal stated that teachers connect previous lessons to support students to see a purpose for learning. Additionally, the principal reported that students learn best when teachers model and demonstrate clearly what is expected and begin lessons by “letting the students know what they are doing and why.” However, these teaching practices were not observed across classrooms visited. Furthermore, in one of the English language arts (ELA) classes, a teacher started the lesson by saying, “This is an extension, and you know what you are supposed to do.”
- The principal reported that the school's shared belief about teaching and learning included teacher modeling, flexible grouping, and scaffolded instruction to support diverse learners, including ELLs and students with disabilities. However across classrooms visited, teaching strategies do not align to the school's shared beliefs. For example, in some classes, students worked independently on a writing task and the adults provided feedback on the completion of the task rather than feedback on specific writing strategies. Additionally, evidence of teacher modeling, flexible grouping, and scaffolded instruction was not observed.
- Across classrooms visited, student work products demonstrated a lack of student thinking. Work folders for ELA and math contained end of unit assessments. Folders and notebooks for science and social studies were not readily available. Students' notebooks contained few published pieces and high-quality work products.
- Across classrooms visited, lessons were teacher directed and student participation was minimal. Student-to-student discussions were not heard. The prompts provided to learners were about process rather than content or product. For example, teachers said, “are we ready”, “discuss the roles in your groups”, “keep working and then you will have a discussion as a group”, “what page are you on”, and “what are you doing.”
- The school's coherent beliefs on how students learn best were expressed inconsistently by a variety of stakeholders. The school leaders stated that the school's shared belief aligns to the workshop model, however, the teachers and parents stated the school's shared belief aligns to a highly structured and disciplined environment. The school's shared belief system is not yet informed by Danielson Framework for Teaching. Additionally, evidence of coherent beliefs was not observed in any of the seven classrooms visited.

## Additional Findings

<b>Quality Indicator:</b>	<b>1.1 Curriculum</b>	<b>Rating:</b>	<b>Underdeveloped</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	-----------------------

### Findings

Curricula and academic tasks generally do not emphasize rigorous habits and higher-order skills across grades, subjects, and for ELLs. The implementation and planning of academic tasks across all grades and content areas does not ensure that students are cognitively engaged.

### Impact

The school's curricular decisions are resulting in minimal improvement in student achievement.

### Supporting Evidence

- Teachers shared that they review the standards and decide on important skills necessary for reading and writing units. However, a review of the academic tasks revealed that tasks do not typically emphasize rigorous habits.
- School leaders and teachers stated that teachers discuss and refine task based on grade level standards and student needs. Each grade has a point person for each subject area, they plan for that area, and then share it with the entire grade teams. The schedules provided have built in common planning times. Planning to provide individual or groups of students and to cognitively engage a diversity of learners was not evident in unit plans reviewed.
- Across classrooms visited, vocabulary charts were displayed in multiple subject areas indicating the past focus on building academic vocabulary to integrate the instructional shift. The Core Knowledge lessons observed started with vocabulary development and discussions. However, the implementation of other instructional shifts such as text-based answers, staircase of complexity, knowledge of disciplines, and dual intensity were not evident in across subject areas such as science and social studies.

<b>Quality Indicator:</b>	<b>2.2 Assessment</b>	<b>Rating:</b>	<b>Underdeveloped</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	-----------------------

### **Findings**

Teachers use school-wide assessments, rubrics, and grading policies that are aligned with the school's curricula, but there is no the analysis of those assessments and students do not receive actionable feedback. Across classrooms, teachers' assessment practices do not reflect the use of ongoing checks for understanding and student self-assessment.

### **Impact**

Across classrooms, teachers' assessment practices do not inform all students of their next learning steps.

### **Supporting Evidence**

- Student work products reviewed had ambiguous feedback and did not provide students with clear next steps. Additionally, students reported that they receive rubrics at the end of ELA and math tasks, but no rubrics are given to them in other subject areas such as science and social studies.
- All students participated in an ELA and math test simulation. Teachers, with the assistance of a data consultant, scored this assessment. However, there was no evidence of assessment analysis to determine students' struggles. Additionally, a review of data binders revealed binders contain running records (RR) with percentages listed, but there was no analysis of the RR for individual or groups of students at the strategy and skill levels.
- The principal stated that in every classroom teachers capture students' strengths and challenges during lessons and that students self-assess their work by using rubrics and completing exit slips at the end of the lessons. However, in one out eight classrooms visited, a teacher carried a clipboard to capture conferring notes. A review of the clipboard revealed no notes were recorded about students' struggles, the teacher did not ask any questions regarding the content and no adjustments were made to the lesson.
- Across classrooms observed, there was no evidence of teachers' use of ongoing checks for understanding and adjusting the lessons based on students grappling on the content. Students were not observed self-assessing their work. Teachers asked questions to guide behavior and procedures of the task. Additionally, teachers had not asked questions to assess students understanding of the content. For example, teachers followed the Core Knowledge lesson in a classroom of ELLs and continued reading the text even when students raised their hands and asked questions. The questions in multiple classrooms included: "Are we ready?" "are we listening?" "Do you have the paper?" "Are you ready for a computer?"

<b>Quality Indicator:</b>	<b>4.2 Teacher teams and leadership development</b>	<b>Rating:</b>	<b>Developing</b>
---------------------------	---	----------------	-------------------

### Findings

The majority of teachers are engaged in structured professional collaborations on teams that are loosely connected to school goals and the implementation of Common Core Learning Standards and the instructional shifts. Teacher teams inconsistently review assessment results and student work products.

### Impact

The teacher team's inquiry-approach work is not yet resulting in improved teacher practice or progress toward goals for groups of students or individual students.

### Supporting Evidence

- The principal and teachers reported that each grade-level teacher team comprises of a teacher with strengths in a content area. That teacher is responsible for developing the unit of study and presenting it to the rest of the team. However, teachers are not yet engaged in professional collaborations where they cohesively design and refine curricula units of study.
- United Federation of Teachers chapter chairperson and teachers have collaborated to create a professional development committee. Consultants and network staff provide ongoing professional development. However, teachers reported that their implementations of these professional collaborations are not always consistently monitored. Furthermore, school leaders were not able to provide evidence of the professional development collaborations shifting consistent improved teacher practice.
- Teachers meet weekly in grade-level team meetings. Each team has a chairperson who is responsible for sharing information as well as grade-level initiatives with school leaders and key stakeholders. However, this process of sharing information is not based on progress for groups of students and it does not consistently improve teacher practice. The practice of examining student work and adjusting pedagogical practices based on team outcomes are not yet consistent across teacher teams.
- Teachers stated that they work in grade teams and are beginning to use protocols to look at students work, but there was no evidence of strategies being developed (in the meeting observed) or implemented in the classroom to advance student learning. Differentiation at the classroom level and for individual and/or groups of students was not evident during observations, in plans, assessment binders or student work; therefore, this work does not typically result in improved teacher practice or progress toward goals for students.