



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

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

# **Quality Review Report**

## **2015-2016**

**P.S. 112 Bronxwood**

**Elementary School X112**

**1925 Schieffelin Avenue  
Bronx  
NY 10466**

**Principal: Susan Barnes**

**Date of review: April 21, 2016  
Lead Reviewer: Heidi Pierovich**

## The School Context

P.S. 112 Bronxwood school is an elementary school with 417 students from grade pre-kindergarten through grade 5. In 2015-2016, the school population comprises 0% Asian, 47% Black, 50% Hispanic, and 2% White students. The student body includes 5% English Language Learners and 20% students with disabilities. Boys account for 46% of the students enrolled and girls account for 54%. The average attendance rate for the school year 2014-2015 was 90.6%.

## 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 <i>Framework for Teaching</i> , 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>Developing</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 communicate high expectations to staff, and staff, in turn, develop expectations that are connected to a path to college and career readiness and communicate them to families.

### Impact

Staff is developing an understanding of what the expectations are for instruction across classrooms, and they are being supported by professional development and being held accountable. School leaders and staff are developing systems to provide feedback to families regarding student progress toward meeting those expectations.

### Supporting Evidence

- Although a few students articulated an understanding of the expectations connected to the school's instructional focus of "learning through partnerships, doing hands-on activities, questioning, and making real-world connections," not all students were able to do so. A student stated, and others agreed, "I wish that the writing was better and we had more activities, especially partner sharing, so kids would learn more off each other. We should have time to talk to each other so we could learn from each other and compare our knowledge." Students shared they know how they are doing based on the teachers' feedback on assignments, although, not all students understood or were able to use that feedback in a meaningful way in the next assignment.
- Parents reported the various ways they feel the community sets high expectations for their children and supports them towards those expectations. They cited the communication through various methods including newsletters, emails, phone calls, and 1:1 meetings. A parent stated that she knows how her child is doing in school because she, "talks to her child's teacher daily." However, not all parents are able to do so. Another parent stated, "[The teacher] sends home a calendar on how [the child] did that day; if there is homework, it gets stickers." Another parent stated that her child's teacher uses numbers instead of stickers; while another stated she did not receive that calendar, saying it depends on the teacher. Another parent added that teachers need to continue to develop communication from the time the students take the pre-test to the time they take the post-test to help parents understand how to help their children. Others agreed when one parent stated that she had heard of "Lexile level," reading levels, or goals for reading, but not all knew their children's reading levels or goals. All agreed, however, that there is a certain amount of time suggested for reading at home. They also cited middle school selection workshops for parents to provide support in the middle school application processes.
- The administration consistently communicates expectations to staff via multiple measures including a staff handbook, emails, and professional development. Although staff attends professional development, the implementation of expected practices is developing across the school. At the beginning of the school year, administration presented the 2014-15 data for students in grades 3-5 for English Language Arts and math as well as data trends over the past three years. However, this information does not show how teachers use data to improve trends.

## Area of Focus

<b>Quality Indicator:</b>	<b>1.2 Pedagogy</b>	<b>Rating:</b>	<b>Underdeveloped</b>
---------------------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------

### Findings

Across classrooms, teaching strategies typically do not provide multiple entry points into the curricula and do not support appropriately challenging tasks to meet the learning needs for all students. Student work products and discussions reflect a general lack of student thinking and participation.

### Impact

As a result, there is lack of engagement in appropriately challenging tasks and little demonstration of higher-order thinking skills in student work products. Students are not meaningfully engaged in high-level discussions, and there are few opportunities for support into the learning with scaffolds.

### Supporting Evidence

- Since the school has a population that includes 25% English Language Learners and students with disabilities, as well as struggling students, the administration expects that staff uses multiple entry points to differentiate instruction. Techniques such as graphic organizers, sentence frames, tiered assignments, extensions, and discussion protocols were not provided across classes.
- Many classes provided all students with the same materials. In a grade 2 math lesson, students worked in mixed ability groups with the same materials using a centimeter ruler to measure clay to build a structure. Some groups struggled with completing the task and received additional support from the teacher, while others finished early and had no extension. In other classes the scaffolds were not provided. In a grade 5 Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) history lesson, all students had the same assignment even though they were grouped by teacher. Additionally, in a grade 3 reading lesson, students were asked, “to think like poets” in pairs and to share their partners’ thoughts after a pair-share. Yet, upon returning to their desks, they all had the same task. Students were slow to start “thinking like a poet” as they were not provided with a scaffold to support writing their “poetic thoughts.”
- Although students were provided with opportunities for discussion, expected schoolwide protocols for those discussions were not provided, and the questioning was uneven. In a self-contained bridge class, students were asked to discuss the beginning, middle, and end of a story they knew. Instead, students shared their favorite story parts; the teacher explained that they did not answer the question and moved on in the lesson without pedagogical adjustment. In a grade 4 math lesson, students were in groups with tiered assignments and group roles to solve and answer on chart paper. However, the discussion did not occur across the class, as they did not have discussion protocols, so students were not listening to group members which left several students frustrated. One student stated, “That [answer is] not right. They are not listening to me. They do it all the time.” Similarly, in a kindergarten science lesson, students were in groups with the same assignment without discussion protocols. Students were to categorize animals in their habitats by placing pictures of animals onto plates labeled sea, air, and land; however, students struggled with the low-level Depth of Knowledge task because they could not discuss their opinions or come to consensus. What was planned to be a short activity took almost the entire visit. In a grade 4 ICT writing lesson, one group of students pair-shared after a teacher loudly demonstrated how to read poetry with emotion and line breaks, but the other teacher and her students could not hear each other when trying to explain how to read the poem.

## Additional Findings

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

### Findings

Collaborative teacher structures are supporting the strengthening and planning of curriculum. Consistent rigor of tasks across classrooms and the building of coherence in order to consistently promote college and career readiness is in the development stage.

### Impact

As a result, students are inconsistently engaged in critical-thinking tasks across grades and disciplines which hinders their ability to graduate with college or career ready skills.

### Supporting Evidence

- Staff has agreed on common components used for lesson plans, including, but not limited to, a learning target, Common Core Learning Standards, vocabulary, mini lesson, small group, wrap up, and assessment. Some lessons include plans for tiered groups based on student work and data, listing student names for each tier. For example, in an ICT kindergarten/first grade lesson, tiered groupings had specific descriptions such as, tier one “will work on the graphic organizer without the descriptions of each story element,” while the tier two “will use the graphic organizer with descriptions of each story element”, and tier three, kindergarten, “will work with the teacher as they draw the beginning, middle, and end of the book we read.” On the other hand, other lessons had tiered groupings which only included generic descriptions of work for students with special needs, English Language Learners, and struggling students. For example, one plan states, “struggling and ELL populations may need further explanation of the tasks, including specific language immersion, to be sure they understand the concept of a detail in a meaningful moment.” However, no further explanation was provided. Some lessons had the space to include a tiered plan, but none were provided. Lessons for enrichment or for advanced learners are also unevenly planned. One grade 2 math lesson plan included three versions for enrichment, while another second grade math lesson plan included an unspecific activity listed as, “The advanced students will be given an enrichment activity to further explore the concept.”
- Curriculum maps list the unit and the instructional shifts that apply to that unit. However, the remainder of the map includes a generic list of direct instruction strategies, general materials, and unspecified assessments at different levels of Depth of Knowledge that all repeat for each unit listed. At the end of each math chapter is a performance task. At the end of each English Language Arts unit is also a performance task that ranges from an unnamed “extended thinking inquiry project” or described as “TCRWP reading record.”
- A review of teachers’ plans demonstrated uneven revisions and planning using student work and data, as teachers are beginning to memorialize these revisions using an online program for ease of use and transparency. A pair of co-teachers shared a lesson whereby some students did not successfully achieve the learning target, so they revised the lesson and scaffolds to reteach it differently. This reteaching with modifications resulted in students’ achieving the lesson’s goal. However, only a couple of similar examples were provided. Last year teachers worked to knit together two programs, *ReadyGen* and *TCRWP*, using the reading from *ReadyGen* and the writing from *Teachers College*.

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

### Findings

Across classrooms, teachers use or create assessments and rubrics that are aligned with the curricula, but teachers' assessment practices inconsistently reflect the use of ongoing checks for understanding and student self-assessment.

### Impact

Feedback to students and teachers regarding student achievement is limited, and teachers inconsistently make effective adjustments to meet students' learning needs.

### Supporting Evidence

- Teachers use *Fountas & Pinnell* (F&P) as the Measures of Student Learning (MOSL) three times a year to assess students' reading levels. A report demonstrates a comparison of the October 2015 and January 2016 F&P scores. Although there is some comparative data to show that some grades demonstrated an average uptick in scores in this time frame, grade 5 shows no data; grade 4 shows 50% with 0.1-0.2% grade-level increase and 50% with a 0.4-0.9% grade-level increase. In kindergarten, first, and second grades from 5% to 20% of students showed no growth. While, in kindergarten, first, and second grades there was a 0.4-0.9% increase from 40-45%. Administration stated, "Students' reading scores are not improving as fast as [we] would like." Teachers use math unit tests, and the data are not analyzed as ELA is. While some lesson plans show students grouped by F&P level, there is no comparative data showing how these groups have improved student achievement. In addition, there are grade rosters of students' comparative scores for F&P, but there is no demonstration of how this data is used to inform curricular or pedagogical decisions. To support students who are not at grade level in ELA, teachers use *Waterford* program for improving reading, comprehension, and fluency. *Waterford* provides teachers with data including goals for usage. Although the data shows that students are using the program, the data does not show a comparative analysis, nor how teachers use this data to support students in the classroom.
- Although teachers use rubrics and checklists to support students in knowing next steps, students do not always know how to improve their work. During student interviews, some students knew how to use a rubric or checklist to support their learning and how to reflect on next steps, and others did not. For example, a student received feedback stating, "I love your engaging story and use of voice. Next time use margins and paragraphs." However, the student did not understand the concepts of margin or voice, so the feedback was neither actionable nor meaningful. Although most student work receives a grade, checkmark, and often a complimentary "great job," often work received feedback but no score. For example, a student said he was proud of a math assignment because he was able to solve the problems. However, the student's work received neither a grade nor comment, so the student stated, "I'm unsure if my solutions are correct."
- The staff has started using assessment during instruction, and administration has accordingly provided staff with professional development on best practices. However, the implementation of these practices and checks for understanding using formative assessment during teaching was uneven. In an ICT grade 4 literacy class, although one teacher took conferencing notes, it was unclear how these notes might inform instruction during the class. A few teachers also walked around groups, and some used the clipboard for data collection but without making effective adjustments during instruction.

<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 where they analyze assessment data and student work for students they share or on whom they are focused. These collaborations may be loosely connected to school goals and the implementation of Common Core Learning Standards. Distributed leadership structures are developing to support building leadership capacity.

**Impact**

The use of an inquiry approach is developing across teacher teams, but this work does not yet typically result in improved teacher practice or progress towards goals for groups of students. Teachers are beginning to be included in key decisions that affect student learning across the school.

**Supporting Evidence**

- Distributed leadership is beginning to be evident; each teacher team has an instructional lead who has not yet been trained but facilitates each grade team meeting. The instructional leads meet with administration twice a month to review data trends and make recommendations for the team. On Mondays, teachers design and deliver professional learning along with the coaches and administration around the Danielson *Framework for Teaching*. In addition to the site-based professional development sessions, teachers also receive support from outside consultants for both literacy and math. Teachers use common protocols for looking at student work and intervisitation
- Teachers are starting to use an inquiry approach for looking at student data and to use the information to determine next steps in their teaching and supporting student needs. However, this is a new process as observed during the teacher meeting where they began their second inquiry cycle of the year. First, teachers shared that the focus was to provide English Language Learners and students with disabilities with a pre-planned section in the teachers’ lessons through looking at selected student work to determine where students are and what would meet their needs. Teachers worked in pairs to look at targeted student work, and then they came back together to share the common instructional strategies used with different groups of students, including using a quick-draw activity, sounding out words whole class, sentence starters for opinion, and using anchor charts. Their next step was to set up a schedule for intervisitations. Although teachers can speak to one or two students in a class, they were not able to demonstrate how analyses are able to provide support for student needs or progress toward goals for groups of students.
- Teachers spoke about how working in teacher teams has supported improved instructional practice. A teacher stated, and others agreed, that, “The feeling of having options and fellow teachers to discuss what works in the classroom helps me to think if this strategy will benefit my students.” Together they share curricular adjustments because they are working to “knit together *ReadyGen* reading and *TCRWP* to make a cohesive writing block.”