



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

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR DISTRICT AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS (DTDSE)



SCHOOL REVIEW WITH DISTRICT OVERSIGHT REPORT

Common Core Conceptual Frame

2015-16 School Year

BEDS Code	550101	
School	Odessa-Montour Hanlon Elementary & Middle School	
School Address	300 College Avenue, Odessa, NY 14869	
District	Odessa-Montour Central School District	
Date(s) of Review	March 18, March 29, March 31, April 21, May 3, May 12, May 16, May 18, 2016	
School Review Team	Name	
School Leader	Chris Wood, Superintendent	
Representative for the District responsible for the quality of the report and the adherence to DTSDE protocols	Chris Wood, Superintendent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> District Employee <input type="checkbox"/> District Outside <input type="checkbox"/> Educational Expert
Additional Team Members	Name	Affiliation/Title
Additional Team Members (Add rows as necessary)	Rob Francischelli	Elementary Principal
Additional Team Members (Add rows as necessary)	Almon McCarty	Middle/High School Principal
Additional Team Members (Add rows as necessary)	Veronica Lewis	Director of Special Services & K-2 Principal
Additional Team Members (Add rows as necessary)	Valerie Cole	SEIS of RSE-TASC

School Information Sheet for

School Configuration (2015-16 data)					
Grade Configuration	3-8	Total Enrollment	339	SIG Recipient	Yes
Types and Number of English Language Learner Classes (2015-16)					
# Transitional Bilingual	0	# Dual Language	0	# Self-Contained English as a Second Language	0
Types and Number of Special Education Classes (2015-16)					
# Special Classes	7	# SETSS	0	# Integrated Collaborative Teaching	4
Types and Number of Special Classes (2015-16)					
# Visual Arts	2	# Music	3	# Drama	0
# Foreign Language	1	# Dance	0	# CTE	0
School Composition (most recent data)					
% Title I Population	41%	% Attendance Rate	95.09%		
% Free Lunch	42%	% Reduced Lunch	8%		
% Limited English Proficient	.002%	% Students with Disabilities	17%		
Racial/Ethnic Origin (most recent data)					
% American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	% Black or African American	0.6%		
% Hispanic or Latino	1.5%	% Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.9%		
% White	92%	% Multi-Racial	2%		
Personnel (most recent data)					
Years Principal Assigned to School	1	# of Assistant Principals	0		
% of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate	0%	% Teaching Out of Certification	0%		
% Teaching with Fewer Than 3 Years of Experience	11%	Average Teacher Absences	7%		
Student Performance for Elementary and Middle Schools (2014-15)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	25%	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	32%		
Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (4th Grade)	93%	Science Performance at levels 3 & 4 (8th Grade)	72%		
Student Performance for High Schools (2014-15)					
ELA Performance at levels 3 & 4	65%	Mathematics Performance at levels 3 & 4	56%		
Global History Performance at levels 3 & 4	64%	US History Performance at Levels 3&4	86%		
4 Year Graduation Rate	92%	6 Year Graduation Rate	86%		
Regents Diploma w/ Advanced Designation	21%	% ELA/Math Aspirational Performance Measures	25%		
Overall NYSED Accountability Status (2014-15)					
Reward	No	Recognition	No		
In Good Standing	No	Local Assistance Plan	No		
Focus District	Yes	Focus School Identified by a Focus District	No		
Priority School	No				

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	N/A
White	No	Multi-Racial	N/A
Students with Disabilities	No	Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	No	ALL STUDENTS	No
DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	N/A
White	No	Multi-Racial	N/A
Students with Disabilities	No	Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	No	ALL STUDENTS	No
DID NOT MEET Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science (2013-14)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	Black or African American	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	N/A
White	No	Multi-Racial	N/A
Students with Disabilities	Yes	Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	Yes	ALL STUDENTS	No
<p>Identify the school's top priorities (no more than 5) based on the school's comprehensive plans (SCEP, SIG, DIP, etc.):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. 2. 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. 			

Information about the review

- The review was led by Chris Wood, Superintendent, in collaboration with Rob Francischelli (Hanlon Elementary 3-6 Principal), Almon McCarty (Odessa-Montour Jr./Sr. High School), Veronica Lewis (BC Cate Elementary K-2 Principal & Director of Special Services) and Valerie Cole (Special Education School Improvement Specialist of the RSE-TASC). Chris Wood, Superintendent, was responsible for providing oversight on this review to ensure it aligned to the DTSDE vision and review protocols.
- The review team visited a total of 30 classrooms during the 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 reviewers did not use results of student, staff or parent surveys, as they are not required for a District Review without an identified school.

School Review with District Oversight Information						
# of teachers in the school	# of English language arts (ELA) classes visited during the review	# of mathematics classes visited during the review	# of classes for Students with Disabilities visited during the review	# of classes for English language learners visited during the review	# of ELA lessons reviewed using the Tri-State Rubric	# of mathematics lessons reviewed using the Tri-State Rubric
34	9	12	30	0	9	11

COMMON CORE CONCEPTUAL FRAME SCHOOL REVIEW WITH DISTRICT OVERSIGHT

Mark an "X" in the box below the appropriate designation for each Statement of Practice. Provide the letter rating in the OVERALL STAGE ATING row as the overall Conceptual Frame rating.

#	Statement of Practice	Stage 4	Stage 3	Stage 2	Stage 1
2.3	Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL RATING FOR COMMON CORE CONCEPTUAL FRAME				D	

REVIEW OF COMMON CORE CONCEPTUAL FRAME

Directions:

Provide a final rating for each Statement of Practice (SOP) within the COMMON CORE CONCEPTUAL FRAME:

2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5 and an overall rating of the COMMON CORE CONCEPTUAL FRAME based on the results of the classroom visits, Evidence of Shifts in Practice and the Review of units/lessons.

Each Statement of Practice (SOP) should have one bulleted Finding-Evidence-Impact (FEI) statement to reflect the rating. List the FEI under **Strength** if the rating is *Stage 3* or *Stage 4* and under **Area for Improvement** if the rating is *Stage 1* or *Stage 2*. (Delete the heading that is not used.)

For each **Stage 1** or **Stage 2** rated SOP, indicate the **Next Steps** to be taken that will be used to inform the upcoming school year's School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP).

#	Statement of Practice	Stage
2.3	Leaders make strategic decisions to organize programmatic, human, and fiscal capital resources.	Stage 3
	<p><u>Strength:</u> <u>Finding:</u> School leaders have effective key strategic actions to strengthen opportunities for student success as evidenced through document review indicates 3 areas including: <u>Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Support Team (for all students referred for intervention as it relates to social/emotional developmental health), • Professional Learning Communities (teacher-leaders take leading roles in professional development, data protocols and the monitoring/adjustment of curriculum and instruction), and • The addition of full-time AIS teacher in ELA and Math (filling gaps in learning and raising student achievement on benchmark and State Assessments). <p><u>Impact:</u> By making carefully calculated decisions to establish thoughtful academic and social/emotional systems and supports through the creative use of available resources, time and personnel, the new school leaders have increased opportunities for students to be successful.</p>	

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.	Stage 3
<p><u>Strength:</u> <u>Finding:</u> The school leaders use a distributive model to ensure and support a systematic plan of quality implementation of rigorous and coherent curricula and the instructional shifts that are appropriately aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) as evidenced through: <u>Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review reveals the use and walk-thrus reveal implementation of a year-long scope and sequence as well as curriculum maps that are aligned to the depth of the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), key shifts in the CCLS, instructional supports that are varied and responsive to student need and assessments that accurately measure whether students are mastering standards-based content and skills. • Teacher interviews and document review, curriculum modules from EngageNY have been adapted and implemented by teachers in grades 3-8 to ensure students are provided with quality, rigorous and engaging opportunities to achieve deep conceptual knowledge toward the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). • Unit plans are submitted and reviewed by teacher-leadership teams to ensure they are designed in a sequential and thoughtful manner while maintaining the high quality and rigor of the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). <p><u>Impact:</u> As a result of the systematic planning for the implementation of rigorous and coherent curricula and the key Shifts in the Common Core Learning Standards, all students are provided instruction that is deliberate and purposeful according to the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) which meet varied student needs and are responsive to the diverse needs of all students, leading to college and career readiness.</p>		
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.	Stage 2
<p><u>Area for Improvement:</u> <u>Finding:</u> Teachers develop unit plans that meet the demands of CCLS but inconsistently develop lesson plans and inconsistently monitor and adjust curricula across the school. <u>Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per document review, year-long curriculum maps and unit plans are submitted and reviewed to ensure alignment with the CCLS, as is a structured grade-level Data-Driven protocol to monitor and adjust curriculum; however, it is done so inconsistently across the elementary and junior high levels. • Document review revealed that while all lesson plans were consistent with the unit plans that are regularly expected and have been reviewed to ensure alignment with the CCLS per review against the Tri-State Rubric, the lesson plans were completed for this review only and are not regularly written or expected. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 out of 29 lesson plans included student data to meet the needs of all students as well as the demands of the CCLS and grade level DDI protocols. • RSE-TASC walk-thrus revealed that 3 out of 17 posted clear objectives and used them to drive instruction. • The leadership interview indicated that there are few interdisciplinary connections in terms of special areas (i.e., art, music, physical education) supporting the Common Core Learning Standards and Common Core Instructional Shifts. <p><u>Impact:</u> Because CCLS aligned lesson plans with objectives are inconsistently written, curricula with long-term goals is infrequently monitored and adjusted and there are few special areas supporting Common Core Standards, deep conceptual knowledge around specific content is limited for students.</p> <p>Next Steps if Stage 1 or Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that the Hanlon Elementary 3-6 has established successful and productive Data Driven protocols, the District will facilitate collaboration and teacher-leader trainings to ensure consistent use of these protocols across all grade levels and buildings. • The schedule will provide meeting time for teachers to collaboratively create and examine curriculum unit plans supporting the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) both within grade levels (horizontally) as well as among grade levels (vertically). • Teacher leaders in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will collaborate with special area teachers to turn-key the knowledge and skills they have received through various professional development opportunities in order for special area teachers to develop lessons that are aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). 	
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.	Stage 2
	<p>Area for Improvement:</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> Teachers are beginning to develop a system of analyzing data to make curricular decisions and are inconsistently using a variety of assessments to adjust curricula and provide feedback based on that data to address student self-reflection, monitoring and ownership of learning.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While 3rd grade students do monitor their own reading fluency per walk-thru data, student interviews reveal that in all other skill areas and grade levels, they are not encouraged to self-regulate using self-reflection, monitoring and take ownership of their own learning. • During the vertical teacher focus group, junior high teachers revealed that while they have access to item analysis data, they admittedly do not use it to inform their work but are in the process of working together to begin to develop a system and protocol for doing so. • Vertical teacher group interview revealed that the curriculum between the K-2 building and the 3-6 building as well as the 3-6 and the 7-8 buildings are not aligned to prevent gaps in knowledge and skills and does not include multiple types of common assessments. <p><u>Impact:</u> Inconsistent analysis of data to make curricular decisions as well as the lack of goal setting and progress monitoring toward those goals leads to the potential of decelerating the learning process, the lack of informed instructional and curricular decisions, less accountability for student outcomes, lower expectations from teachers and more special education referrals.</p>	

	<p>Next Steps if Stage 1 or Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All educators will receive professional development on student self-regulation including goal setting, taking ownership for their own learning, monitoring their learning and self-reflection in order to incorporate such strategies into their own lessons and units. The schedule will provide meeting time for teachers to collaborate between B.C. Cate Elementary (K-2), Hanlon Elementary (3-6) and the 7-8 junior high to facilitate collaboration and teacher-leader trainings in order to ensure consistent use of data protocols, common assessment protocols as well as curriculum gap prevention across all grade levels and buildings. 	
4.2	<p>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.</p>	<p>Stage 2</p>
	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> School leaders are new within the past nine months and are now in the beginning stages of engaging teacher leaders and staff in the process of developing systems for protocols and practices that promote high levels of student engagement and inquiry.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While all 17 teachers in the elementary are using various engagement protocols and strategies to meet various needs but in 10 of the 17 classes, the tasks/activities students are doing are all the same with the same pace and expected end-product. Likewise, 4 out of 12 junior high teachers are using various engagement protocols and strategies to meet various needs with 2 of them creating tasks/activities with a pace and end-product that is tailored to student needs. Through classroom visits, it was revealed that while most teachers (14 out of 17 = 82% during guided practice) use formative assessments to measure student progress and determine student needs, few teachers checked for understanding or used formative assessment <i>before or during</i> instruction to inform next steps throughout the lesson (4 out of 9 = 44%). <p><u>Impact:</u> Since school leaders are in the beginning stages of developing systems for consistent protocols and instructional practices throughout the entire school, teachers are not able to reach all students and students are not able to reach their full potential.</p> <p>Next Steps if Stage 1 or Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Development and ongoing coaching on Differentiated Instruction in general education as well as Specially Designed Instruction in various services on the continuum will help teachers to meet the individual needs of students and adapt curriculum as appropriate while maintaining high levels of rigor. Ensure, through professional development and monitoring, that teachers use lesson plans that promote higher-order thinking skills and help students analyze information through use of formative as well as summative assessments. 	
4.3	<p>Teachers provide coherent, and appropriately aligned Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students.</p>	<p>Stage 2</p>
	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> Not all teachers are differentiating activities or providing multiple points of access for all students.</p>	

	<p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walk-thrus indicate that teachers are not differentiating activities or in the case of students with disabilities, specially designed instruction is not deliberately planned to meet the various needs of students based on formative assessment and progress monitoring data. • Teachers in self-contained special classes are not adapting the curriculum to meet the needs of students with disabilities while maintaining the rigor and high levels of texts and content complexity of the CCLS as evidenced through the RSE-TASC walk-thru data. <p>Impact: As a result of not differentiating activities or specially designing instruction, not all students are not able to meaningfully participate in or meaningfully access the curriculum, leading to lower levels of student engagement and achievement.</p> <p>Next Steps if Stage 1 or Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through professional development and monitoring, teachers will use daily lesson plans that promote higher-order thinking skills and help students analyze information through use of annual goal setting as well as daily objectives. • Professional development and ongoing coaching will be provided to special educators to assist them in creating Standards-based IEPs with appropriate criteria and measurement units and lessons that include high expectations for students, as well as high expectations for teaching with appropriate opportunities, supports, services and instruction provided to students with disabilities. 	
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).	Stage 2
	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>Finding: All teachers are not continuously using data to track student progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review has shown that 7 out of 10 IEPs do not include criteria including accuracy and mastery, leading to inaccurate or at least unknown accuracy data and measurement toward annual goals. • Review of School Report Cards and Special Education School District Data Profiles over 4 years (2011-2016) indicate that the classification rate for Students with Disabilities subgroup increased from 10.9% to 17%. • Leader interviews revealed that although a small percentage of teachers have a poor attitude and work ethic (estimated 5%-10%) as it relates to putting in the extra time it takes to analyze data, adjust curricula and provide thoughtful, appropriate, explicit feedback, it is too many. <p>Impact: Because not all teachers continuously use assessment data to track student progress and adjust instruction, they are not able to ensure that individual students receive support in the areas in which they are struggling or enrichment in areas in which they are excelling.</p> <p>Next Steps if Stage 1 or Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special educators will receive professional development in developing standards-based IEPs that include attainable, measurable criteria with appropriate methods of measuring standards-based skills and schedule with appropriate frequency by which the goal will be monitored. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likewise, special educators will be trained in the progress monitoring process to determine the effectiveness of the specially designed instruction as well as how and when to adapt their instruction according to the data garnered from the process. • Teachers will be provided with evidence-based strategies and continued cognitive coaching relating to the Growth Mindset based on Carol Dweck’s work to ensure they are designing classroom activities that focus on the value of the learning process, creating micro-goals and celebrating incremental growth toward those goals. As a result, students are more motivated and successful as they feel a sense of responsibility to do their best, thus students will experience the positive feedback loop of effort and success, encouraging the development of perseverance and the positive outcomes of a productive struggle.
--	---

Report Quality Assurance from the District

I certify that I have provided oversight on behalf of the district regarding this review to ensure that this School Review with District Oversight follows NYSED expectations and protocols.

Name	Chris Wood
Title	Superintendent
District Lead Credential status (choose one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Issued by NYSED on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Pending -- The requirements have been fulfilled, but I have yet to receive word from NYSED <input type="checkbox"/> Pending -- I have not yet fulfilled the requirements, but plan on doing so by the June 30, 2016. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A This is the only School Review with District Oversight and District-led review I am responsible for.