

Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Bay View Elementary School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

January 24 – 25, 2024



Table of Contents

Overview of Maryland School Site Reviews.....	2
Executive Summary	4
Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction.....	7
Appendix A	11
Appendix B	13

Overview of Maryland School Site Reviews

PURPOSE

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) is committed to supporting school systems in improving student outcomes. MSDE conducts comprehensive school reviews to identify promising practices and opportunities for growth in curriculum, instruction, interventions, socio-emotional and mental health services, educator support, and school management. School reviews are a collaborative process among local education agencies (LEAs), schools, and MSDE aimed at accelerating student learning, supporting the whole child, and enhancing educator practice.

SCHOOL REVIEW PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

All school reviews are facilitated by an Expert Review Team (ERT) led by MSDE. ERT members consist of trained teachers, school leaders, and education experts with experience in improving student outcomes. Members participate in extensive training led by MSDE to calibrate the review process to ensure a consistent approach to school reviews. To identify effective practices and opportunities for growth in a school, the ERT analyzes school data, reviews documents submitted by the school, and conducts a one or two-day site visit that includes classroom observations, focus groups, and a principal interview.

The Expert Review Team uses a rubric (see Appendix B) to form a consensus rating for each measure based on student data, documents, observations, focus groups, and a principal interview. The rubric consists of three domains:

- **Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction** - High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and assessments are implemented to support student learning.
- **Domain 2: Student Support** - Schools use data to identify students and implement a multi-tiered approach to support all student groups.
- **Domain 3: Educator Support** - Educators at all levels are provided with support to improve results and shift instructional practice.

Each domain contains indicators and measures. Indicators specify criteria within the domain that will be reviewed. Measures identify the component that will be rated within the indicator. Each measure can earn one of four ratings:

- **Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement** - evidence reviewed demonstrates that a school fully addressed action(s) while implementing measures and attaining outcomes and demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement.
- **Accomplishing** - evidence reviewed demonstrates that a school fully addressed action(s) while implementing measures and attaining outcomes.
- **Developing** - a plan and/or process is observed; however, actions towards attaining measures and outcomes have not yet been implemented.

- **Not Evident** – a plan and/or process towards implementing measures or obtaining outcomes was not observed.

In cases where the measure and/or component does not apply, it will be marked as not applicable.

MSDE will collaborate with LEAs for any school that earns a rating of Developing or Not Evident for any measure to develop recommendations, a support plan, and a timeline for the school to make progress toward the Accomplishing or Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement rating.

STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

The following report is organized into three different sections.

Executive Summary: In this section, you will find a summary of the school's review. This includes:

- Information about the school, with more detailed information, can be found online in [the Maryland School Report Card](#).
- The summary of findings is a snapshot of the ratings the school received by each domain, with more detailed ratings of each measure embedded in the complete school rubric in Appendix B.
- Overall recommendations for the school to focus their school improvement work.

Findings and Recommendations by Domain: Each domain contains a section that outlines ERT findings, including strengths and areas for growth. For each domain, targeted recommendations are provided with evidence, action steps, and resources to address the recommendation. Resources are currently being reviewed for accessibility.

Appendices: Two appendices expand on information provided in the body of this report. They provide detailed information on the specific methods used by the ERT during the site visit and a deeper dive into the ratings the school received on the School Review Rubric.

Executive Summary

ABOUT BAY VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Bay View Elementary School, located in Cecil County, serves a total of 443 students in grades PreK-5th. The enrolled population is made up 9% African American, 8% Hispanic, and 73% White. The school's population includes approximately 46% of students that receive free or reduced meals and 20% or less of the population includes either students with disabilities or students with 504 plans. More detailed information, including enrollment, attendance, demographics, and student outcome data, can be found in the [Maryland School Report Card](#).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following table summarizes the school's ratings for Domain 1. The school scored its highest rating of Accomplishing in Curriculum and Instructional Materials and its lowest rating of Accomplishing in Classroom Instruction. A comprehensive list of measures, indicators, and ratings can be found in the full School Review Rubric in Appendix B.

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction		
Indicator	Percentage	Rating
Curriculum and Instructional Materials	81%	Accomplishing
Classroom Instruction	78.5%	Accomplishing
Assessment and Timing	79%	Accomplishing

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following actions are recommended to support improvement in the areas identified as needing improvement through the School Review process. More detailed information about these recommendations, linking them to specific findings in each domain and providing action steps and resources to implement them, can be found in the following sections.

- Emphasize and provide a job-embedded professional learning series on research based instructional practices and strategies regarding student-driven instruction with a focus on student-led engagement, representation, and actions (UDL).
- Implement learning walks, including leadership and teachers, with focus on collaborative learning strategies for preparing students to work collaboratively. Support staff/special educators should be included in grade level collaborative meetings to enhance student's access to grade level material. Emphasize professional learning in the area of collaborative learning/productive group work.

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Curriculum and Instruction

High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and assessment are implemented to support student learning.

Findings and Recommendations

STRENGTHS

The Local Education Agency (LEA) provided documentation supporting the high-quality curricula aligned with the Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards (MCCRS). The school documentation is aligned with the LEA documents provided to MSDE.

The school focus group participants agreed the climate is supportive to all and emphasized there are multiple opportunities for professional development on curricular materials.

- During the school leader and teacher focus group, it was shared that there are instructional coaches who observe teaching and using the instructional programs. They meet with them regularly to provide feedback. They commonly shared that the coaches are shared among multiple schools and that they are not in their building as much as they would like and wished they had more access to them.
- In addition to the county-wide coaches, the school has a Title 1 resource teacher who assists with the planning and delivery of professional development and supports grade level teams in reviewing their data (Acadience reading and math) to create differentiated groups in reading and math. The Title 1 resource teacher teaches small groups and interventions to ensure all students are getting instruction at their level.
- During the teacher focus group, teachers shared that they used Schoology regularly to individualize content-based PD opportunities. Staff conduct training for others in the building on a specific instructional topic when they return from a workshop.
- Professional development is offered through Bookworms virtually and special education offers summer training related to specific contents.

In most of the eleven classrooms reviewed, there was evidence of differentiation of instruction which contributed to the learning environment and supported student learning.

- During classroom reviews, multiple examples of differentiation were evident, as evidenced by corrective reading materials modified for the three learners; modeling a variety of strategies to solve the problem; questions were scaffolded to build to higher order questions; students were given options so that they could select their own pace; and in four classrooms teachers used an audio system during instruction.
- In four out of four mathematics classrooms, lessons were aligned to grade-level math content standards. Students were completing procedural fluency assessments to monitor progress during

the quarter and the teacher discussed errors made in calculation and had students justify the correct answer. This classroom environment engaged students with movement and flexibility while promoting them to solve problems. Teachers inspired students with statements such as: "Kiss your Brain", "Are you clarifying with a friend", and "Do your best don't worry about the rest!" served to continuously foster a positive approach toward learning.

- In ten out of eleven classrooms, students were greeted by name, timers were used to support focused learning, classrooms were welcoming, hugs were given, and the teacher checked for personal needs (breakfast) and if the students were ready to learn. Students were familiar with classroom routines and transitions and worked on personalized learning goals as the class worked collectively to earn a star.
- In seven out of eleven classrooms, the teacher used roles and jobs in the classroom for each student. Redirections were given in a way to not escalate students, coping strategies were mentioned, and teachers stated what students on task were doing. Throughout the classrooms there was use of the positive behavior interventions and support (PBIS) school-wide system, classroom positive reinforcement, and the use of slides to build the structure of the day. In the same classrooms, students were reminded about using the calming strategy they were familiar with.

The structures and systems of the learning environment create space for students to build critical thinking skills by engaging with challenging questions and receiving teacher feedback.

- In seven out of eleven classrooms, teachers used phrases such as, "How do you know?" Teacher questioning was tied to vocabulary and higher level, high-interest text. Questions were asked to recall/review vocabulary and make connections among early topics. Additionally, for a learning task, students wrote a letter to defend their choice of travel, using persuasive writing to encourage critical thinking.
- During focus group discussions, all teachers shared that they give the Acadience assessments three times a year in mathematics and reading. In addition, they also give the Northwestern Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment two or three times a year depending on grade level. This information is used to drive instructional groups and flex groups which helps to individualize instruction.
- Five out of six parents and all teachers in the focus groups shared that score reports are sent home quarterly so that parents are aware of their student's progress. However, several teachers shared that there is too much emphasis placed on test scores as opposed to student growth and teacher input. Similarly, parents stated there was little to no evidence of daily or weekly assessments being used to drive instruction.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

Leverage the current structures in place to begin shifting the teacher-driven learning to a more student-driven learning environment.

- In ten out of eleven classrooms, the learning was teacher-driven with little no student leadership opportunities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are meant to support school leadership in improving in the areas that were identified as needing growth. Each is closely connected to the evidence presented above under “Areas for Growth,” and includes specific action steps and resources to support the implementation of these improvements. Domain-specific ratings can be found in Appendix B.

FOCUS AREA 1

Emphasize and provide a job-embedded professional learning series on research-based instructional practices and strategies regarding student-driven instruction with a focus on student-led engagement, representation, and actions (UDL). Included professional development on engaging all learners and differentiating whole group instruction/co-teaching would allow for a more inclusive opportunity for all students.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Provide professional learning opportunities to support teachers in designing structured collaborative learning that is student-driven and incorporates current teacher practices that have been modeled for students.
- Develop a peer-to-peer monitoring system that provides teachers with opportunities to share and improve practices without an evaluative lens from administrators.

RESOURCES:

1. [How to Foster Student-Centered Collaborative Learning in Modern Classrooms?](#)
2. [Creating a Path Instructional Rounds: What? Why? How?](#)

FOCUS AREA 2

Implement learning walks, including leadership and teachers, with focus on collaborative learning strategies for preparing students to work collaboratively. Support staff/special educators should be included in grade-level collaborative meetings to enhance student's access to grade-level material.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Build teachers and paraprofessionals capacity to give roles in the classroom so students can take more leadership in the learning process. Conduct peer visits on-site and off-site to provide teachers with greater insight into developing a stronger student-driven learning environment.
- Develop a structure that supports teachers who are not core content to engage in the learning structure to incorporate strategies within arts-related courses.

RESOURCES:

1. [Improving Teacher Performance Through Instructional Coaching](#)

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Andrew Zanghi, Principal, Prince Georges County Public School
2. Michelle Murphy, IEP Chair, Baltimore County Public School
3. Elizabeth Hazelwood, Teacher, Garrett County Public School
4. LaNisha Robinson, CCEIS, Anne Arundel County Public School
5. Willanette Lohr, Inclusive Education Facilitator, Calvert Country Public School
6. Holly Hatton, Supervisor of Special Education, Wicomico County Public School

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, January 24, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, January 25, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Eleven

Description of Classroom Visited

January 24, 2024	January 25, 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindergarten SEL • Corrective Reading Group • Math/Flex 3rd • Math/Flex 2nd • ELA/Shared Reading 5th • Special Education 1st • ELA 4th 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Building Foundations 1st • Differentiated Instruction (DI) 2nd • DI & ELA 5th • Math 4th

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Six (6)

- 10 students
- 10 school leaders
- 8 teachers
- 13 parents

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Bay View Elementary School

The Expert Review Team Rubric is used by the review team to form a consensus on a rating for each measure based on all collected evidence. Collected evidence includes documents submitted by the school before the on-site review; outcomes of classroom observations; answers to focus group questions from teachers, administrators, students, and parents; and student data. Items checked were reviewed through data documentation or during the on-site school review.