

Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Chevy Chase Elementary School

Maryland State Department of Education

Table of Contents

Overview of Maryland School Site Reviews.....	2
Executive Summary	4
Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction.....	7
Appendix A	10
Appendix B	12

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 ERT 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 CHEVY CHASE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Chevy Chase Elementary School, located in Montgomery County, serves a total of 456 students in grades PreK-5th. The enrolled population is made up of 11% Asian, 22% African American, 9% Hispanic and 51% White. The school's population includes approximately 22% of students who receive free or reduced meals and 8% 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 rating on Domain 1. The school scored its highest rating of Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement in Assessment and Timing and its lowest rating of Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement 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	94%	Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement
Classroom Instruction	92%	Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement
Assessment and Timing	96%	Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement

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.

- Support student-driven learning by utilizing interest inventories, providing devices and websites for research, forming pairs or groups of students based on interest, and allowing student choice for learning topic and final product that reflects learning. Utilize formative assessment and build cooperative learning based on individual student strengths.
- Emphasize or provide professional learning on the use of student-led discussions. Strategies should ensure that student-led discussions are balanced and structured.

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.

There is a high level of instruction that occurs in the classrooms. The student engagement level with clearly defined outcomes and objectives provided many examples to help students relate the concept/skill to the real world with a focus on student achievement that was inclusive of all students.

- Reviewers noted in thirteen of the fourteen classrooms reviewed, teachers' interactions with students are positive and respectful. For example, teachers used routines for management and wait time to keep students moving through transitions. In those classrooms, there was minimal loss of instructional time and as a result, students were able to move through multiple modes of practice.
- Likewise in those same classrooms students' interactions with their peers and the teacher were positive and respectful. For example, during collaborative work time in media class, all students engaged in groupwork activities and working together, in Center for Enrichment (CES) ELA, Math, and Social Studies classes students were also observed working together and staying on task. No put-downs or negative behaviors were displayed.
- In thirteen out of fourteen classrooms reviewed, instruction showed evidence of differentiation and equitable practices including the use of sentence stems, visuals, student choice for modified levels of rigor, word banks, idea cards, graphic organizers, and Total Physical Response (TPR) gestures for response options to deliver instruction designed to meet individual student needs.
- According to the five teachers in the first focus group, the school's gifted and talented program is identified as the Center for Enrichment (CES). Teachers in the focus group reflected on the continuous improvement focus toward improving literacy for all students. However, students in the focus group stated they believe the CES program is impacting the friendships with non-CES students.
- In eight of the fourteen classrooms reviewed, teachers provided options to students in how they shared their learning, and at what pace they learned and provided opportunities to extend learning.
- In nine out of fourteen classes reviewed, students collaborated in groups or pairs to solve problems, work on assignments, or answer questions. Students who worked collaboratively in

these identified groups focused on completing an assigned task; selected other students to answer questions; and discussed picture cards to determine if they were reinforcing or busting a stereotype.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

Increase the opportunities for student-driven learning to be a shared experience between students and teachers with time for blended collaborative activities.

- Reviewers noted in nine of the fourteen classes, students worked collaboratively on completing a task without assigned roles.
- While teachers in the focus group stated the students decide what and how they engage in their learning, reviewers noted this was evident in less than five of the classrooms and that teachers made the choices for the students.
- Four out of fourteen classes with student collaborative group learning, discussions were structured, balanced, and allowed for various viewpoints due to having assigned roles.

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

Support student-driven learning by utilizing interest inventories, providing devices and websites for research, forming pairs or groups of students based on interest, and allowing student-choice for learning topic and final products that reflects learning. Utilize formative assessment and build cooperative learning based on individual student strengths.

Emphasize or provide professional learning on the use of student-led discussions. Strategies should ensure that student-led discussions are balanced and structured.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Develop a professional development series for student-driven learning opportunities in conjunction with structured collaborative learning.
- Use the current master schedule to develop peer-to-peer learning tours to support veteran teachers with continuous improvement practices of teaching and learning
- Incorporate the current structures for peer learning walks to include learning from colleagues who currently implement collaborative learning groups with student-driven learning successfully.

RESOURCES:

1. [10 Strategies to Build on Student Collaboration in the Classroom.](#)
2. [Learning From Instructional Rounds](#)
3. [Leveraging Teacher Leadership](#)
4. [Teacher Moves That Cultivate Learner Agency](#)

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Stephen Isler, Instructional Specialist, Prince George’s County Public Schools
2. Judy Geisler, Classroom Teacher, Frederick County Public Schools
3. Noraida Ankobia, Resident Principal, Baltimore City Public Schools
4. Dr. Rachel Thompson-Adedeji, Pupil Personnel Worker, Prince George’s County Public Schools
5. Natalie Zinkham, Classroom Teacher, Baltimore County Public Schools
6. Jennifer Hernandez, Director of World Languages and ESOL, Baltimore County

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, March 20, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, March 21, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Fourteen

Description of Classroom Visited

Wednesday, March 20, 2024	Thursday, March 21, 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 W.I.N. (RGR) • Grade 4 CES • Grade 5 Reading • Grade 3 ELA • Grade 5 CES • Grade 5 Sci/SS • SEL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 5 Media • WIN (OGL) • Grade 5 Math • Special Education • Grade 3 Eureka Math • EML Small Group • Grade 5 Social Studies

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Eight

- 17 students (2 groups)
- 13 school leaders (2 groups)
- 12 teachers (2 groups)
- 16 parents (2 groups)

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Chevy Chase 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 prior to 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.