

Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Dufief Elementary School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

February 21-22, 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 DUFIEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Dufief Elementary School, located in Montgomery County, serves a total of 245 students in grades K-5th. The enrolled population is made up of 32% Asian, 28% White, 18% African American, 12% Hispanic, and 10% 2+ Races. The school's population includes approximately 20% of students that receive free or reduced meals and 34% 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 in Classroom Instruction and its lowest rating of Accomplishing in Assessment and Timing. 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 | 84% | Accomplishing |
| Assessment and Timing | 71% | 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.

- Provide teachers with professional learning opportunities focusing on collaborative learning best practices and classroom management techniques. Facilitate peer observation, feedback, and coaching to enable teachers to learn from experienced colleagues.
- Provide teachers with comprehensive professional learning opportunities on student-driven learning. Create more opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning by creating choices in content, making space for student collaboration, and grouping with specific roles.

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.

Reviewers noted the positive and supportive learning environment cultivated by Dufief Elementary teachers and school leaders. The nurturing atmosphere and supportive relationships with students encourage academic growth and the development of social-emotional competencies for students.

In thirteen out of thirteen classrooms reviewed, teachers nurture student engagement with positive affirmations, encourage collaboration among students, and personalize learning experiences with motivational tools and adaptive strategies, resulting in uniformly respectful and constructive student-teacher dynamics across all classrooms.

- Teachers employ positive reinforcement and patience to encourage student engagement and self-expression, as evidenced by affirmations and their patience in waiting for student responses.
- Students receive support to actively engage with both peers and learning materials, encouraged through collaboration prompts, and commended for their participation.
- All classrooms incorporate motivational tools such as rewards and recognize individual student needs through adaptive seating and opportunities for self-regulated breaks.
- Across all classrooms, there is consistently a positive and respectful dynamic between teachers and students, contributing to a supportive and positive atmosphere.

Data is central to supporting students holistically, as evidenced by focus groups and classroom reviews.

- Teachers and school leaders in the focus group reported that formative data is collected daily and is used to plan differentiation and further instruction.
- In the teacher's and school leaders' focus group, it was stated that data is used for behavior management, prevention, and Social Emotional Learning purposes.
- All focus groups highlighted that Focused Interventions, Reteaching, and Enrichment (FIRE) time, and Collaborative Child Conversations (CCC), are key strengths in supporting students.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

In four out of the thirteen classrooms, student-driven learning was evident, emphasizing the need to enhance systems for promoting student engagement with materials and self-monitor their learning.

1. In nine out of thirteen classrooms reviewed, teachers led all instruction with no student choice about what they learned and how they would learn.
- Out of the thirteen classrooms reviewed, there was evidence of student-led discussions in three classrooms.

While there is evidence that collaborative learning is being incorporated in six out of thirteen classrooms, this is an area that could be improved specifically by having students work collaboratively to solve problems and having students perform specific roles to complete a group task.

- In two classrooms out of thirteen classrooms, students engaged in discussions and worked together to create a product.
- In one out of thirteen classrooms, there were self-assigned roles during student-led groups.

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

Provide teachers with professional learning opportunities focusing on collaborative learning best practices and classroom management techniques. Facilitate peer observation, feedback, and coaching to enable teachers to learn from experienced colleagues.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Provide concrete strategies for implementing collaborative learning in the classroom.
- Arrange opportunities for teachers to observe experienced colleagues conducting collaborative learning sessions.
- Establish structured feedback protocols so teachers provide and receive feedback on their teaching practices.
- Provide coaching sessions to guide teachers through the implementation of collaborative learning strategies.
- Provide follow-up professional learning sessions based on evaluation feedback.

RESOURCES:

1. [Using Collaborative Learning Effectively](#)
2. [Big List of Class Discussion Strategies](#)
3. [Peer Assessments](#)
4. [Making Cooperative Learning Better](#)

FOCUS AREA 2

Provide teachers with comprehensive professional learning opportunities on student-driven learning. Create more opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning by creating choices in content, making space for student collaboration, and grouping with specific roles.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Identify areas for improvement in student-driven instruction through classroom visits.
- Develop professional learning opportunities covering student-driven Instruction: Adapting teaching methods to student proficiency levels.
- Conduct professional learning focused on hands-on activities and model lessons showcasing effective student-driven learning techniques.
- Provide teachers opportunities to observe peers and provide/receive feedback on student-driven learning techniques.
- Implement regular assessments and feedback mechanisms to measure training impact.
- Provide ongoing support, follow-up sessions, and access to resources as needed.

RESOURCES:

1. [Power School](#)
2. [Student Role](#)
3. [What is a learner Agency?](#)
4. [Co-Constructing Success Criteria with Students](#)

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Judy Geisler, Teacher, Frederick County Public Schools
2. Katherine Landen, Assistant Principal Garrett County Public Schools
3. Paul Fer, Principal, Frederick County Public Schools
4. Howard Franklin, People Personnel Worker, Baltimore County Public Schools
5. Tara Dedeaux, Principal, Harford County Public Schools
6. Katherine Aiery, Teacher, Harford County Public Schools

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, February 21, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, February 22, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Thirteen

Description of Classroom Visited

| Wednesday, February 21, 2024 | Thursday, February 22, 2024 |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math 1st • Gym 2nd • ELA 2nd • FIRE 3rd • Math 4th • ELA K • ELA 3rd • Reading INT • Reading 5th | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math 5th • Math 5th • Math 2nd • Literacy |

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Six

- 15 students (2 groups)
- 4 school leaders
- 11 teachers
- 15 parents (2 groups)

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Dufief Elementary

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.