Maryland School Review
Expert Review Team Mathematics Report

Woodridge Elementary School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

October 9th -10th, 2024

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

Tenette Smith, Ed. D.
Deputy State Superintendent
Office of Teaching and Learning

Wes Moore
Governor

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Joshua L. Michael, Ph.D.
President, Maryland State Board of Education

Monica Goldson, Ed.D. (Vice President)

Chuen-Chin Bianca Chang, MSN, PNP, RN-BC

Kenny Clash

Clarence C. Crawford (President Emeritus)

Abhiram Gaddam (Student Member)

Susan J. Getty, Ed.D.

Nick Greer

Dr. Irma E. Johnson

Dr. Kim Lewis

Dr. Joan Mele-McCarthy, D.A., CCC-SLP

Rachel L. McCusker

Xiomara V. Medina, M.Ed.

Samir Paul, Esq

Table of Contents

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 two or three-day site visit that includes classroom observations, focus groups, and a principal interview.

The Expert Review Team forms a consensus based on student data, documents, observations, focus groups, and a principal interview. The rubric consists of two domains:

- **Domain 1: Instruction and Student Support** - High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and assessments are implemented to support student learning. Schools use multiple sources of data (qualitative, quantitative, and perceptual) to identify students and implement a multi-tiered approach to support all student groups. Progress monitoring systems are clearly defined and integrated into daily practice.

- **Domain 2: Professional Learning and Educator Support** - Educators at all levels are provided with support to improve results and shift instructional practice. Professional learning goals for educators are clearly aligned to school and LEA overarching student achievement goals.

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, is available online in the Maryland School Report Card.

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 and action steps to address the recommendation.

Appendices: The appendix expands 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.

Executive Summary

ABOUT WOODRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Woodbridge Elementary School, located in Prince George's County, serves a total of 332 students in grades PreK-5. The student population is 6.3% African American, 85.2% Hispanic and 5.1% white. The school's population includes 95% Title I, 52.4% economically disadvantaged, 67.7% multilingual learners, and 10.2% students with disabilities. More detailed information, including enrollment, attendance, demographics, and student outcome data, can be found in the Maryland School Report Card.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following actions are recommended to support 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 subsequent sections.

- Increase instructional opportunities for students to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others through student discourse to create more learner-directed classrooms by equipping teachers with higher order questioning strategies to support students with constructing logical arguments and drawing mathematical conclusions, critique the reasoning of their peers, and effectively respond to and use peer feedback.

- Enhance current data analysis practices by developing a differentiated school-wide professional development plan to provide teachers with ongoing, job-embedded professional learning on how to use data to adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students and improve student outcomes.

Domain 1: Instruction and Student Support

Instruction and Student Support	High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices and assessments are implemented to support student learning. Schools use multiple sources of data (qualitative, quantitative, and perceptual) to identify students and implement a multi-tiered approach to support all student groups. Progress monitoring systems are clearly defined and integrated into daily practice.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

STRENGTHS

There was evidence of a schoolwide focus on class instruction reflecting researched based practices that challenged and supported most students.

- In eight out of nine classrooms visited, the whole group instruction was aligned to grade-level standards.

- In nine out of nine classrooms visited, the learning environment fostered strength-based relationships. Teachers redirected inappropriate student actions with minimal disruption to instruction.

- In many of the classrooms visited, the teacher or aides worked with small groups of students while the other students worked on independent activities on the computer or completing worksheets at their desks.

- In six out of nine classrooms visited, students were provided opportunities to actively engage in discussions about mathematical concepts.

- In seven out of nine classrooms visited, students were provided immediate feedback through individualized student learning. Feedback was specific, timely, and aligned to the content of the lesson.

- In five out of nine classrooms visited, students were observed engaging in collaboration and/or discussions with their peers. In some classrooms students collaborated in groups or pairs to solve problems.

- During focus groups, ten out of ten parents indicated there is support in place to assist students such as Class Dojo, Math Night, and Math Club.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

There were minimal opportunities for student collaboration and learner directed instruction fostering balanced collaboration, peer feedback, or opportunities for student communication and mathematical reasoning.

- In some classes visited there was misalignment of objective, lesson, assessment and/or learning activities. For example, in one classroom the learning target was evident during whole group instruction; however, when students moved into small groups the instructional activities were not aligned to the whole group learning goals.

- In two out of six classes students had opportunities to engage with mathematics to solve problems or represent quantities in multiple ways, select mathematical tools for specific tasks, or had students use patterns to simplify/solve problems.

- While students were consistently invited to explain or justify their thinking. Students were provided with few opportunities to make their thinking public by sharing directly with peers.

- During class visits, reviewers noted some students had opportunities to respond to teacher questions but there were few opportunities for students to explain their reasoning and/or critique the reasoning of others.

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.

Focus Area 1:

Increase instructional opportunities for students to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others through student discourse to create more learner directed classrooms by equipping teachers with higher order questioning strategies to support students with constructing logical arguments and drawing mathematical conclusions, critique the reasoning of their peers, and effectively respond to and use peer feedback.

ACTION STEPS:

- Survey teachers and use informal observation data to identify teacher leaders who regularly use questions to deepen student learning and push their thinking using intentional questions to deepen learning.

- Provide ongoing professional learning opportunities on higher-order questioning to ensure teachers plan and scaffold questions daily that will increase students' levels of thinking and use evidence to justify responses.

- During professional learning and weekly planning model and share best practices on how to use the curriculum and instructional materials to increase the frequency of higher-order questions during daily instruction. Provide regular opportunities for teacher leaders to share lessons that promote student discourse and critical thinking with higher order questions.

- Utilize planning for teachers to use the curricular and instructional materials to develop and plan varied questions that engage all students in the learning and require them to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.

- Monitor and support consistent implementation through peer observations and informal observations. Following any observation ensure immediate and specific feedback to teachers and follow-up with coaching or resources to address challenges. Include opportunities to celebrate and share success.

Domain 2: Professional Learning and Educator Support

Professional Learning and Educator Support	Educators at all levels are provided with support to improve results and shift instructional practice. Professional learning goals for educators are clearly aligned to school and LEA overarching student achievement goals.

FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

STRENGTHS

There was evidence that teachers and leaders participate in job-embedded professional learning anchored in the curriculum and instructional materials.

- Site visit documentation included agendas and presentations for various professional development sessions held for teachers during the 2023-2024 & 2024-2025 school year. The topics include small groups in mathematics, student discourse, test taking skills, and a new teacher academy.

- During the school leader focus group, leaders shared teachers make professional development suggestions and requests from the administrative team. The principal then works with the district math team to provide teachers with support.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

It was evident that teachers participate in professional development; however, there is a need to enhance the current structures to have job embedded opportunities for teachers and leaders to engage in differentiated data-driven professional learning experiences to reflect on their practice and receive actionable feedback to support professional growth and improve student outcomes.

- In four out of nine classes visited, there was evidence of equity-based practices including some teachers' use and display of vocabulary in students' native language.

- During teacher focus groups, one teacher shared she notes student progress during the lesson and uses the information to plan the next day's lesson not to adjust current instruction.

- In one out of nine classes visited, students were observed reasoning abstractly and quantitatively. Limited evidence was available to demonstrate recognizing and using patterns or structures in mathematical problems.

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.

Focus Area 1:

Enhance current data analysis practices by developing a differentiated school wide professional development plan to provide teachers with ongoing, job embedded professional learning on how to use data to adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students and improve student outcomes.

ACTION STEPS:

- Research data protocols to identify and implement one to establish a sustainable data-driven culture to ensure teachers regularly engage in data cycles to reflect and adjust instruction using the available curricula resources, assessment data, and progress monitoring systems.

- Develop differentiated professional learning plans to prepare teachers to implement the data cycle and assess the progress of implementation.

- Engage in ongoing reflection and adjustment of the professional learning plan to ensure the selected data cycle is effective and meets the schoolwide need.

Appendix

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Kelly Cleland, Teacher, Calvert County Public Schools
2. Jill Snell, Manager, Educator Development, Baltimore County Public Schools
3. Maureen Liakos, Department Chair Social Studies, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
4. LaNisha Robinson, Project Specialist Disproportionality Management, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
5. Willanette Thomas-Lohr, Assistant Principal Calvert County Public Schools
6. Devorah Danielson, Educational Consultant, Montgomery County Public Schools

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, October 9, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, October 10, 2024

Site Visit Day 3

None

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Eight

Description of Classrooms Visited

October 9, 2024
- Kindergarten Math   1st Grade Math-2   1st/2nd Grade Math   2nd/3rd Grade Math   2nd Grade Math   3rd Grade Math Intervention   5th Grade Math

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Four

- 9 students

- 6 school leaders

- 11 teachers

- 10 parents

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school.