Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Folger McKinsey Elementary School

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 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 FOLGER MCKINSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Folger McKinsey Elementary School, located in Anne Arundel County, currently serves a total of 627 students in grades K-5th as of March 14, 2024. The enrolled population is made up of 3% Asian, 2% African American, 7% Hispanic, 83% White, and 5% two or more races. The school's population includes approximately less than 5% of students that receive free or reduced meals and 10% 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 in Curriculum and Instructional Materials. 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	72%	Accomplishing
Classroom Instruction	87%	Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement
Assessment and Timing	100%	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.

- During the implementation of the existing schedule designated for the bimonthly collaborative planning for teachers and school leaders to analyze disaggregated data, it is recommended to emphasize connections for using data to support special education and multilingual learner groups as requested by teachers and parents. Communicate the plan on how the team(s) will monitor student engagement and performance, and make instructional decisions.

- Provide job-embedded professional learning and student-centered coaching focused on high-leverage differentiation strategies designed specifically to support multilingual learners, students receiving special education services, and students who are not yet meeting learning standards.

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Curriculum and Instruction	High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and assessments 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 provided is aligned with the LEA documents provided to MSDE.

This school review highlights the LEA's emphasis on belonging, growing, and succeeding toward becoming world-class learners as this was evident in the classrooms reviewed.

- The learning environment was supportive of fostering student thinking. All fourteen classrooms reviewed resonated with positive and respectful student/teacher interactions, as well as student-peer interactions.

- One hundred percent of the classrooms reviewed showed evidence of the schoolwide reward system and reinforcement charts in use and effective with the consistent use of verbal praise.

- The learning environment created conditions that implemented multiple strategies for differentiation and questioning techniques. Examples of this were seen in all reading classes as teachers used scaffolds to support student reading interventions, students worked in small groups or partner activities, and in math classes, students used manipulative tools to support instructional strategies.

- According to the Folger McKinsey professional development calendar, the school engages in a quarterly assessment data analysis protocol to identify students who require intervention responses to support them in meeting grade-level expectations. Following the identification of students, monthly collaborative planning sessions are also used to design instructional support to help students meet grade-level expectations.

- According to the majority of the participants in both the school leadership and teacher focus groups, the school uses data from the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), iReady, and Class Dojo to support students who need academic and social and emotional support.

- Both teachers and school leaders focus groups mentioned and agreed that the Beginning of Year (BOY), Mid-Year (MOY), and End of Year (EOY) iReady Diagnostics for reading and math, quarterly county-wide benchmarks, CogAT (Cognitive Abilities Test) are administered to improve instruction. They further stated that the LEA implemented an incentive called "Pause, Remediate, Extend" week for teachers to collect data to improve instruction and change instructional groupings.

- During classroom reviews, reviewers noted that at least one higher-order question was asked in each classroom.

Students benefited from the explicit instruction and collaborative learning groups that were provided in each classroom reviewed.

- Three of the four classrooms focused on reading instruction in the early elementary grades grounded in the science of reading.

- Data collected from these same classrooms featured: students working on decoding, recognizing rhyming words, manipulating sounds in words, reading aloud for fluency practice and students engaging in small group instruction with the teacher.

The mathematics instruction students received was aligned with the LEA curriculum and used evidence-based instructional strategies. All math classes presented objectives with instructional goals clearly communicated in student-friendly language. Students were engaged in content that matched the Maryland State Standards for Mathematics (MSSM) rigorous grade-level expectations.

- Mathematics skills, vocabulary, concepts, and assessments are the focus of instruction and challenge student thinking through the standards of mathematical practices (SMP). For example, a math teacher specifically asked students to explain how they used benchmark fractions to place equivalent fractions on a number line. Students were asked how the fractions compared to one-half and if they solved the problems in the most efficient way possible.

- All three of the mathematics classrooms reviewed provided one or more of the following pieces of evidence: students used fraction bars, number lines, fraction models, whiteboards, and graphic representations of decimals to support the division of fractions. Students also used plastic coins to represent tenths. Students were further asked to justify and explain the fraction 9/8 and why it did not fit on the number line.

- In one math class, students were encouraged to use multiple strategies and explain which strategy was the most efficient.

- In 93% or more of the fourteen classrooms reviewed, two or more types of evidence were a shared learning experience for students as evidenced by: students engaging with content in small group discussions that required problem-solving, responding to questions, and listening and speaking to each other with the content vocabulary.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

Evidence of at least one student disengaged from the learning was seen in each classroom visited. While the school is to be commended for the number of differentiation and scaffolding strategies used during instructional delivery, it did not go unnoticed that disengaged students checked out of learning.

- In thirteen of the fourteen classrooms reviewed, collaborative learning and student groups were evident; however, the current classroom structure lacked the opportunity for students to monitor their own learning and develop strategies for individual learning needs by assigning specific roles to student group work.

- During stakeholder focus discussions neither of the seven school leaders nor the ten teachers spoke to how other instructional resource staff was used to support instruction.

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

During the implementation of the existing schedule designated for the bimonthly collaborative planning for teachers and school leaders to analyze disaggregated data, it is recommended to emphasize connections for using data to support special education and multilingual learner groups as requested by teachers and parents. Communicate the plan on how the team(s) will monitor student engagement and performance, and make instructional decisions.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Consider providing bi-monthly collaborative planning for all instructional staff on analyzing and disaggregating student data to meet the needs of all learners and to make instructional adjustments as needed.

- Implement a monitoring system that regularly reviews and adjusts daily instruction and instructional strategies for students not meeting grade-level growth and expectations.

RESOURCES:

1. Data Analysis - CFIP

2. How to Monitor Student Progress in the Classroom

FOCUS AREA 2

Provide job-embedded professional learning and student-centered coaching focused on high-leverage differentiation strategies designed specifically to support multilingual learners, students receiving special education services, and students who are not yet meeting learning standards.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Provide job-embedded professional learning to support all instructional staff with high-leverage differentiation strategies that support multilingual learners, students in target education programs, and students not meeting grade-level expectancies.

RESOURCES:

1. Differentiated Instruction

2. Working with Paraprofessionals

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Jill Snell, Coordinator, Baltimore County Public Schools

2. Tiffany Tresler, Principal, Howard County Public Schools

3. Elizabeth Danielle Hazelwood, Teacher, Garrett County Public Schools

4. Roman Ganoe, Teacher, Washington County Public Schools

5. Sara Nathan, Teacher, Montgomery County Public Schools

6. Jennifer Hernandez, Director, Baltimore County Public Schools

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, February 7, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, February 8, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Fourteen

Description of Classroom Visited

Wednesday, February 7, 2024	Thursday, February 8, 2024
- Wellness & ELA 3rd - Science Intervention 1st grade - Reading Intervention 1st grade - Advanced Math 5th grade - Math 2nd grade - ELA 3rd grade - EEE STEM - ELA Kindergarten	- Wellness & ELA Intervention 2nd grade - ELA 4th grade - ELA 5th grade - Wellness & ELA 2nd grade - Math 4th grade - Math 5th grade

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Four

- 12 students
- 7 school leaders
- 10 teachers
- 9 parents

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Folger McKinsey 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.