

# Maryland School Review

## Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Gleneig High School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

February 7-8, 2024



## Table of Contents

Overview of Maryland School Site Reviews.....	2
Executive Summary .....	4
Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction.....	7
Appendix A .....	12
Appendix B .....	14

# 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 GLENELG HIGH SCHOOL

Glenelg High School, located in Howard County, serves a total of 1,298 students in grades 9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup>. The enrolled population is made up 17% Asian, 4% African American, 7% Hispanic, 67% White. The school's population includes approximately less than 5% of students that receive free or reduced meals and 7% 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 Curriculum and Instructional Materials 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	100%	Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement
Classroom Instruction	86%	Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement
Assessment and Timing	80%	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 additional opportunities for professional development for all teachers that are job-embedded, aligned to research-based practices, and grounded in data. Provide differentiated professional development for staff: instructional strategies, student engagement, and student-driven instruction.
- Emphasize professional development on differentiating instruction based on individual student needs such providing specific modifications for students with 504s, IEPs or EL plans.

## 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 LEA's website emphasizes the commitment to four overarching commitments: valuing every stakeholder to ensure they feel empowered, connecting with students and staff to create a safe nurturing environment to help all thrive, develop and utilize supports to help every person reach milestones for success; and empower schools, families, and the community are invested and share in student achievement and well-being.

- During the site visit, evidence of the LEA curriculum was visible in the sixteen classes reviewed. Additionally, during focus group discussions stakeholders explicitly included evidence statements connected to curriculum components and training.

Within the school, the classroom learning environment was positive and supportive to allow teaching and learning interaction that incorporated impactful instruction.

- In all sixteen classrooms reviewed, student interactions with their peers and the teacher were positive and respectful. Student responses to the teacher and each other were appropriate and polite as students comfortably took positive risks answering challenging questions. In fifteen of the classrooms reviewed, the teacher interaction with students was reciprocal as students were addressed with polite, kind, and energetic statements and received positive reinforcement and praise.
- Ten of the sixteen classrooms, reviewers noted that teachers provided instructional materials and resources that were modified to support individualized student learning such as: online and print resources, texts provided at multiple levels, and multiple ways for students to demonstrate understanding. Within those twelve classrooms, teachers provided a variety of instructional strategies to support student learning including: discussions, modeling, and direct instruction.
- In twelve of the sixteen classrooms, a variety of differentiation was used as evidenced by, scaffolding to support student learning; small-group instruction, 1:1 instruction, gesturing, verbal prompting, cloze notes, Cornell notes, graphic organizers, and English Learners (EL) resources.

The school learning environment provided evidence of explicit instruction that was intentional and supportive of student learning needs that included questioning and feedback aligned to the learning objectives.

- Explicit instruction was visible in 100% of the classrooms reviewed, displayed, and referred to objectives throughout the lesson.
- Thirteen out of sixteen classrooms showed teachers guiding student practice and providing feedback by: circulating the room, asking clarifying questions, and working 1:1 with students who had questions.
- In twelve out of sixteen classrooms, reviewers saw teachers utilizing academic vocabulary in their classrooms; therefore, making relationships between skills being taught and what would be seen on standardized tests. Students implemented vocab in their dialogue with each other.
- Interventions that are grounded in the science of reading instruction was evident in all five of the classrooms with support for new and struggling readers who were not meeting course demands.

Collaborative learning was evident in the majority of the classrooms reviewed.

- In twelve of the sixteen classrooms, students collaborated in groups or pairs to solve problems, work on assignments and answer questions within the use of station rotation activities, turn and talk opportunities, partner pairs, and group discussions.
- In those same classrooms, peer-to-peer learning was evidenced by students providing helpful responses about an assignment as students collaborated with each other to solve problems, provided answers to each other, asked probing questions, and provided peer feedback.
- During the teacher focus group discussion, one teacher remarked, "My class is heavy on group work. I try to emphasize how well they work in their groups and seems to make kids more excited to work in a group."
- In all four of the mathematics classrooms reviewed, goals were visible in student-friendly language with standard-aligned vocabulary. The standards and objective were posted on the board and teachers consistently addressed them and revisited the goal for the day during instruction.
- In four out of the four classrooms, students engaged in purposeful discourse using mathematical language seen in conversations between teachers and students, and in student groups when solving problems.
- One hundred percent of the mathematics classrooms reviewed, students were engaging in tasks that require sense-making, critiquing reasoning of others, and constructing arguments/justifications to explain their thinking. Students used multiple ways to approach a problem, connections to real life, opportunities to explain answers.

## AREAS FOR GROWTH

Provide professional development for all instructional staff on increasing opportunities for student-driven learning to support peer-to-peer academic acceleration.

- Student-driven learning was evident in less than 60% of classrooms reviewed. In nine out of sixteen classrooms reviewed, students presented and shared content, volunteered to answer questions, wrote explanations on the board, and created questions. Furthermore, in eight out of sixteen classrooms, students provided helpful responses about an assignment, product, or answer to each other, and worked in groups providing helpful answers to each other as they worked on group assignments.

- During the principal interview, it was stated the professional development that is given to teachers that are using interventions. The LEA focused on 24 teachers that were trained with intensive professional development on interventions and program approaches with fidelity.
- The majority of all four stakeholder groups acknowledged knowing about the LEA "redo policy". However, there is confusion about who can use the policy, when and where it applies, and who is not eligible and why those students are not eligible.

## 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 additional opportunities for professional development for all teachers that are job-embedded, aligned to research-based practices, and grounded in data. Elevate differentiated professional development for staff: instructional strategies, student engagement, and student-driven instruction.

#### ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Develop structures that support the implementation of the county funded professional development and calibrate all instructional staff on delivery methods.
- The school leadership team should analyze the current monitoring system to regularly ensure the target growth for improving instructional practice(s) is moving toward and meeting goals.

#### RESOURCES:

1. [How to Implement Active Learning Strategies and Activities Into Your Classroom](#)
2. [Learning From Instructional Rounds](#)

**FOCUS AREA 2**

Emphasize professional development on differentiating instruction based on individual student needs such providing specific modifications for students with 504s, IEPs or EL plans. More opportunities could have been provided to extend learning.

**ACTION STEPS:**

As a result of this school review:

- Increase opportunities to extend learning beyond the “one size fits all” approach and incorporate strategies that are more project based and non-traditional.

**RESOURCES:**

1. [The Shift to Student-Led](#)
2. [Universal Design for Learning \(UDL\): What You Need to Know](#)

# Appendix A

## SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

### Expert Review Team Members

1. Ashley Warfield, Assistant Principal, Carroll County Public Schools
2. Laila Watkins, Teacher Specialist, Frederick County Public Schools
3. Stephanie Ware, Principal, Frederick County Public Schools
4. Laurie Jenkins, Retired, Montgomery County Public Schools
5. Chris Beers-Arthur, Coordinator, Frederick County Public Schools
6. Stacey Kohnitsky, Retired, Montgomery County Public Schools

### Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, February 7, 2024

### Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, February 8, 2024

### Number of Classroom Reviewed

Twelve

### Description of Classroom Visited

Wednesday, February 7, 2024	Thursday, February 8, 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Art 2</li> <li>• English 9</li> <li>• Biology</li> <li>• AP Statistics</li> <li>• Geometry</li> <li>• Algebra 2</li> <li>• English 9</li> <li>• US History</li> <li>• Biology</li> <li>• Strategic Reading 1 &amp;2</li> <li>• English 11</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Algebra 1</li> <li>• US History</li> <li>• AP Spanish 5</li> <li>• AP English 12</li> <li>• Earth &amp; Space Science</li> </ul>

---

### Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

### Number of Focus Groups

Four

- 9 students
- 10 school leaders
- 10 teachers
- 6 parents

### Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

## Appendix B

### MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

#### Ratings for Glenelg High 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.