Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Linganore High School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

January 24-25, 2024

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 domain one, 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 LINGANORE HIGH SCHOOL

Linganore High School, located in Frederick County, serves a total of 1,519 students in grades 9th - 12th. The enrolled population is made up of 4% African American, 3% Asian, 9% Hispanic, and 79% White. The school's population includes approximately 9% of students that receive free or reduced meals and 11% 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 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	81%	Accomplishing
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.

- Implement an informal observation process that includes regular learning walks, content look-fors and expected non-negotiables for all departments and staff to share best practices for student-driven learning opportunities. Conduct regular cross-team informal observations and monitor evidence for trends of strengths and growths.

- Adopt the practice of regular and periodic review of disaggregated data to identify any gaps in access, opportunity, or outcomes for student demographic groups.

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 promises to reach, challenge, prepare and empower young people, no matter who they are no matter their backgrounds or circumstances, to ensure they can succeed in college and careers for a global society.

The school learning environment fosters academic growth as evidenced by differentiation and strategic questioning designed to increase the cognitive demand of students was consistently used throughout the classrooms schoolwide.

- All twelve of the classrooms visited, teacher/student interactions were positive and respectful as evidenced by positive reinforcement and/or a positive behavior system. Content lessons were presented through multiple modalities such as paper, electronic, discussion, and opportunities for speaking and listening.

- Evidence of scaffolded learning – (i.e., graphic organizer, building knowledge, modeling instruction, and adapting instruction to meet student needs) was present in nine of the twelve classrooms reviewed.

- Student engagement with higher-order questions was evident in nine of the twelve classrooms as teachers consistently asked questions that required students to cite evidence and justify their answers, and respond to open-ended questions posed to the entire class.

- Similarly, in the same nine classes, teachers consistently provided feedback to students throughout the lesson as students provided oral responses and written work samples. Additionally, there was evidence of teachers providing multiple ways to check student understanding: checking written answers, and verbal and visual check-ins.

Explicit instruction and literacy at the secondary level were evident as most of the students were engaged in lessons designed with the student learning objective in mind.

- The main point of the lesson, objective, and/or expectations were reinforced by the teacher during explicit instruction. In eleven of the twelve classes reviewed, teachers guided instruction by providing support and feedback, circulated to individual students, directed students to edit work based on teacher-provided clarifications, and answered individual questions to help student find answers.

- Nine out of twelve classes showed evidence of the teacher focusing on critical skills such as: providing vocabulary instruction, providing word banks, and explicitly teaching concepts. Additionally, in the same classes, there was evidence of gradual release, teachers modeling, students trying to work with a partner or group, and students completing instructional tasks individually.

Collaborative learning was evident in most of the classrooms reviewed.

- Students worked in groups or partners to complete a task in eight of the twelve classrooms reviewed, as well as discussed and shared various views about the task, materials, and lesson.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

Increase opportunities for students to expand their thinking and take ownership of the cognitive demand.

- In twelve classrooms of various content, there was limited evidence of feedback that addressed content specifically and led teachers to adjust instruction based on student responses.

- In five out of the twelve classrooms reviewed, students were expected to question and challenge peers to justify answers. However, opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking during tasks in all classrooms were not evident.

- Out of the twelve classrooms reviewed, two classrooms provided space for students to share definitions and responses and one other classroom provided evidence of students leading discussions. However, structured lessons that included collaborative learning opportunities that provide students with high-demand tasks requiring them to drive the learning was not evident.

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

Implement an informal observation process that includes regular learning walks, content look-fors, and expected non-negotiables for all departments and staff to learn from peers that implement student-driven learning opportunities. Conduct regular cross-team informal observations and monitor evidence for trends of strengths and growth.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Design structures that build on the current collaborative learning systems to support teachers in developing lessons that increase student-led learning.

- Begin to adopt the practice of regular and periodic review of disaggregated data to identify any gaps in access, opportunity, or outcomes for student demographic groups.

RESOURCES:

1. GROUP WORK: Using cooperative learning groups effectively

2. Learning From Instructional Rounds

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Ashley Warfield, Assistant Principal, Carroll County Public Schools

2. Dr. David Stone, Assistant Vice President, Operations, Kennedy Krieger Schools

3. Danielle Ellis, Program Director, New Leaders- Non Profit

4. Dr. Martha James, Associate Professor/Accreditation Coordinator, Morgan State University

5. Scott Ruehl, Director of Leadership Development, Howard County Public Schools

6. Jacob Goldberg, Data Coach, Prince George's County Public Schools

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, January 24, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, January 25, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Twelve

Description of Classroom Visited

Wednesday, January 24, 2024	Thursday, January 25, 2024
- English 10 - English 9 - ELA 10 - Chemistry H - Geometry M CT - Algebra 2 - Algebra 1 Special Education	- Algebra 1A - Algebra 1B 9/11 - English 11 - Hort 1 - Biology H

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Six

- 16 students (2 groups)
- 16 school leaders (2 groups)
- 10 teachers
- 8 parents

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Linganore 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.