Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 2: Student Support
Domain 3: Educator Support

Snow Hill Elementary School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

March 6-7, 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 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 SNOW HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Snow Hill Elementary School, located in Worchester County, serves a total of 379 students in grades Pk- 3rd. The enrolled population is made up of 60% White, 23% African American, 8% Hispanic, and 8% 2+ races. The school's population includes approximately 58% of students that receive free or reduced meals and 13% 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 ratings on Domains 2 and 3. The school scored its highest rating of Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement in Professional Learning and its lowest rating of Accomplishing in Observation and Feedback. A comprehensive list of measures, indicators, and ratings can be found in the full School Review Rubric in Appendix B.

Domain 2: Student Support		
Indicator	**Percentage**	**Rating**
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	85%	**Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement**
Opportunities and Access	83%	**Accomplishing**

Domain 3: Educator Support		
Indicator	**Percentage**	**Rating**
Observation and Feedback	62%	**Accomplishing**
Professional Learning	88%	**Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement**
Career Growth	75%	**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.

- Clarify and/or provide training to staff on the observation and feedback timelines/requirement processes at the school. Specifically address the roles central office personnel play in the observation and feedback process. Ensure routine pre-conference requirements are followed and that timely feedback and observation measures are provided for all staff members to effectively support professional development and enhance student outcomes.

Domain 2: Student Support

Student Support	Schools use data to identify students and implement a multi-tiered approach to support all student groups.

Findings and Recommendations

STRENGTHS

The school has developed a continuum of integrated academic, social, emotional, and behavioral supports to support students' academic progress.

- School leaders in the focus group reported that the school has implemented a well-established system to screen students and provide support across various needs.

- In the teachers and school leader focus group, it was shared that there are multiple data-driven practices in place, including iReady diagnostics and DIBELS evaluations to track students reading levels toward mastery.

- Teachers in the teacher's focus group shared that there is a consistent focus on differentiating instruction based on data and addressing needs via Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS).

- In the different focus groups, it was shared that there is a proactive model for behavioral support, where staff uses Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), along with restorative practices to address student needs effectively.

1. Parents in the focus group survey, eleven out of eleven parents shared that they are happy with the level of support that students are provided by the school and the communication that is shared with them at the school/.

2. In the student focus group survey, seventeen out of nineteen students indicated that they feel supported at the school, and nineteen out of nineteen students shared that they have access to a caring adult at the school who they can approach if they have a problem at school.

There is an established well-structured plan at the school that appoints qualified personnel to ensure that the mental well-being of students is addressed.

- The leadership focus group shared that multiple partnerships with outside agencies directly support student mental health and family support.

- In the teacher's focus group, teachers shared that they have been provided with multiple positive behaviors and mental health support strategies to proactively support students' mental health.

The school actively addresses personalized student needs through real-time instructional coaching, and tailored scheduling by school leaders, and has actively matched students with identified needs assigned to the school's most effective teachers.

3. During a focus group with school leaders and teachers, it was stated that instructional coaches are available to support teachers in real time. Instructional coaches were observed providing support to teachers during classroom visits.

-   In the leadership focus group, school leaders shared the importance of tailoring schedules to match individual students' intervention and service needs, ensuring that schedules are designed with each student's unique requirements in mind.

-   Parents in the parent focus group stated that the school team aligns teachers and supports best to meet the specific needs of students at the school.

Domain 3: Educator Support

Educators Support	Educators at all levels are provided with support to improve results and shift instructional practice.

Findings and Recommendations

STRENGTHS

The school has developed a comprehensive approach to professional learning, focusing on job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with research-based practices, and grounded in data.

- In the school leader focus group, it was shared that all staff members have access to varied professional learning opportunities, including monthly half-day sessions and specialized instruction.

- Assistant principals and leadership actively disseminate a robust schedule of development opportunities, fostering staff engagement.

- The teacher focus group discussed how the School Improvement Process (SIP) allows staff to select and contribute to personalized improvement areas, such as school culture, Conscious Discipline, attendance, vocabulary, and writing, each backed by research and tailored committee work.

- In the teacher focus group, teachers stated that there is an ongoing collaboration with Salisbury University that allows for the support of novice teachers and provides leadership opportunities for more experienced teachers.

The school's data support system is structured to enable teachers and leaders to engage in continuous, job-embedded professional development. It focuses on using a collaborative, data-driven approach to enhance student learning outcomes.

- In the school leader focus group, school leaders shared how iReady diagnostic data is reviewed three times a year, guiding instructional differentiation in math and reading.

- During the school leaders' focus group, school leaders stated how data dives inform targeted instruction, with iReady consultants aiding in the development of differentiation strategies.

- Teachers and school leaders in their respective focus groups shared how data dives directly inform differentiation practices.

- In the teacher focus group survey, twelve out of thirteen teachers reported that they regularly receive dedicated time for collaborative data discussions. All thirteen teachers confirmed that they are trained on how to use disaggregated data to make informed decisions about instructional practices.

AREAS FOR GROWTH

The review focuses on the effectiveness and challenges of the observation and feedback process for teachers and leaders within the school system, aiming to foster professional growth and enhance student outcomes.

- During the teacher focus group, teachers shared that they were unclear as to why central office personnel were assigned to support the observation process.

- In the teacher focus groups, teachers stated that pre-conferences are not routinely practiced, which could affect the preparation and relevance of feedback, and that feedback timeliness is an issue, with some reports taking longer than the expected one-week turnaround, necessitating redoing observations.

- Non-classroom staff members stated they find the standard observation measures misaligned with their roles, expressing concerns about the applicability of feedback designed primarily for classroom settings.

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

Clarify and/or provide training to staff on the observation and feedback timelines/requirement processes at the school. Specifically address the roles central office personnel play in the observation and feedback process. Ensure routine pre-conference requirements are followed and that timely feedback and observation measures are provided for all staff members to effectively support professional development and enhance student outcomes.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

4. Develop communication with teachers on the guidelines on the roles of central office personnel in the observation process.

- Make pre-conference meetings a mandatory aspect of the observation process.

5. Standardize and monitor the feedback timeline to ensure it does not exceed one week.

- Develop and implement observation and feedback criteria specific to non-classroom roles.

RESOURCES:

1. Danielson Group
2. Marzano Resources
3. Learning Forward

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Nicholas Gardiner, Teacher, Charles County Public Schools
2. Dana Peake, Coordinator, Washington County Public Schools
3. Christy Renzulli, Counselor, Harford County Public Schools
4. Jessica Zentz, Coordinator, Frederick County Public Schools
5. John Reidenour, Principal, Frederick County Public Schools
6. Kelly Cleland, Specialist, Calvert County Public Schools

Site Visit Day 1

March 6, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

March 7, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Twelve

Description of Classroom Visited

Wednesday, March 6, 2024	Thursday, March 7, 2024
- ELA 1st - Math 3rd - Math 2nd - ELA K - ELA 1st - UBD 3rd - ELA 1st - Math 2nd	- Math K - Reading 2nd - Math PK - ELA 3rd

Number of Interviews

One Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Six

- 18 Students

- 9 School Leaders

- 12 Teachers

- 10 Parents

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Snow Hill 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.

[Insert the school's completed rubric checklist here.]