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The Quality Review Report

The Quality Review is a two-day school visit by an experienced educator. During the review, the reviewer visits classrooms, talks with parents, students, teachers, and school leaders and uses a rubric to evaluate how well the school is organized to support student achievement.

The Quality Review Report provides a rating for all ten indicators of the Quality Review Rubric in three categories: Instructional Core, School Culture, and Systems for Improvement. One indicator is identified as the Area of Celebration to highlight an area in which the school does well to support student learning and achievement. One indicator is identified as the Area of Focus to highlight an area the school should work on to support student learning and achievement. The remaining indicators are identified as Additional Finding. This report presents written findings, impact, and site-specific supporting evidence for six indicators.

Information about the School

Mott Hall V serves students in grade 6 through grade 12. You will find information about this school, including enrollment, attendance, student demographics, and data regarding academic performance, at http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/report/default.htm.

School Quality Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Core</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent does the school...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Ensure engaging, rigorous, and coherent curricula in all subjects, accessible for a variety of learners and aligned to Common Core Learning Standards and/or content standards</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best that is informed by the instructional shifts and Danielson Framework for Teaching, aligned to the curricula, engaging, and meets the needs of all learners so that all students produce meaningful work products</td>
<td>Area of Focus</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Align assessments to curricula, use on-going assessment and grading practices, and analyze information on student learning outcomes to adjust instructional decisions at the team and classroom levels</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent does the school...</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Maintain a culture of mutual trust and positive attitudes that supports the academic and personal growth of students and adults</td>
<td>Area of Celebration</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Systems for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent does the school...</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Make strategic organizational decisions to support the schools instructional goals and meet student learning needs, as evidenced by meaningful student work products</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Establish a coherent vision of school improvement that is reflected in a short list of focused, data-based goals that are tracked for progress and are understood and supported by the entire school community</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Observe teachers using the Danielson Framework for Teaching along with the analysis of learning outcomes to elevate school-wide instructional practices and implement strategies that promote professional growth and reflection</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Evaluate the quality of school-level decisions, making adjustments as needed to increase the coherence of policies and practices across the school, with particular attention to the CCLS</td>
<td>Additional Finding</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area of Celebration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indicator:</th>
<th>1.4 Positive Learning Environment</th>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings
The school community has an approach to culture-building, discipline, and social-emotional support in which structures such as advisory groups and a guidance team provide supports for students’ learning needs.

Impact
The school is a safe and inclusive place, where students and adults treat each other respectfully, and where student voice is welcomed.

Supporting Evidence

- Programs are designed to include all students, especially those in transition from elementary to middle and from middle to high school. These programs include both incoming grade-six and grade-nine students. Grade-six students participate in one week of orientation before school formally begins in September, while grade-nine students attend a three-week Summer Bridge transition program. Students reported on the importance of having a preview of what school would be like and meeting other students who were also new to the school. Besides the newly adopted Leader in Me program based on Covey’s Seven Habits of Highly Effective People, the school has implemented the focused, accountable learners who are compassionate, open-minded, noble, and safe (FALCONS) expectations for several years. As one student shared, “I was antisocial. I opened-up and became a FALCON[S]. Now I belong here.” There are monthly assemblies that celebrate the diversity in the school and student accomplishments. Through an incentive program, students earn Mott Money for various practices and can spend it in earned fieldtrips and other opportunities. These programs connect with the school’s Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program that articulates behavioral expectations throughout the school. As a result, parents, students, teachers, and school leaders all report that the school is a safe and inclusive place.

- Student voice is welcomed and valued. The first assembly this year was organized by students as a pep rally to introduce the Leader in Me program. In addition, guidance staff and teachers with administrative oversight have instituted Restorative Circles for the past three years that are used to support and guide students who may have adjustment issues, are noncompliant, or have negatively interacted with others. These sessions focus on both involved parties, who are guided to state their grievances and eventually develop a resolution and agree to problem-solve the conflict. Students have learned the protocol and practices well, and spontaneously form a circle to resolve conflicts without adult guidance, thus internalizing the process. Students also create interest in new clubs that are offered to all students, along with student run activities during the senior class carnival at the beginning of the year.

- All students participate in advisory classes, which support students being known well by an adult. High school advisory class meets two to three times per week, while middle school advisory meets once a week. The Leader in Me program is introduced and communicated with students weekly during advisory. In addition, there are three guidance counselors and two deans, one for middle school and another for high school, who support students along with the new relationship with Astor Clinic and the Urban Health Clinic, which offer clinical support for students and their families for areas outside of the expertise of the guidance department.
Findings
School leaders and teachers believe that students learn best when classrooms are centered on collaborative engagement in rigorous tasks through a modified workshop structure, although this was not evident in all classes visited. Across most classrooms, teaching strategies provide multiple entry points into the curricula, but not all are strategically implemented.

Impact
Meaningful student work products are inconsistent across classes. Although there are multiple entry points, not all classrooms demonstrate high-quality supports and extensions.

Supporting Evidence

- School leaders believe that students learn best when classrooms focus on students collaboratively engaged in higher order thinking using a modified workshop model based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching. They then take intellectual risks, ask thought-provoking questions, challenge peers, and track their own personal growth and skill development. In a global history class, students moved through a series of role-plays that had them representing National Assembly representatives in the time of the French Revolution. By changing their perspectives, the students analyzed a variety of roles that represented those who wanted to work with the king to make changes, women who marched on Versailles, writers of the constitution, participants of the Reign of Terror, counter-revolutionaries, and the Austrians who declared war on France. Each point of view required background knowledge, stating a claim based on evidence, and preparation for what an oppositional point of view must present. This lesson required that students work with a partner in a small group and present an informed position through several discussions using critical thinking to arrive at supported arguments.

- Teacher-centered instruction was observed in a majority of class visits. Specifically, during another history class, most of the lesson featured the teacher presenting information and asking questions with limited opportunities for students with partners to discuss answers. During turn and talks, the teacher walked around the room, saying in a loud voice, “fifteen seconds… five seconds...” as a countdown to the time allotted for student discussion. By keeping the entire class together, asking all of the questions, and giving all students the same amount of time to process, discuss, and present answers, those who could have moved more quickly and those who needed more processing time were unable to do so. There was no evidence of multiple entry points or differentiation in the implementation of the lesson.

- Multiple entry points that were observed in some classes included differentiated planners, visual representations, student discussions with peers, diagrams, and support built into small groupings. These strategies enabled all learners, including English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities, to engage in appropriately challenging tasks and demonstrate higher order thinking skills in work products. Students used technology, questioning prompts, small group discussions, and modeling of various question categories. They demonstrated rigor through the use of Webb’s Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning levels with Blooms Taxonomy and learning objectives to show mastery. In a math class, a modified workshop lesson demonstrated an opening with an introduction of new material, followed by guided practice, student practice, an outcome, and closing. The students were organized into three different groups, demonstrating the provision of multiple entry points, with one group needing the most help, a second group that needed some help, and a third group that had mastered the lesson. During the student practice time, as students improved their skills, they moved individually from the small group to independent work on a laptop, with each student working with individualized programming.
Additional Finding

| Quality Indicator: | 1.1 Curriculum | Rating: Proficient |

Findings

School leaders and faculty review curricula to align the Common Core Learning Standards and content standards to their curricula and include instructional shifts. Curricula and academic tasks are planned and refined using student work and data, as demonstrated in unit plans, curricular maps, and lesson plans stored on Google Drive.

Impact

An analysis of student performance data confirms alignment between standards and curriculum, thus building coherence and promoting college and career readiness for all students. Diverse learners, including ELLs and students with disabilities, have access to the curricula and tasks and are cognitively engaged.

Supporting Evidence

- Common Core aligned curricula are reflected in lesson plans and posted on Google Docs in a shared drive that instructional technology staff developed with department chairs in each content area. Semi-annual curricular reviews revealed gaps and areas of focus that needed to be developed. For example, the department chair for English noticed that not enough non-fiction was being read and analyzed by students during instruction. As a result, additional non-fiction texts were integrated into the curriculum. Three years ago, the curricular review revealed that students were not engaged in rigorous tasks and a professional development (PD) collaborative was established with an outside provider to explore methods to improve student engagement by having them assume assigned roles in cooperative groups. As a result, college and career readiness was improved as teachers were able to provide more rigor and increase student involvement each year, as shared by teachers, students, and school leaders.

- Instructional shifts are focused, as in argumentative writing across content areas that involve citing evidence from sources to support an argument. Students use the restate, answer; cite evidence and explain (RACE) strategy when using information from text to support an argument or position. This shift is stressed in presenting positions in English Language Arts (ELA) along with social studies, science, and math. More specifically in math, the instructional shift is having a deeper understanding by breaking down problems and using strategies, such as solve the problem, outline the options, limit and apply the solution, verify the solution, and explain the results (SOLVE). There is also an instructional shift in ELA that stresses the balance of fiction with non-fiction texts.

- Based on their curricula, teachers administer pre-planned benchmarks archived in assessment portfolios and analyze the resulting data to determine upcoming curricular adjustments. Five data analysis days are scheduled during the year in the PD calendar to allow time for teachers to complete these reflections. Students are also given the opportunity to reflect on how they performed on these assessments and they set next steps with their teachers. Teacher teams look at both student work and teacher created tasks to refine practice and plan next steps. Common planning time for teachers of ELLs, special education, and related services is scheduled weekly to use data and student work to refine curriculum to meet the needs of different learners. Lessons are then modified to include scaffolds and other modifications to allow entry points for these students.
Additional Finding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indicator:</th>
<th>2.2 Assessment</th>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings
Teachers use common assessments to determine student progress toward goals with baselines, pre- and post-tests, and mock State assessments. Teachers use checks for understanding that include walkarounds, exit slips, Do Now, questioning, and thumbs-up along with student self-assessment and reflection.

Impact
Results from common assessments, checks for understanding, and student self-assessments are effectively used to adjust curricula and instruction to meet all students’ learning needs.

Supporting Evidence

- Departments have developed a series of assessments aligned to State standards that are administered during scheduled interim assessment days. Data days provide time for teachers to reflect on and analyze these results. Teacher teams look at the previous year’s State exam data, New York State English as a Second Language Assessment Test (NYSESLAT) data, and Regents item analyses in order to identify anchor standards and gaps in the previous year’s curriculum. The curricula are then adjusted to help close gaps and reinforce anchor standards. In addition, schoolwide student literacy is assessed at the beginning of the year through an iReady diagnostic and results are shared schoolwide so that teachers can plan to meet the needs of all of their students across content areas. Math data through iReady are also analyzed in grades six through eight and used to inform Academic Intervention Services (AIS) and extension groups, and to identify the content to be retaught. In grades six through eight, both ELA and math are assessed at mid-year and in late spring to adjust these groups and measure progress.

- Baseline assessments administered in fall 2018 were analyzed for each course in the high school, with each teacher developing an action plan to meet the challenges presented by the data. Each action plan includes an analysis of learning standards or traits in which students scored the most points and those areas where students scored the least, called the top areas for growth. Based on this data, the action plans list the specific learning objective or skill that needs to be mastered, the implementation timeline, and specific activities. Further, there are equity findings that focus on students with disabilities, ELLs, and former ELLs compared with their general education peers. If there are disparities, then interventions are described and when they will be introduced. Finally, the plan lists grouping implications that indicate which specific students in each period will need targeted supports or learning extensions based on their needs.

- Teachers check for understanding in a variety of methods. They check in the middle of the lesson by strategically walking around, and explicitly modeling again after giving students an opportunity to start. They pause and ask questions while modeling. They follow-up by backtracking and reteaching. When there are two teachers in a class, one teacher circulates around the room while the other checks-in with individual students. At the end of the lesson, teachers have students respond with exit tickets and student reflections. Time to reteach or revisit is built into the weekly schedule. In high school, math is taught daily Monday through Wednesday. Thursday is called spiral day, which is reteaching day, with Friday driving what will happen the next week. Class discussions also include questions that are leveled; follow-up can be in small groups. According to teachers and students, students self-assess their own work in a variety of ways. They use rubrics, answer keys in math and science, and corrections on tests that they can retake. Self-reflections include a data tracker that each student fills out to keep track of assessment scores. There are also sections for strengths and “What can I do differently?” where students focus on specific learning standards and follow-up strategies. For example, a student wrote that he needed to “determine a theme by analyzing the relationships with characters.”
Additional Finding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indicator:</th>
<th>3.4 High Expectations</th>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings

School leaders provide training and consistently communicate high expectations through handbooks, weekly calendars, monthly newsletters, teacher observation feedback, emails, and post-its. Teacher teams and staff establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to students through the advisory classes, FALCON approach, and *Leader in Me* sessions.

Impact

Staff knows, understands, and is accountable to the school leaders' expectations. Students are prepared for the next level through the ongoing and detailed feedback and guidance supports.

Supporting Evidence

- School leaders held a PD session at the beginning of the school year that was called “Year of P+R²” (Pause + Rigor and Relationship). This training introduced the *Leader in Me / 7 Habits of Highly Successful People* to the entire staff. The presentation connected the mission, vision, and school goals to *Leader in Me* and the development of the Lighthouse Team, made up of teachers and administrators who guide its implementation. In order to ensure accountability, a mid-year survey was administered to all staff and students with results shared with school leaders and the School Leadership Team (SLT). Last year’s results showed improvement from the beginning of the year and were consistent with the results of the Learning Environment Survey (LES). Survey takers were asked one thing you want to improve at the school. The staff also developed accountability partners with each other and shared that they feel they are more honest and open with each other as a result.

- Instructional expectations are listed in the staff handbook under four distinct headings: All of our collaborations will center on student learning, structured portfolio with trackers and feedback, school-wide literacy, and classroom expectations. School leaders evaluate how well high expectations are being implemented in the school through regular observations, walkthroughs, Advance ratings, feedback to teachers, and by reviewing lesson plans and tasks. Teachers shared that the impact of teacher teams on curricula is through department meetings, where teachers work collaboratively to break down and modify tasks to differentiate instruction for groups of students. A specific example referred to the newly introduced Global History Regents exam and the preparation that was needed to update and revise the curriculum. The social studies department created a series of meetings to address the situation by developing and teaching the new curricula and reflect on how well the students were learning through the new design.

- Staff teaches the FALCONS expectations, starting with incoming grade-six students during a summer orientation. The student handbook is reviewed at the beginning of each year with students in their advisory classes. FALCONS expectations are recognized and rewarded through a PBIS structure of “Mott Money” and raffles. Students are also recognized in grade-level assemblies for meeting these expectations. In addition, to monitor the expectation that students be present and punctual every day to learn, the attendance committee meets weekly to work with students and families who are not meeting attendance expectations. Grade teams follow up with incentives for students meeting expectations. Grade teams hold assemblies for students to review expectations throughout the year and highlight students meeting these through spirit days and awards. Anecdotal attendance data is reviewed weekly in the high school and followed up with consequences for lateness or anecdotal write ups in Skedula. Restorative circles are developed to address needs of students not meeting expectations, such as chronic lateness, being out of uniform, or cell phone violations.
### Additional Finding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indicator:</th>
<th>4.2 Teacher Teams and Leadership Development</th>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings**

Teacher teams consistently analyze data and student work for students they share. Distributed leadership structures are in place.

**Impact**

The analysis of student work products leads to improved teacher practice and progress toward classroom goals for groups of students. Distributed leadership structures empower teachers to serve in positions such as department chairs, grade level leaders, and Lighthouse committee members so that they build leadership capacity and have a voice in decision making.

**Supporting Evidence**

- After each marking period, teachers receive scholarship reports to reflect on student achievement in their own courses and collectively as departments. Teacher teams, in departments, analyze data from their portfolio assessment benchmarks, and analyze student work samples to develop curricular adjustments and instructional next steps. The Instructional Team, made up of department chairs and the Grade Leader Team, meet regularly to report on their teams’ work in these areas and propose schoolwide shifts and next steps based on data. Deans, the guidance department, and school leaders meet weekly to review academic and attendance data and discuss individual students who need support beyond what individual teachers or teacher teams can provide. As a result, last year, there was an increase in the end of the school year Advance ratings compared with the beginning of the year. Teachers who needed additional structured support last year improved significantly and are no longer in need of structured support this year.

- A middle school math team meeting was observed. One teacher presented her grade-six problem-solving task along with student work samples, while team members used a tuning protocol to examine the work. Students had worked in small table groups on ratio relationships. Each table had a different problem and student groups were given the rate and the situation and how it would have been represented using the x and y axis. After the students worked together, their chosen strategy was written with graphics onto chart paper and displayed for the other groups to examine. As part of the tuning process, each team member’s feedback was given as warm or cool. An example of warm feedback was that there were columns evident on each chart. Cool feedback included the suggestion that students might want to check-in before they put the information on chart paper. Additional feedback included that teacher team mates appreciated that questions and problems were differentiated and “not cookie-cutter.” After discussing the process, the team decided to bring in examples of additional student work where they were unsuccessful for the next meeting to determine whether there were common attributes.

- There are multiple opportunities for teachers to develop their leadership skills as members of the SLT, department chairs, grade level team leaders, and Lighthouse Committee members who lead the implementation of the *Leader in Me* initiative. There used to be two teacher-leaders and now there are five. In communication with the entire staff, department chairs who contributed to instructional improvements recognized those who shared their portfolio practices; another who collaborated with the literacy department to incorporate informational responses aligned to the two-point writing rubric; and a department chair who invited team members to lunch with work sessions to support individual teacher’s needs.