

Maryland School Review

Expert Review Team Report

Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction

Liberty High School

Maryland State Department of Education

Office of Teaching and Learning

March 6-7, 2024



Table of Contents

Overview of Maryland School Site Reviews.....	2
Executive Summary	4
Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction.....	7
Appendix A	10
Appendix B	12

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 LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL

Liberty High School, located in Carroll County, serves a total of 994 students in grades 9th – 12th. The enrolled population is made up of 6% Asians, 6.2% African American, 13% Hispanic and 78% White. The school's population includes approximately 13.5% 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 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	63%	Accomplishing
Classroom Instruction	75%	Accomplishing
Assessment and Timing	70%	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 professional development on differentiation and collaboration to increase student achievement and adjust the monitoring system to ensure it is consistently utilized with fidelity.
- Include a job-embedded professional learning series on research-based instructional practices that allow for collaborative and student-driven learning. Utilize collaborative groupings in class to focus on a specific goal, outline student expectations and roles, and provide purposeful grouping based on student needs and data.

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 submitted is aligned with the LEA documentation.

The school creates a learning experience that is a positive and supportive learning environment that fosters academic growth and the development of social-emotional competencies that were evident throughout the classroom reviews.

- All teacher interactions with students were positive and respectful. Student interaction with peers was evident as they willingly supported each other and remained on task in sixteen of the seventeen classrooms reviewed.
- The overall classroom climate in fourteen of the seventeen classes reviewed provided evidence of various instructional strategies. Examples include stations/rotations, timers, word banks, small group instruction, graphic organizers, and whiteboards to support student learning.
- In fourteen of the seventeen classes reviewed, evidence of scaffolded learning was seen such as, small group instruction, 1:1 adult support, partner pairings, and learning stations.
- Examples of questioning were evident in twelve out of seventeen classes. Questions were asked that required probing, inquiring, or hypothesizing. Examples included, "What did Barbara think?" "Do you have an alternate solution?" Also in mathematics classes, questions were asked that required justification or citing of evidence. Examples include, "By changing the variable how did the domains, slope, and y-intercepts change?" "How did you find your problem, do you have an alternate solution, and what must have changed between steps 2 and 4?"

AREAS FOR GROWTH

Provide continuous improvement strategies focused on collaboration and including student voice.

- In nine of the seventeen classes reviewed, students were allowed to collaborate throughout classroom lessons, however, students were not assigned a specific role when completing tasks, nor were expectations provided while working on the tasks.
- During focus group discussions, nine teacher participants spoke about how they analyze data, however, there was no discussion about how the data was used to adjust instructional practices to inform collaborative groups.

- Professional development is inconsistently implemented. All nine teachers in the focus groups reported that they received one day of professional learning from the LEA during the in-service week. As a result, determine how to implement a system of professional learning more regularly for staff and evaluate learning.

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 professional development on differentiation and collaboration to increase student achievement and adjust the monitoring system to ensure it is consistently utilized with fidelity.

ACTION STEPS:

As a result of this school review:

- Provide professional development opportunities for teachers on structured collaborative learning aligned to differentiated learning strategies.
- Leverage the current structures for teacher planning to implement peer-to-peer learning opportunities with classroom teachers who currently implement collaborative learning as model classrooms.
- Utilize the current monitoring system to ensure that the professional learning is implemented with fidelity.

RESOURCES:

1. [10 Strategies to Build on Student Collaboration in the Classroom.](#)
2. [Learning From Instructional Rounds](#)
3. [Leveraging Teacher Leadership](#)

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EXPERT REVIEW TEAM ACTIVITIES

Expert Review Team Members

1. Shawn Mitchell, Teacher, Prince George’s County Public Schools
2. Elaine Gorman, Retired Administrator, Maryland and New York
3. Dr. Seth Barish, Principal, Baltimore County Public Schools
4. Stephanie Ware, Principal, Frederick County Public Schools
5. Tanya Montgomery - Principal – Department of Juvenile Services
6. Rebecca Casserly- Kindergarten Teacher, Baltimore County Public Schools

Site Visit Day 1

Wednesday, March 6, 2024

Site Visit Day 2

Thursday, March 7, 2024

Number of Classroom Reviewed

Seventeen

Description of Classroom Visited

Wednesday, March 6, 2024	Thursday, March 7, 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy • AP Capstone • Geometry • AP Computer Science • ESOL • Algebra 1 • Advanced Topics in Chemistry • English 10 • Health • Foundations of Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algebra 2 • Government • World History • AP Spanish • Jazz Ensemble • Drama, Case Ag

Number of Interviews

One

- Principal

Number of Focus Groups

Four

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

Documents Analyzed

- Site visit documentation submitted by the school and LEA.

Appendix B

MARYLAND SCHOOL REVIEW RUBRIC

Ratings for Liberty 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.