Asbury Park High School
2-13-2007 to 2-20-2007

Introduction

The New Jersey Department of Education conducted a CAPA (Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement) review of Asbury Park High School on 2-13 to 2-20-2007. This school is designated as “in need of improvement” for three or four consecutive years as defined in the NJ Accountability Workbook. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) §1117: School Support and Recognition requires that the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) create and maintain a statewide system of intensive and sustained support for those Title I schools designated as “in need of improvement” for more than two consecutive years. As part of this required support system, the NJDOE developed the CAPA review process, which assigns teams of skillful and experienced individuals to provide schools with practical, applicable, and helpful assistance, increasing the opportunity for all students to meet the state’s Core Curriculum Content Standards.

The CAPA review team activities included:
- a review of the documents collected for the school portfolio and data profile;
- 105 classroom observations;
- general observations, such as morning and afternoon arrival and dismissal, lunch in the cafeteria, and student restrooms;
- 78 interviews with teachers;
- 11 interviews with building leadership and administrators;
- 5 interviews with district administrators;
- 127 interviews with students;
- 46 interviews with school and student support staff; and
- 11 interviews with parents.

Following the study of documentation and the conducting of interviews and observations, the team discussed each standard and its indicators. Based on these findings, the team offered its recommendations.
CAPA team members and their affiliations included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM POSITION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>John P. Delaney</td>
<td>NJ Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Liaison</td>
<td>Patricia Moran</td>
<td>Asbury Park School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Edwin Kiess</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>Keisha Smith-Carrington</td>
<td>NJ Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Mitchell</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Language Arts</td>
<td>Anthony Tirrell</td>
<td>Asbury Park School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Specialist</td>
<td>Susan Hinkle</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Mathematics Specialist</td>
<td>Anna Maria Graf</td>
<td>Asbury Park School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Specialist</td>
<td>Joseph Jakubowski</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Special Education Specialist</td>
<td>William Shannon</td>
<td>Asbury Park School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education Specialist/PD</td>
<td>Eloisa DeJesus Craig</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Bilingual Education</td>
<td>No person identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Services or Equity Specialist</td>
<td>Thomas Gambino</td>
<td>NJ Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution of Higher Education</td>
<td>No person identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Guardian or Grandparent</td>
<td>Kelly Edwards</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE Liaison</td>
<td>James McBee</td>
<td>NJ Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Academic Performance Standards
The following Academic Performance Standards address curriculum, classroom evaluation/assessment, and instruction.

**Standard 1:** The school implements a curriculum that is rigorous, intentional, and aligned to state and local standards.

**Standard 2:** Multiple evaluation and assessment strategies are used to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

**Standard 3:** The school’s instructional program actively engages all students by using effective, varied, and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.

**School Learning Environment Standards**
The following Learning Environment Standards address school culture; student, family, and community support; and professional growth, development, and evaluation.

**Standard 4:** The school functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

**Standard 5:** The school works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career, and developmental needs of students consistent with 6A:10A-3.6 Supports for Parents and Families and NCLB §1118 Parental Involvement.

**Standard 6:** The school provides research-based, results-driven professional development opportunities for staff and implements performance evaluation procedures in order to improve teaching and learning.

**School Efficiency Standards**
The following Efficiency Standards address leadership, school culture and resources, and comprehensive and effective planning.

**Standard 7:** School instructional decisions focus on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction, high performance expectations, creating a learning culture, and developing leadership capacity.

**Standard 8:** There is evidence that the school is organized to maximize use of all available resources to support high student and staff performance.

**Standard 9:** School leadership and the SLC or NCLB planning committee communicate a clear purpose, direction, and strategies focused on teaching and learning through the development, implementation, and evaluation of the following: vision, goals, NCLB school improvement plan, and report on instructional priorities for Abbott schools.
**District Academic Performance Standards**
The following Academic Performance Standards address curriculum, classroom evaluation/assessment, and instruction.

**Standard 1:** The district P-12 curriculum is rigorous and aligned to state standards.

**Standard 2:** The district and school uses multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

**Standard 3:** The district’s instructional program actively engages all students by using effective, varied, and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.

**District Learning Environment Standards**
The following Learning Environment Standards address school culture; student, family, and community support; and professional growth, development, and evaluation.

**Standard 4:** The district functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

**Standard 5:** The district works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career, and developmental needs of students consistent with 6A:10A-3.6 Supports for Parents and Families and NCLB §1118 Parental Involvement.

**Standard 6:** The district provides professional development opportunities based on an evaluation of individual and collective teacher needs.

**District Efficiency Standards**
The following Efficiency Standards address leadership, school culture and resources, and comprehensive and effective planning.

**Standard 7:** District instructional decisions focus on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction, high performance expectations, creating a learning culture, and developing leadership capacity.

**Standard 8:** The district is organized to maximize use of all available resources to support schools in achieving high student and staff performance.

**Standard 9:** District leadership and the SLC or NCLB planning committee communicate a clear purpose, direction, and strategies focused on teaching and learning through the development, implementation, and evaluation of the following: vision, goals, NCLB district improvement plan, and report on instructional priorities for Abbott districts.
COMMENDATIONS

SCHOOL
• While it is not in the protocol of the CAPA Team to cite individuals, the team wishes to acknowledge those teachers and staff who hold high expectations for their students and strive under difficult circumstances to provide quality educational preparation.

• The school is commended for the efforts put forth in designing and implementing the SPOT.

DISTRICT
• The district supervisor is commended for the quality of the mathematics curriculum documents and leadership of the mathematics program.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Asbury Park High School

Visit Date: February 13 to 20, 2007
Team Leader: Jeff Delaney
Grade Levels: 9-12
Enrollment: 508
AYP Status: AYP Missed in HSPA LAL and Mathematics

The CAPA team members, together with school and district leadership, have identified common themes emerging from the report that would have the greatest impact on student achievement. This summary represents these themes found in findings, next steps and recommendations.

WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM MODEL STATUS:
• Previous Model - SFA Mid 1990s - 2005

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
1. The school and district should develop an interdisciplinary, research-based curriculum, aligned to the NJ CCCS, which includes strategies and techniques that address the needs of the students. This curriculum should be rich with connections to post-secondary and career options and opportunities for authentic learning.
2. The school and district should establish criteria for evaluating student performance to ensure that assessments are frequent and of sufficient rigor to be true indicators of student achievement.
3. Differentiation needs greater emphasis within the professional development program of the special and general education staff. It should be an expected and monitored practice.
4. The district and school leadership should review The Bilingual Education Act (N.J.S.A. 18A:35-15 and P.L. 1974, c.197) to ensure the bilingual program meets the needs of the current ELL population.

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
1. Repair or replace various items around the school; for example, fix roof leaks, upgrade the lighting system, upgrade the heating system, repair and/or replace the non-operating kitchen equipment, the school’s security camera system, and devise a method for teachers to communicate with security or the office.
2. The school should use the CAPA surveys and rubrics (Standard 6) as a reference to improve the process of observation and evaluation. Data should be reviewed and analyzed to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses of individual professional development.

EFFICIENCY AND LEADERSHIP
1. The school leadership should restructure the high school into small learning communities.
2. Block scheduling should be introduced.
3. Serious attention should be given to the issues of low levels of staff trust and cohesiveness.
4. The SLC should become an integral part of school leadership
STANDARD 1 - CURRICULUM

The school implements a curriculum that is rigorous, intentional, and aligned to state and local standards.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:

- School and district administration, director of special services, special education teacher, general education teacher, paraprofessional, I&RS chairperson, child study team, extended school day coordinator, student, non-instructional staff, and parent interviews
- Classroom visitations and observations of hallways and classrooms

STANDARD 1 INDICATORS

1.1 The school conducts regular discussions to ensure that curriculum standards are clearly articulated across all grade levels (P-12).

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS

The school does not conduct regular discussions to ensure that curriculum standards are clearly articulated across all grade levels. The middle school language arts program is undergoing a reorganization process that has not yet reached the high school English department. During the few opportunities provided for teachers of these two buildings to gather, discussions to ensure vertical articulation do not occur.

Within the high school, the master schedule contains one period each day for each teacher labeled common planning. For many of these periods, only two English instructors are free of teaching responsibilities. There is no departmental or school central office guidance on the use of this time. Similarly, there may be other content-area teachers free during these “planning” periods who are not expected to work with the English staff to develop interdisciplinary units.

The one faculty meeting scheduled each month is not often used to discuss curriculum issues. Key transition points between and among building levels have not been identified. The professional development provided to the English department staff rarely focuses on English language arts (ELA) instruction. When ELA professional development does occur, administration and content supervisors are not scheduled to attend. This fosters a disconnect between supervision and instructional personnel.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS

No opportunities exist for formal discussion among teachers to ensure horizontal articulation of the
curriculum. Faculty who teach the same courses do not have common prep time during which they can informally discuss the curriculum for their course, and no department meetings are held which would facilitate vertical articulation within the school and provide an opportunity for teachers to review and modify the curriculum according to the students’ needs. Vertical articulation with feeder schools takes place at the district level between the district math supervisor and the elementary and middle school math facilitators. Teachers state that curriculum guides for grade levels other than their own are available, but that they must take the initiative to seek them out.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

This school year, Asbury Park High School has provided each teacher with an additional non-student contact period in addition to their preparation period. It is considered a common planning period in which meetings organized around topics provided by supervisors can be discussed. It does not afford the opportunity for horizontal or vertical articulation. These periods are not organized around any commonality, such as subject area or grade level. It is simply a collection of teachers who randomly have that period available. Therefore there is no time during the school day in which any department can meet for the purpose of evaluating and monitoring curriculum implementation based on local and state standards or student performance on classroom and state assessments. If a supervisor wishes to utilize this vehicle for discussion, they would have to select members of a particular department in each of the common planning time periods and hold sequential meetings throughout the day. This does not afford a department an opportunity to share and brainstorm ideas or to plan curricular implementation as a group. Special education ICS teachers are most often not provided an opportunity to plan daily lessons with their general education counterparts, further frustrating the notion that they function as equal members of the instructional team. This results in the general education teacher doing most of the planning, with little input from the special education teacher. Special education teachers, therefore, rely on the modifications that are provided by the CST as their daily guide. It is unclear as to how this program is monitored, other than through observations.

1.2 The school requires all students to take courses with sufficient academic rigor to prepare for post secondary education.

**FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS**

There are two elective courses in careers that all students are encouraged to take in 9th or 10th and 11th or 12th grade. There are no components of a career program in place for students during alternate years. The English curriculum documents provide few intentional connections to post-secondary and career options. There are minimal opportunities for students to apply skills, knowledge, and processes that will prepare them to be self-sufficient and productive citizens. Most instruction does not include authentic opportunities for students to apply learning, but requires literal recall or some other form of knowledge- or comprehension-level thinking skills.

**FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS**

Little evidence is found to indicate that there are connections being made in math classes to post-secondary training in math, nor is there a deliberate attempt to connect the students’ mathematics education to careers in which math is a major component. Although the curriculum contains activities which require students to apply algorithmic learning to real-life situations, there is limited evidence that this is actually happening.
An advanced placement math course is offered for those students who qualify for it; however, to date few students have been successful in passing the examination to earn college credits.

Most students do enroll in at least one of two career education courses offered through the business department and are thus exposed to career opportunities in general and are encouraged to explore their interests and aptitudes to aid them in making post-graduation choices.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION

There are no intentional connections to familiarize special education students with post-secondary and career options built into the curriculum, per se; however, some teachers have integrated discussions and activities that pertain to careers into their instruction. There is no school-wide career awareness program for the general education or the special education population. There is a life skills program provided to those students assigned to the class for cognitively impaired children. There are 15 special education students who attend the Monmouth County Vocational School program in which they receive career awareness and vocational training in various trades. Other students who have expressed a desire to attend college work closely with the special education guidance counselor in that regard. Ten students or 40% of the 2006 graduation class went on to attend college, with most attending a local community college.

All special education teachers state that they are expected to implement the general education curriculum and use the same textbook as are used in the general education classes. Although teachers are cognizant of the need to use real life examples within their instructional program, and these activities are sometimes built into the instructional materials that are used, some have expressed that, for some students, the implemented curriculum does not provide special education students the opportunity to develop into self-sufficient and independent learners. Most teachers, CST, and guidance personnel have said that the current curriculum is not able to meet the needs of those students who have reading deficiencies, within the existing program. There is no reading program being implemented within the English program. Some students who are referred to the Wilson reading program have experienced success in that program; however, it serves too few students and is offered on an elective basis. It currently serves 25 general and special education students.

1.3 The school leadership works with district supervisors and school faculty to systematically evaluate and adjust the curriculum based on the evidence of student achievement and to ensure that the district curriculum is effectively taught.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS

There is minimal evidence of a systematic process to evaluate and adjust the curriculum based on the evidence of student achievement. No clear procedure to address curriculum issues is in place. There is no evidence that state assessment results are used to inform curriculum. For example, despite scores below the just proficient mean (JPM) on both the reading and writing subclusters, the English curriculum documents neither detail district-endorsed strategies to address the needs of struggling readers and writers nor advocate for a block of instructional time to do such. There is limited evidence that data analysis reached the depth to ensure that either current professional development or the allotted common planning time specifically address the examination of student work for the purpose of monitoring, evaluating, and/or adjusting instructional practices.
The approved district curriculum was not the result of the work of a curriculum committee. Professional development on its use was not scheduled. The majority of the teachers implement an instructional program that includes aspects of the curriculum. There is no evidence of a coordinated peer review of either the standards or the curricula for English.

Although administrative interviews indicate that informal walkthroughs exist, there is little evidence that these walkthroughs have been systematized to provide routine guidance on sound instructional practice. There is a flexibility in lesson plan development that results in some teachers having precise plans aligned to cumulative progress indicators within each of the LAL strands, and others having general outlines of instruction that address one or two strands per unit. Although documents of bimonthly lesson plan review exist, there is minimal evidence of sufficient administrative feedback to move teachers toward sound lesson planning (i.e., objective, learning task, assessment, guided/independent practice, technology, differentiation, etc.).

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS

Although limited evidence is found to indicate that school leadership takes part in any discussion concerning curriculum issues, the assistant principals have begun working to become familiar with the language arts and math curricula to improve their efforts at monitoring classroom implementation of the board-approved curriculum for these disciplines. The primary vehicle used to evaluate the adherence to the curriculum is lesson plan review and formal observations conducted by the district math supervisor and school administrators. Teachers do receive meaningful feedback on submitted lesson plans, including encouragement, recommendations, and specific modifications to align classroom practices with the approved curriculum; however, evidence shows that this has had little effect. Many teachers use the curriculum only to address the units of study as listed, bypassing suggested activities and instructional strategies.

There is no formal curriculum committee. Teachers are recruited to revise curriculum during the school year and summer on an as-needed basis, and the revisions may or may not be written by personnel who will actually be teaching the courses.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION

The approved district curriculum is implemented in all special education classrooms. Teachers are expected to make the necessary modifications/accommodations relative to the instructional needs of the students. Many of these are delineated in the IEP for implementation in general and/or special education classes. These are, for the most part, general in nature and are often more suitable for ICS classes than for replacement classes, where some students present more significant deficiencies that have to be modified or compensated for in order to implement the district curriculum. The Child Study Team has not been trained in the district curriculum or in making modification to that curriculum to meet the specific needs of special education children relative to these deficiencies or their learning differences.

Special education teachers are observed equally by building administrators and the special education supervisor. Lesson plans are submitted to the building administrators and receive comments on a regular basis. These are sometimes found to be helpful and often offer recommendations relative to the lesson plan or as aspect of instruction described in the plan. Although the plan does have a section labeled “procedures/modifications,” this section, despite its emphasis on supervisor feedback forms, almost always only includes procedures and seldom deals with modifications to the curriculum.
or instruction. Teachers report that the supervisor is frequently in their classes and often offers valuable suggestions for curriculum implementation and instruction. CST case managers visit classrooms and make themselves available for consultation in regard to the adjustment of instructional practices relative to the needs of specific students. The ICS program, although served by both general and special education staff members, is largely the responsibility of the special education staff and supervisors. Although its success is highly dependent upon collaboration, planning, and the implementation of specific modifications, it is unclear as to how this program is monitored, other then through observations.

There is no curriculum council and no structured vehicle for special education teachers to have input into, or participate in, any articulation relative to curriculum development, alignment, and revision.

1.4 There is a P-12 district curriculum that is aligned to the NJ CCCS and that is clear and specific about what is to be taught to all students by grade level and subject and contains a pacing chart, technology, and suggested resources.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
The curriculum is not clear and specific about what is to be taught to all students and does not contain a pacing chart, technology, and suggested resources. The language arts curriculum documents include few resources that may help teachers in the preparation of sound instructional lessons. Interdisciplinary and post-secondary connections are not evident. There is limited evidence of alignment to the standards or the language arts frameworks. There is evidence that student performance has a limited impact on curriculum decisions. There are no strategies or techniques for the instruction and assessment of students who struggle with reading and/or writing. Similarly, there are no accommodations for either English language learners (ELLs) or students with disabilities.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
A review of the curriculum document reveals an alignment to the NJ CCCS, specific skills objectives, instructional and activities, and references to textbook pages and supplemental materials for most courses. Limited direction is provided to assist teachers with pacing, listing only a broad time period given in weeks in which to complete a unit. A comparison of lesson plans and classroom observation reveals that teachers are not always actually in the same place in their instruction as their pacing guides and lesson plans indicate. Plans have been made to revise the curriculum guide for the remaining course to match that of the other courses. All students taking a course of a specific title are exposed to a core curriculum for that specific course with all students using the same textbook.

All students who do not meet the requirements for enrollment in an honors or advanced placement course are required to take a HSPA preparatory class addressing skills necessary to pass the 11th grade state-mandated test; however, there is some question as to the effectiveness of this course. Many classes have only 10-12 students, and are not usually taught by staff whose primary assignment correlates with their HSPA math assignment. Although this three-year course has been in place for a number of years, assessment data shows no improvement in the students’ performance as a result of these classes.

Technology in the classroom is generally limited to the use of scientific calculators, with graphing calculators used by only a few teachers. A new course developed as a result of a review of student
performance and available to a small number of students is the only one which uses computers as an integral part of the classroom instruction. The course is currently offered to freshmen who show the greatest need according to assessment data. The curriculum was developed by Carnegie Learning, Inc. and is supported by Columbia University. Plans have been made to extend the program to all 9th grade students next year and to implement a 10th grade version for those enrolled as freshman this year.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION

There is no evidence that state assessment results, quarterly or periodic assessments, including end-of-unit or midterm results, or district-designed assessments are analyzed to adjust the curriculum. Further, there is no indication that assessment is used to select instructional materials and provide special education teachers with guidance and resources relative to the special education program.

There is a common academic core offered to all students including special education students. The curriculum does not address modifications that are necessary for students with disabilities; however, modifications are listed in each IEP as they pertain to the general and special education classroom. These modifications are very general and could better be described as accommodations. Most are frequently listed in most students’ IEPs and offer very little specific direction to teachers. Most of these modifications are not of a nature that would facilitate a student’s success in a general education class. In fact, classroom observations of all ICS classes reveal that no apparent modifications are being implemented. Replacement classes offer no modifications to specific students, but seem only to offer small classes and possibly a slower pace.

Although the curriculum does not deal with cross-content projects per se, classroom visitations reveal several examples of cross-content instruction.

STANDARD 1 NEXT STEPS

MATHEMATICS

1. The assistant principals should increase their level of responsibility for monitoring the math curriculum in the building by conducting documented walkthroughs and participating in formal observations with the intent of monitoring implementation of the curriculum. (1.3)

2. Increase enrollment in the new Algebra I course now, using performance data to identify students who are at risk in their current math placement. (1.4)

3. Encourage students to pursue mathematics in a post-secondary setting as a step towards preparing for a career in a math-related field by deliberately focusing on those activities stated in the curriculum guides. (1.2)

STANDARD 1 RECOMMENDATIONS

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

1. School leadership should adopt a model for lesson plan development. In addition, leadership should ensure that formal and informal feedback on planning and instruction targets observed teachers’ strengths and weaknesses and are useful for moving him or her toward higher levels of planning and instruction. Teachers should include detailed instructional strategies in each day’s
lesson plan with feedback concerning future modifications if necessary. Collaboration on instructional strategies should be made a high priority with teachers who have common planning time or prep periods. (1.3, 3.1)

2. School leadership should empanel a committee representing teachers of all populations and multiple content areas to form a study group to research best practices in language arts literacy teaching and learning. This committee should then be charged with the task of developing an interdisciplinary, research-based curriculum, aligned to the NJ CCCS, which includes strategies and techniques that address the needs of the students. This curriculum should be predicated upon a clearly defined philosophy of language arts literacy instruction, generated by the research. This curriculum should be rich with connections to postsecondary and career options and opportunities for authentic learning. In addition, this resource should address methods to assess students’ reading, writing, and vocabulary development. (1.2, 2.3, 3.2)

3. The curriculum should include clear guidance on both the scheduling and the use of language arts blocks as an opportunity to develop the reciprocal relationship between reading and writing. The school and district should maximize the benefits of this scheduling by revising the master schedule to facilitate departmental common planning time to allow collegial sharing, ongoing professional learning, and vertical as well as horizontal articulation. This professional learning should also include instructional coaching to scaffold teachers’ learning of research-based strategies and techniques for instructing struggling adolescent readers and writers. (1.3, 3.1-3.3)

**DISTRICT**

1. District leadership should develop a process to ensure vertical articulation between the high school and the middle school. Minimally, the school should attempt to ensure that the professional resources (i.e., professional texts, Web sites, etc.) on hand in the middle school are available to high school educators. (1.1, 3.2)

2. The district should implement ongoing professional learning that meets the needs of each teacher. This professional learning should include multiple opportunities for collegial growth, including analyzing student work, lesson planning and evaluation, participating in study groups (to address needs identified through ongoing data analysis), and, where appropriate, visitations to other secondary schools implementing research-based literacy programs. (1.3, 3.3, 3.4)

**MATHEMATICS**

1. Revise the schedule to allow for common planning time for all math teachers at each grade level, to provide opportunities for teachers to discuss curriculum issues and to make recommendations for revisions. Require an agenda and minutes of the meetings to be submitted to the school leadership. This can be achieved by increasing the length of the periods to at least 60 minutes and combining classes of 10 students or less, thus streamlining the schedule and allowing more flexibility in teachers’ schedules. (1.1)

2. Re-institute department meetings to articulate the curriculum vertically and horizontally, analyze student work, and encourage teachers to share classroom practices which may lead to recommendations for modifications of curriculum. (1.1)
3. Replace all HSPA math classes with courses similar to the Carnegie Learning course, which helps students develop or improve such skills as number sense, proportional reasoning, and spatial relationships. (1.4)

4. Provide in-service before the end of the 2006-2007 school year for those teachers who will be assigned to the Carnegie Learning classes, ensuring that the program can be fully implemented at the start of the next school year. (1.4)

SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. Common planning time should be organized around departments so that subject-area teachers can collaborate in the evaluation and monitoring of curriculum implementation based on multiple factors (e.g., local and state standards, student performance on classroom and state assessments, student academic needs defined by other sources). Special education teachers should participate in these meetings as per their assigned subject areas. (1.1)

2. Formal meeting opportunities should be provided to special education teachers, as a group, in order to offer a formalized vehicle to discuss curriculum, program, and assessment issues as they apply to special education: specific modifications for specific learning issues, sharing curricular projects, successful assessment and instructional practices in use, authentic assessment and rubrics in use, and differentiated instructional practices, supplemental materials, and program issues. This should also be a vehicle for CST/teacher collaboration, professional development decisions and opportunities, and, if the schedule permits, multi-department meetings in order to discuss placement issues, ICS program implementation, etc. (1.1)

3. Consideration should be given to providing a language arts two-period block so that reading instruction can be added to the language arts program. For some students, this block could accommodate the Wilson Reading program on a mandated basis and for other students a program that offers instruction in fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. A formal assessment vehicle should be utilized to determine the appropriate placement. These blocks might also incorporate the HSPA preparation programs that are now offered as a separate classroom experience. (1.2, 3.3, 5.2)

4. The lesson plan format should list areas of differentiation and modifications as a separate category. These should be reviewed by the supervisor of special education on a regular basis. The general education supervisor who might review these plans should be trained in differentiated instruction and modifications as per learning styles, multiple intelligences, and developmental levels. (1.3)

5. Special education teachers and CST staff should be provided with specific training relative to adapting the existing curriculum to meet the diverse needs of their students, especially as impacted by learning styles, multiple intelligences, and the like. In addition all ICS general and special education teachers should be trained, in teams, in the implementation of an ICS program on an ongoing basis and as needed. (1.1, 1.4)

6. Modifications listed in the IEP should be individualized and more significant in terms of curricular, assessment, and instructional modifications, rather than generalized accommodations. Further, they should be based on a child’s preferred learning style and dominant multiple intelligence. (1.4)
STANDARD 2 – ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
Multiple evaluation and assessment strategies are used to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:
- Administrator, district personnel, special and general education teacher, and paraprofessional interviews
- Review of sample assessments, student work, lesson plans, student folders, in-class assessments, homework assignments, classroom materials, and classroom displays of student work
- Classroom visitations

STANDARD 2 INDICATORS

2.1 The school leadership and faculty ensure that multiple assessments are frequent, rigorous, and authentic; aligned with NJ CCCS; and used to gauge student learning and adjust teaching to individual needs.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
While the New Jersey Registered Holistic Scoring Rubric is posted in the majority of the classrooms, the limited amount of displayed assessment samples and other student work samples reveals that teachers primarily score student work with a numerical grade. Little to no holistic scoring is noted in the LAL classrooms. Students indicate that they receive limited feedback regarding how to improve their work. No in-depth analysis of any assessment, including the midterm, is done to determine student weaknesses and strengths in order to inform instruction and curriculum or to meet the students’ needs. Only grade analyses are done. Lesson plans are collected and checked every two weeks by an assistant principal or supervisor assigned to the building.

School leadership and faculty do not ensure that multiple, rigorous, authentic, aligned assessments are used to gauge student learning and adjust teaching to individual needs. The majority of assessments are geared toward lower-level questions rather than challenging analytical responses. Classroom visitations show teacher-dominated lessons with little opportunity for student engagement. There is little evidence of student peer conferences or review. Many of the teacher-designed assessments are multiple choice and short answer and are not clearly aligned to the NJ CCCS. There is no evidence of an analysis of students’ assessment results to revise instruction, curriculum, or assessment. Many classrooms do display an objective on the board.

Assessments do not include an opportunity for students to reflect on their performance. There is little evidence that students have opportunities to choose the mode of assessment. Instruction does not address multiple intelligences, resulting in unfocused learners. There is no evidence that collected student work forms a portfolio assessment tool used to measure student growth over time. Samples of student work are not demonstrative of diverse types of writing and/or reading tasks. Teachers are not provided with direction for interdisciplinary planning. The recently given midterm exam was teacher-created with little to no alignment to the NJ CCCS. Within the English department, there is little to no opportunity for consensus scoring or collaborative development of assessment.
Teacher and supervisor interviews indicate that open-ended questions are included in some class work, quizzes, tests, and midterms. Teacher interviews indicate that few instructional modifications are determined via the analysis of classroom assessment tasks.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
Some teachers recently received professional development on analyzing assessments and using the results to modify pacing and lesson plans; however, this is not a common practice throughout the math department. Generally, assessments are administered at appropriate breaking points in the course work, and instruction resumes regardless of the results.

Most commonly, classroom assessments are either publisher-provided, are pieced together using questions from several different supplemental texts, or are simply pages taken from workbooks or textbooks. These assessments are paper-and-pencil tests administered to the whole class, without modifications to meet individual student needs. Little or no feedback is evident on any graded work, and there are no indications that teachers use rubrics to score student responses when appropriate.

Although many teachers report incorporating projects and other performance-based assessments in their classes, no evidence of this is found in posted work or lesson plans. No portfolios or even collections of student work are available for review. Students are given no choice in how they demonstrate proficiency of skills, nor are they familiar with the state generic rubric for mathematics.

Most assessments do not require the same rigor as the standardized tests and do not reflect the format or higher-order thinking skills necessary to make them valuable as predictors of student performance on any benchmark assessment. Many students express concern that the grades they earn in their current math classes will not translate to the same level of success if they transferred out of the district, and students who are new to the school question the large improvement in their grades for courses they were enrolled in at their former schools.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
With few exceptions, there is little evidence that school leadership and special education faculty ensure the use of student assessments. The most common adjustment to student learning is to “modify” instruction and assessments to lower the level of rigor.

Teachers most often utilize teacher-made assessments or those provided by the textbook company. There is no evidence that the building administration implements procedures to ensure rigor, monitor progress, or modify instruction to meet individual needs. Individual teachers occasionally provide an opportunity for students to choose ways in which they demonstrate learning, but few lessons observed or assessments reviewed address multiple intelligences or higher-level thinking skills.

There is little analysis of standardized assessment data to determine necessary modifications. The inopportune scheduling of common planning time prevents teachers from meeting formally to collaborate to design authentic assessments. Assessment rubrics are rarely used.
2.2 Students in each class can articulate the academic expectations and know what is required to be proficient. Academic expectations are clearly communicated, evident in classrooms, and observable in student work.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
Because many teachers conduct class sessions in more than one room, they typically write the objective of or the agenda for the lesson on the board at the beginning of the period. Most student work samples lack the specificity necessary for meaningful feedback to students. There is no indication that teachers formally collaborate to develop any rubrics. Students indicate that to be successful in class, they have to be prepared, pay attention, and comprehend the material. Students have difficulty articulating academic expectations, often confusing them with adherence to behavioral expectations or the completion rather than quality of their assignments.

There is no evidence that students are asked to reflect upon or evaluate their work; students report that this is not asked of them in class. Some students can articulate academic expectations and know what is required to be proficient. Academic expectations are neither clearly communicated to all students nor evident in many observable student work samples. Inconsistent classroom management impacts many opportunities for teachers to communicate expectations. Students have few opportunities to reflect on their performance. Lack of common planning time and effective use of department meeting agenda formulation hampers opportunities for teachers to collaborate to develop rubrics or discuss student work samples. The limited teacher-developed rubrics that are available have no explicit alignment to the standards for proficiency adopted by the state. Most ELL students state that behaving in school is important for learning and doing well in class. There is some indication from the students that they are cognizant of what they need to know and be able to do to be proficient in a discipline. Grades and teacher approval are the guidance for quality of work. ELL students express enthusiasm for learning and going to ELL classes.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
Students are unable to articulate course requirements, teacher expectations, or the skills needed to show proficiency in their classes. Many report that they do not feel their abilities are being correctly assessed, and therefore they are not being challenged to reach beyond what the teachers perceive to be their capacity for learning new skills and concepts. Some teachers report that when given the opportunity for self-assessment, students’ expectations for their own ability was far below what is expected of children of similar age and academic experience. Rubrics are not used in math classes, either by teachers to score student work or by students to construct quality responses to problems.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
Both students and staff articulate that low expectations for academic achievement are the norm. Many classrooms post the state rubric for scoring writing, but there is little indication that it is in use. Students are unfamiliar with the rubrics and the reason for their use, and there is scant evidence to indicate teachers collaborate to develop defined rubrics. Classroom visits show most students do not have opportunities to reflect upon their work or formally evaluate their own performance.
2.3 Disaggregated test scores are used by the district and school to identify curriculum gaps and adjust instructional practice, as needed, for all students and subgroups.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
There are monthly faculty meetings, but they are not used to address data, effectively identify curriculum gaps, and modify curriculum, instructional practices, and assessment as needed. The only disaggregated data available to the language arts staff is that provided by the state for the HSPA. The gap analysis data provided by the school does not indicate students’ strengths and weaknesses on the HSPA or GEPA by cluster. The SLC does not do any data analysis; it does look at the data provided by the district. It has no subcommittees to study this.

Data is not disaggregated by the school to identify curriculum gaps and adjust instructional practice, as needed, for all students and subgroups. School staff members are not cognizant of students who score partially proficient on the GEPA. Data analyses do not result in instructional implications for student remediation. There is no breakdown of clusters to determine emphasis on instruction. Administrators and teachers do not use data analysis to determine how to differentiate instruction to maximize student performance. The lack of disaggregated data results in a lack of assistance and support for those students who demonstrate need, exacerbating the experience of continual failure without intervention through the development of a plan for future success.

There is no analysis of the midterms as to what questions or topics students had difficulty with; therefore, there is no analysis that can help inform instruction or modify curriculum. Interviews with teachers and the supervisors reveal that TerraNova test results are not utilized at all and therefore do not identify, adjust, or make congruent the instructional needs of the students or subgroups.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
All analyses of data are done by district personnel, who are then charged with modifying the curriculum to fill any identified gaps in the curriculum. Most teachers are unaware of the curriculum at grade levels other than the one they currently teach, and so are unable to effectively identify gaps and modify curriculum to address this issue. The staff is informed of assessment results, but there is no follow-up to determine if the information is used in any meaningful way in the classrooms.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
Teachers receive standardized test scores, but most teachers do not utilize the information for gap analysis. School staff members use the results of the tests for communication purposes, but not to modify curricular, instructional, and assessment practices.

As teachers often receive disaggregated data in late October, most use their own pre-assessment tools to determine students’ areas of strengths and weaknesses. There is little evidence of the use of disaggregated test data to modify or adjust curriculum or instruction within individual classes.

Benchmark assessments are not used as tools to adjust curriculum. Some teachers report that they review the results and modify instruction for their students, but there is little evidence that data analysis is used to determine curriculum gaps or to adjust instruction.
STANDARD 2 NEXT STEPS

MATHEMATICS
1. A policy should be established which requires a common core set of classroom assessment tools be used in all classes at the same grade level to enable all students’ skills proficiencies to be measured against a common standard. (2.1)

2. Teachers should begin providing rubric-generated feedback on all student work, which will allow the student to reflect on his or her performance and use it to increase skills proficiency. (2.2)

3. The state-approved math rubric should be posted in all math classes and students should be trained to use it to complete assigned tasks. (2.2)

4. Benchmark tests and mid-term examinations should be reviewed to check for alignment with currently implemented pacing guide and scope and sequence. (2.3)

STANDARD 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY
1. The school leadership should develop an action plan that allows for professional development in the areas of differentiated instruction, rubrics, multiple intelligences, and use of data to modify instruction. Leadership should provide a sustained, classroom-focused professional development program, including coaching, mentoring, and clinical supervision. School leadership should regularly monitor the implementation of instructional strategies learned in order to challenge and motivate students to high levels of learning. (2.1, 3.1-3.4)

2. The principal and supervisor should disseminate data to staff. District resources should be used to develop staff ability to analyze results and use this analysis to modify classroom instruction. Purposeful effort should be given consistently to ensure that analyses and professional development activities increase the occurrence of student-centered instruction through differentiation and attention to multiple intelligences research. (2.1, 2.3)

3. Opportunities for students to reflect upon their work orally and/or in writing should be woven into classroom instruction. Teachers should provide feedback to students on these reflections that supports their ability and motivates them to move forward. (2.2)

4. The school should develop a true portfolio system. Authentic assessment of student work (writing pieces, open-ended questions, journal entries) should be kept in portfolios which follow the students throughout their high school years. The supervisor in conjunction with the principal and assistant principals should periodically check students’ work. Students should be encouraged to become self-regulated learners and have a voice in the documentation of reading and writing development. To this end, teachers should be provided with professional development on conferencing, holistic scoring, collaborative rubric development, and authentic assessment. (2.1, 2.2)
5. The school should provide professional development in analyzing data so that teachers and the SLC can use the data to inform instruction and modify curriculum. (2.1-2.3)

6. Ongoing professional development on creating and effectively using rubrics should be provided to all teachers. Teachers should learn how to use rubrics as one way for students to evaluate themselves or their peers. Teachers should also receive training in using portfolio assessments to measure student growth over time and the purpose for student self-reflection and self-evaluation. (2.1-2.3)

7. ELL teachers should receive professional development in providing students with multiple and authentic assessment practices and the accompanying design of rubrics in their classroom, and should collaborate within their area and with other teachers. Students should be taught to use rubrics to understand the requirements of the academic task. This will enable students to become involved with the process as well as the product and become active participants of their instructional program. As students become comfortable with the criteria of the rubric, they will be able to self-assess their work. (2.2, 2.3, 6.3)

MATHEMATICS
1. Professional development opportunities should be provided to help teachers design authentic assessments which require students to use higher-order thinking skills and to instruct them in using portfolios to track student progress in skill proficiency. (2.1)

2. Teachers at the same grade level who teach the same course should collaborate on designing assessments which test the students’ proficiency on a common set of skills, with each teacher taking responsibility for a unit or two so that the work load is evenly shared. (2.1)

3. Building and district leaders and teachers should work together to establish criteria for evaluating student performance to ensure that assessments are frequent and of sufficient rigor to be true indicators of student achievement. Assessments must be fully aligned with NJ CCCS and should mirror the state-mandated test in format and meet the needs of a diverse student population. (2.3)

SPECIAL EDUCATION
1. District and school leadership should establish procedures to ensure the effective, uniform monitoring of student assessments to ensure their authenticity, rigor, and alignment to the NJ CCCS and cumulative progress indicators on student IEPs. (2.1)

2. School administration and district supervisors should monitor teacher-made assessments to check for alignment to the NJ CCCS, rigor, and variety of problems, including items that elicit higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills, and check for the consistent use of scoring rubrics. (2.1)

3. Teachers should receive additional professional development in the analysis of assessments and in ways to use the data to modify instruction, and common planning times should be organized to further teacher expertise, development, and use of authentic assessments. (2.3)
STANDARD 3 - INSTRUCTION

The school’s instructional program actively engages all students by using effective, varied, and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:

- School and district administration, student, non-instructional staff, parent, director of special services, special education teacher, general education teacher, paraprofessional, I&RS chairperson, child study team, and extended school day coordinator interviews
- Classroom visitations and observations of hallways and classrooms

3.1 There is evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies/activities are used in all classrooms that are continuously monitored and aligned with individual student needs.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS

The language arts supervisor has begun to define expectations for the effective instructional strategies for specific components of the program; however, at this point, these strategies are inconsistently implemented by the staff and are not always noted in the lesson plan books. Classroom objectives are written on the board. Whole-group work, pair work, and the results of project work are not observed during classroom visitations. Questioning techniques encouraging the use of higher-order and problem-solving skills are observed in few of the language arts classes. Some teachers during Black History Month employ an interdisciplinary approach to infusing language arts across subjects, and embrace culturally responsive lessons. However, intentional cross-curricula connections are not evident in the curriculum guides. Teachers indicate they do not meet formally with members of other departments. Most of the lesson plans viewed are standards-based and aligned with the NJ CCCS, but are not always designed with rigorous student-centered activities. Differentiated instruction and knowledge of multiple intelligences are not evident.

There is little evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies are used in most classrooms. School leadership does not have procedures to guide instructional practices. The observation process does not provide teachers with feedback that would improve teaching practices. Most of the instruction that occurs is teacher-directed with the teacher doing most of the speaking. Little interaction takes place among students and teacher. Most assessments relate to memorization of facts.
with little or no higher-level questioning tasks. Teachers sometimes attempt to include connections within their content area, but they do not make interdisciplinary connections. The current curriculum does not evidence standards-based, culturally responsive units of study and lessons. As such, lesson planning may or may not address these units of study.

Some teachers are familiar with the rudiments of learning styles, multiple intelligences, and differentiation, but have not been trained in their use within the instructional program. Many of the visited language arts classrooms offer instruction that is often teacher-centered, in which many students are passive, not actively engaged, and even disruptive at times. The differentiation of instruction is seldom observed in any of the visitations.

**FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS**
Most teachers rely on algorithmically-driven, teacher-centered instruction, which rarely accommodates individual learning styles or multiple intelligences. Students are generally simply required to memorize facts and procedures with little or no understanding of the concepts behind them. Little evidence is found that interdisciplinary connections are being made, nor are there indications that the lessons are culturally responsive. Activities observed in most classrooms are neither interesting nor motivating, and therefore do not engage the students, possibly leading to behavioral issues.

There is an individual teacher or two who conduct their classes using effective questioning techniques, eliciting higher-order thinking from their students. Students in these classes communicate answers to problems effectively and discover rules and algorithms on their own, thus demonstrating the ability of the school’s population to engage in these types of higher-level learning experiences.

Teachers received some professional development earlier in this school year on differentiated learning; however, it was not enough to effect change in classroom instructional practices. There is no procedure in place to follow-up on professional development activities to monitor their implementation in the classrooms.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**
Although teachers state that they have attended workshops in differentiated instruction and do not feel the need for additional training, some teachers are only somewhat familiar with the basic elements of learning styles and are only vaguely familiar with multiple intelligences. The workshops that they have attended were not classroom-based or -embedded and provided only an awareness level of knowledge. Consequently, these practices are seldom observed during classroom visitations. In many cases, instructional strategies, activities, and content are not engaging and do not intentionally accommodate various learning styles, multiple intelligences, and brain research. Although there are some exceptions, most special education classroom visitations reveal that instruction is teacher-centered, in which many students are passive, not actively engaged, and not required to think beyond the recall level or to problem solve. Instruction is the same for the whole group, regardless of the number of students, the least restrictive environment (LRE) placement, or the functional level of the students. There is no differentiation in terms of ability, learning style, content, product, or processes. There are very few instances where cooperative learning, learning centers, and hands-on activities are used. Most instruction is textbook- or worksheet-driven. There is at least one classroom that is a stunning contradiction to this common practice: it does include these elements in classroom instruction. In some classrooms, content and interdisciplinary connections are intentionally planned, implemented, and observed in classroom instruction.
In most visited ICS classes there is an underutilization of the services of the special education teacher, in terms of maximizing differentiation, providing modifications, or a cooperative teaching model. Interviews reveal that although there is some evidence of ICS training in pairs provided for English teachers and their special education counterparts, few other general education teachers have been trained in this model and special education teachers often lack the content knowledge necessary to be equal teaching partners in the classroom. In some cases, general education teachers resent the special education teacher’s presence and, in at least one case, students are instructed not to ask the special education teacher any questions. In other cases, the special education teacher has no input into assessment or grading, resulting in failures for most special education students assigned to that class. Interviews reveal that some special education students are given grades as low as a 3 on a scale that requires at least a 60 to pass. A few special education teachers state that it is inappropriate to make modifications for special education students assigned to ICS classes. This lack of training for special and general education teachers in this model and lack of content knowledge has sometimes resulted in the special education teacher being relegated to the role of a teaching assistant or paraprofessional.

Teachers, CST, and guidance staff report that the supervisor of special education teachers is actively involved with her staff and monitors classroom instruction on an ongoing basis to ensure that teachers plan and modify instruction to meet the needs of special education students. However, classroom visitations reveal that these practices are minimally implemented within special education classrooms. Building administrators do conduct classroom observations, but, with one exception, are not knowledgeable about IEPs, special education, and appropriate modifications beyond the good teaching practice level.

3.2 Instructional strategies, materials, software, supplies, and learning activities are sufficient and available and aligned with the district, school, and state goals and assessments.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS

Students are infrequently required to complete assessments that are similar to state assessments. The textbook is the major instructional tool used in classrooms. The media center does not contain the number of resources consistent with state recommendations. For example, it is stated that the media center has approximately 9,000 texts; state guidance calls for twenty volumes per student, or over 10,000 for APHS. There are similar shortages regarding magazines, newspapers, and professional resources.

The media center does not provide current and appropriate software, e.g., Encarta, Inspiration, and United Streaming to support the language arts curriculum. Teachers rarely use the technology because either they have not had sufficient training or the computers don’t work/are not available. In terms of resources, there is inadequate access to computers that would allow for spontaneous use and that of the Internet. Most of the visited classrooms have an insufficient number of working computers. In the two rooms that do have a sufficient numbers of computers, instruction often does not integrate technology. Computer and mobile labs are available, but have to be scheduled. A system to unlock the mobile labs when the technology coordinator is absent is not in place. Most staff feel that they do not have sufficient print resources to support their programs.

There are no literacy coaches or reading specialists at the high school. Instructional strategies, materials, software, supplies, and learning activities are insufficient and not aligned to the state goals.
and assessments. The textbook series Prentice Hall Literature is used by the majority of the English
department and is aligned to the NJ CCCS. Extensive resources are not available to support the
curriculum. Few classrooms contain displays of novels or other supplemental materials (i.e.,
dictionaries, thesauruses, and grammar texts). The number of novels used to support the instructional
program varies by teacher. Few teacher-created assessments mirror the state assessment format. There
is no evidence of preparation for students regarding timed tasks. Assessment results are not
disaggregated for the purpose of identifying weaknesses and improving delivery of instruction.

Current and appropriate instructional resources that are developmentally appropriate, culturally
responsive, and differentiated to address the individual learning styles of the school’s diverse
population are non-existent. Most selected texts are not representative of young adult literature.
Although it has been stated that classrooms contain multiple sets of materials that would allow each
student to have his/her own text or novel, most students do not have individual copies and cannot
extend reading experiences into their homes.

Instructors in ELL classes have recently adopted the ELLIS (English Language Learners Instructional
System) learning activities. The ELLIS system gauges learners’ abilities to prescribe targeted
instruction that meets students at their individual level. The program combines digital audio and video,
voice recording, role-play, and native language support to encourage and reward interaction.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
Instructional strategies are only minimally aligned to the school curriculum. Alignment with the NJ
CCCS appears only where the standards specify a particular rule or fact that the student must know. In
most instances, standards and CPIs which call for a conceptual understanding of a skill are passed
over, even though activities and instructional strategies are clearly outlined in the school’s curriculum.
Therefore teachers do not require students to complete tasks which are similar to those found on the
state assessment. Most resources are age-appropriate and of sufficient quantity to allow teachers to
incorporate them into their lessons on a daily basis. Teachers have been provided with ample printed
material to find exciting, thought-provoking problems to motivate the students to learn.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
Teachers report that they base their instruction on the general education curriculum and the IEP and
their students’ response to instruction. They report that their classroom assessments are a primary
determiner of the strategies they use and that they are sensitive to the individual needs and learning
styles of their students. They report that they sometimes give their students choices. An examination
of the IEP as well as classroom visitations and student work reveals that the vast majority of formal
assessment practices are traditional paper and pencil in nature in which all students are given the same
assessment. There are few examples of rubrics, and although many special education teachers provide
instruction in writing, most have not been trained in holistic scoring.

Although it is reported by the special services administration that all special education teachers receive
a budget to purchase instructional materials and supplies, most teachers report that they do not have
adequate materials to make necessary modifications or to provide supplemental instruction materials
for their students. Some teachers indicate that they received little or no money this school year for
these purchases and had to make copies of books for some of their students, go to general education
supervisors to obtain materials, or make purchases with their own funds. One teacher actually sought
out donations to obtain a computer projector for her students and brought in her own computer so that
she could teach her students how to make visual presentations such as slide shows and films. Other teachers claim that the orders that were completed in September just arrived this month and, in one case, all of the materials ordered were stolen or misplaced and never replaced. Computers are often in disrepair and work orders are reportedly virtually ignored. In one instance a teacher who has been putting in work orders since the beginning of the school year was told to stop putting them in; they are aware of the problem. Her computers have not been repaired and software that would be valuable to her students goes unused.

3.3 Teachers demonstrate the content knowledge necessary to challenge and motivate students to high levels of learning.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
Inconsistent classroom management practices restrict many teachers’ ability to demonstrate content knowledge necessary to challenge and motivate students to high levels of learning. Some teachers indicate an awareness of the impact teacher expectations have on student achievement, but do not evidence this in their lesson plans. Whereas speaking and reading are sometimes indicated in classroom instruction, there is no formal focus on writing. For example, many classrooms do not have a daily writing task. Students typically submit assigned writing only as a final copy, without having opportunities to participate in writing workshops in the classroom. Except for isolated instances, there is no evidence of the use of the writing process.

All language arts staff are certified and highly qualified under NCLB regulations. Although teachers participated in professional development this year, there is little evidence that it has updated either their content knowledge or current professional practice to challenge and motivate students to higher levels of learning. Professional development is not classroom-focused and does not include a systematic plan of coaching or mentoring. Teachers indicate that they are technologically literate; however, teachers do not consistently integrate technology into instruction and infrequently include its use in lesson plans. Therefore, it is not possible to assess teachers’ technological literacy beyond the ability to generate lesson plans.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
All teachers in the math department are highly qualified and hold certifications in their subject areas. The teachers represent the diverse population of the school and some are well respected by the students. Teachers participate in mandated professional development activities and some request permission to attend additional out-of-district events. Coaching and mentoring opportunities to improve professional practices are provided by the district K-12 math supervisor but are available only on a limited basis due to her heavy workload. Some teachers demonstrate an awareness of the impact teacher expectations have on student achievement and make substantial effort to communicate this to their students.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
Special services administration indicates that it is difficult to find highly qualified special education personnel and that their hiring and firing practices are not always supported. Interviews with supervisors, administrators, teachers, CST, and guidance staff indicate that professional development that has special education as it focus has not been implemented within the school building for general and special education staff members. Some teachers do use their PIPs as
an opportunity to update their knowledge, but most of these are general in nature and sometimes do not update their knowledge specific to meeting the diverse needs of special education children. All interviews reveal that there is a dire need for this PD for all staff members, as well as PD on classroom management practices and the implications of teaching all children with significant and diverse needs. It is frequently stated that without this training and parental involvement, Asbury Park High School will not facilitate practices that maximize learning and motivation.

Most teachers are assigned replacement and ICS classes within the same subject area. Self-contained classes are sometimes departmentalized, but most teachers teach several subjects. General education teachers have stated that many ICS special education teachers do not have adequate content knowledge and need an intense program of professional development to update their knowledge. Additionally, although reading is universally perceived by all interviewed members of the staff to be a significant issue for many students, there is currently no reading program attached to the English classes being taught at Asbury Park High School. There is no evidence to support that special education teachers have the necessary literacy skills relative to reading instruction to implement such a program, should it be offered.

3.4 Teachers examine and discuss student work collaboratively and use this information to inform their practice.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
Teachers have not received training in protocols for analyzing student work. Most teachers develop grading criteria that are not intentionally aligned to either the New Jersey Holistic Scoring Rubric or the Open-Ended Rubric. Teachers and administrators do not meet as a department to disaggregate student responses from released test items to guide instructional practices and improve student performance. The one meeting scheduled to discuss released items did not result in the selection of strategies and techniques to address student strengths and weaknesses. Time scheduled as “common planning” is not used to analyze student work collaboratively.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
Little evidence is found to indicate that teachers analyze student work to guide instructional practices either individually or collaboratively. The absence of common planning time and department meetings prohibits even informal collaboration of student work, although some teachers do use informal assessments strategies such as homework review and observation to modify the pacing of their instruction.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
There is no indication that special education teachers have received training in protocols for analyzing students work; or that they meet formally or informally to analyze student work; or that they receive student responses from released test items. Further, although teachers do indicate that they inform their practice based on the IEP and student response to instruction, there is no evidence of an actual formal analysis conducted by individual teachers.

FINDINGS—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
APHS currently provides 46 students with ESL services. There are 14 Level One students, six Level Two, 15 Level Three, and 11 Level Four. Two more students were tested this week and are expected to
be placed into Level One, or Port of Entry. The identified spoken languages are French/Creole and Spanish. Currently, the school offers limited Sheltered English Classes for students at all levels. Students receive some push-in services in some content area classes.

ESL teachers have received training in protocols for analyzing student work in some content areas and grade levels, but the protocols are not always implemented. There is no evidence general education teachers have had any professional development to ensure an understanding of English language learners’ needs. Nor is there evidence that general education teachers have received professional development on language acquisition stages to ensure modifications as needed to drive instruction.

Individual ESL teachers analyze the work of their students. Results of the analyses are not always used to inform instructional practice and/or school leaders do not provide assistance to teachers in the process. ESL teachers do not have common planning with the general education teachers who support their students. ESL teachers and general education teachers informally meet to analyze student work and discuss upcoming lessons. There is no evidence of a bilingual curriculum aligned to the current content areas or NJ CCCS. Additionally, there is no evidence of books or materials in the two native languages to assist students in classrooms where general education teachers provide services to Level One and Two students. This prohibits port of entry students from understanding daily instruction in monolingual classrooms.

3.5 There is evidence that teachers incorporate the use of technology in their classrooms.

FINDINGS—LANGUAGE ARTS
There is limited evidence that classroom teachers incorporate the use of technology in their classrooms. Lesson plan and observational feedback does not consistently emphasize the use of technology. The one computer in most English classrooms is not used to provide meaningful activities to support learning in reading and math. The building contains SMART Boards, overhead projectors, and mobile and fixed labs to support instruction; however, routine use of computers and other technology by teachers is not evident. Some state that the district procedure for technical assistance is not effective. Several computers observed in two computer labs are labeled out-of-order. Professional development activities on the use of technology are neither ongoing nor subject-specific. Some students state that they have yet to learn basic word processing skills. Other students have created PowerPoint projects. There are many published pieces of student work that do not evidence the use of technology. The school’s technology plan does not clearly address the technological literacy of all students.

FINDINGS—MATHEMATICS
The school library houses a computer lab with a sufficient number of computers for a full class use, and there are three more computer labs for teachers’ use with their classes. All computers have Internet access. The technology coordinator reports that few teachers take advantage of the labs. Every math classroom presently has one computer for the teacher’s use. All teachers have a class set of calculators appropriate for their grade level and math program, and some have a set of graphing calculators available for student use. Calculators are observed in use in all classrooms. The school technology coordinator has provided teachers with Web site resources that would enhance their lessons and is planning to expand his duties to include becoming familiar with the various curricula to enable him to make suggestions on infusing the Internet and computer software into teachers’ lessons.
FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
There is only one instance during classroom visitations where computers or any technology is used for instruction or even turned on. In that one instance technology is the major vehicle for an engaging project in which all students are highly motivated and indeed learning. Most teachers report that many of the computers are in disrepair and that work orders are often ignored. Some teachers report that they use the Internet, but most classrooms have few computers for student use. Interviews reveal that professional development in the use of technology has been lacking and is badly needed in order to support the curriculum and provide for greater levels of differentiation and motivation in the classroom.

FINDINGS—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
Teachers use technology as part of instruction, but the technology is not seamlessly integrated into instruction across content areas. APHS recently purchased the ELLIS computer program to assist students with language learning. Resources are limited to ESL students as the classroom does not have enough computers to support student access. Therefore, technology is available to students, but the accessibility is either limited or inequitable.

Additionally, the school computer labs are on a first-come, first-served basis, limiting opportunities for ESL teachers to take students to labs to use the software. The ELLIS program requires students to increase their language acquisition skills by requiring an audio understanding of the directions. This audio enables students to complete quizzes, play games, and follow along with reading. Computer labs do not provide students with headphones. This causes a distracting environment requiring students to attempt to isolate their audio program from that of the student seated next to them. It is also noted that all computers do not have speakers, causing students to partner in order to use the program. Headphones reportedly have been ordered, but to date they are not available to students.

STANDARD 3 NEXT STEPS

MATHEMATICS
1. Teachers should place the daily objective on the board with the appropriate NJ CCCS standard upon which that objective is based. (3.1, 3.2)

2. Teachers should routinely include open-ended questions in their daily lesson plans. This can replace the fact-recall “Do Now” most teachers use to begin their math classes. (3.2)

STANDARD 3 RECOMMENDATIONS

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY
1. Equitable scheduling of the mobile computer cart should be established. Maintenance of these computers should be a priority. Administration should maintain a duplicate key to the mobile labs. (3.2, 3.5)

2. Continue to investigate materials including ELL software and resources for implementation in the ELL classes. Professional development should be embedded to assist the ELL teachers with the ELLIS diagnostic pre-test, management, and reporting system that will allow learners to focus exclusively on content to make language acquisition accessible. (3.2, 3.3)
DISTRICT
1. Computer hardware should be repaired in a timely fashion. (3.2, 3.5)

2. Administration should reallocate resources to ensure that the library-media center is developed to reach the standards suggested in the guidance from the New Jersey Association for Library Media Specialists. Additionally, school leaders should provide teachers with resources that will target the learning styles and needs of all students. Novels, periodicals, and other reading materials that are geared to the readability levels of all students should be found in all classrooms. School leaders (i.e., district supervisor, assistant principal and/or principal) should check lesson plans to ascertain that students are reading for different purposes and writing on diverse topics. (3.1, 3.3)

MATHEMATICS
1. Additional professional development should be provided on differentiated instruction; the use of technology in the classroom, including graphing calculators in all math classes; and designing rubrics. (3.3, 3.5)

2. An on-site math coach should be designated in order to assist the teachers in incorporating varied instructional strategies and techniques in their daily lessons (e.g., hands-on, inquiry-based lessons and the use of manipulatives to enhance instruction) to challenge students to use more complex methods to solve problems. Discovery-based activities would help foster enthusiasm for math and motivate students to high levels of learning, thus increasing student comprehension of important math concepts and improving students’ skills on high-risk state assessments. This would also create time for the district math supervisor to work more closely with the K-8 schools in the district so that the high school can eventually take on the role of “continuing the effort…” as opposed to being in the position of “taking the initiative.” (3.3)

3. The math department, together with the technology coordinator, should research appropriate software for use in the computer labs. More use of appropriate Internet sites should be incorporated. Future curriculum guides should include specific references for technology use. (3.5).

SPECIAL EDUCATION
1. Differentiation should have greater emphasis within the professional development program of the special and general education staff. It should be an expected and monitored practice. The observation form should reflect that expectation as well as a means of observing and evaluating the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations and modifications that are being implemented within the instructional process. Lesson plans should have a separate category for differentiated activities. As a component of the classroom observations, special education teachers should be asked to produce documentation of the modification vehicles that they have produced and implemented on behalf of the special education students in their classes. The notion of differentiation in terms of ability should be broadened to include differentiation in terms of: content, processes/activities, product, learning styles, and multiple intelligences. Special education and child study team (CST) staff professional improvement plans (PIPs) should include activities specific to the instructional, social/emotional, and behavioral needs of special education students. (3.1, 3.3)

2. In recognition of the diverse learning needs of special education students, teachers should be given the opportunity to obtain specialized print and electronic resources in order to modify and adapt
curriculum, assessment, and instruction consistent with varying learning styles and intelligences in order to provide greater differentiation of instruction. (3.2, 3.5)

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

1. General education teachers with ELL students should receive professional development in Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and cultural diversity. (3.4, 6.2, 6.3)
   
   http://www.njipep.org/classroom/bilingual_esl/Sheltered.html

2. The school should reallocate computers to ESL classrooms to enable teachers and students to take full advantage of the ELLIS program. Additionally, the school should ensure students receive the ordered headphones to use with the ELLIS program. (3.4)

DISTRICT

1. The district and school leadership should review The Bilingual Education Act (N.J.S.A. 18A:35-15 and P.L. 1974, c.197) to ensure the bilingual program meets the needs of the current ELL population. (3.4)

2. The school administration and district should create internal and district-level curricular committees to include stakeholders to create a bilingual education curriculum aligned to content areas and NJ CCCS. (3.4, 5.3)

3. There should be a return to the practice of providing special education teachers with an adequate budget for the purchase of instructional materials in order to provide supplemental and differentiated instruction. These purchases should be monitored in order to assure that these purchased are suitable for this purpose. (3.2)

STANDARD 4 – SCHOOL CULTURE

The school functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:

- School and district administrator, teacher, non-instructional staff, parent, and student interviews
- Review of Asbury Park High School (APHS) vision/mission/philosophy statements, 2006-2007 student planner, student handbook, district discipline policy, district school safety policy, tardiness and suspension reports, attendance reports, crisis and emergency evacuation report, district parental involvement policy, district home work policy, 2006-2007 school and community perception survey results, 2007-2008 curriculum offerings, Asbury Park Public Schools Technology Plan 2004-2007, supplemental educational services (SES) providers, community partnerships, school Web site, Parent Teacher Student Organization (PTSO), parent/community liaison newsletter, guidance newsletter, mailings sent to parents/guardians, School in Need of Improvement plan, school perception surveys, and school report card
- Classroom visitations and observations of hallways and stairwells, arrivals and dismissals
STANDARD 4 INDICATORS

4.1 The principal and school leadership are responsible for and support a safe, clean, hospitable, orderly, and equitable learning environment.

FINDINGS

Asbury Park High School (APHS), built in 1927, maintains its architectural details as a landmark within the small Jersey shore city of Asbury Park. The city is in the midst of revitalization. However, some areas have socioeconomic difficulties and reports of violence. Despite the many challenges, some residents of Asbury Park have expressed a sense of commitment and pride regarding the community and school. The school has a total population of 508 students in grades nine to twelve.

The physical structure of the school does not always provide a safe, clean, and orderly learning environment. Many areas of the building are in need of repair, replacement, and enhancement. During the week of the CAPA visit, several bathrooms and stairwells are flooded as a result of water leakage from the roof. Water leakage and damage is visible in some classrooms. An area of the ceiling in room number #309 collapsed.

The building’s temperature is not consistent. Some areas are extremely hot and others are very cold. Interviews reveal that the school was without heat until the week before the CAPA visit. The doors in the auditorium and gymnasium are difficult to open and close. Interviews reveal that injuries have occurred while doing this task. The lighting in the auditorium is not adequate, and access to change light bulbs is in a small, overhead crawl space.

The bathrooms are deteriorated. Many bathrooms lack a sufficient supply of toilet paper and paper towels. Dispensers are missing or broken. Some toilets are not functioning. Interviews reveal that the building has difficulties receiving supplies for facilities and instructional materials in a timely manner (i.e., paper goods, toner, postage, and ink). The cafeteria, located on the fourth floor of the building, provides a breakfast and lunch program; however many pieces of equipment in the kitchen are not working. The pressure cooker and kettle have not worked in six years and the large refrigerator has not operated in three years. The fan in the smaller refrigerator does not work. Two ovens are inoperable and the door on the oven that does work does not close properly. Interviews reveal that an employee of the kitchen was burned while opening the oven door.

APHS has discipline procedures in place such as cut slips, in-school suspension (ISS), and the 10/10 rule for hall passes, but these procedures are either inadequate or not consistently implemented. Students are often roaming the halls during the day and using cell phones and other devices in the classrooms. Some classrooms either don’t have teachers in them for the entire period or the teachers arrive late. Throughout the day there are constant interruptions over the PA system - a distraction to classroom instruction. Students are seen receiving food deliveries from local eateries and eating during instruction.

The school has one dropout prevention officer. Seven uniformed security officers monitor specific floors and areas of the building. One security officer remains in the cafeteria during lunch periods. The school has an alarm system and security cameras. The monitoring device is in the principal’s office. Interviews and observations reveal some cameras are not working and some hallways and
stairwells of the building are not monitored. Interviews state some students are often able to hide in the building throughout the day without being detected. The school alarm system does not work adequately. People have been able to enter the building after hours and the alarm is not activated. Interviews reveal that some don’t feel safe in the building during the day and after hours because visitors are often able to enter the school through propped-open doors. The security officers’ workday ends at 2:30 p.m.

The classrooms do not have telephones or intercom systems. Interviews reveal that when teachers need assistance they have to leave the classroom and go out into the hallway to get the attention of a security officer. Interviews and observations indicate student fights and disturbances do occur and there is an influx of some gang activity in the school. A student altercation occurred during the week of the CAPA visit. Often the security officer on the floor may be helping another faculty member and has to use the walkie-talkie to call for assistance. Interviews and observations reveal the walkie-talkies don’t work consistently.

Academic and behavior standards are defined in the APHS district discipline policy, but they are not clearly communicated to staff, students, and parents. Interviewees state that a written discipline policy is unavailable for reference.

Evidence reflects minimal learning environment data is collected and used in planning and decision making to enhance the learning environment.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The school has seven security officers and a surveillance system which can only be monitored from the principal’s office. A number of the security cameras are non-functioning at the present time. Entrance doors do not remain locked throughout the school day. There are isolated and unsupervised areas of the building, allowing at times unauthorized entry into the building.

The school leadership has incorporated the district-adopted discipline policy, but staff reports that school administration and security personnel inconsistently enforce the procedures of this policy. The school supports an equitable learning environment for students. Staff concerns regarding safety, orderliness, and cleanliness are of a generalized nature, rather than specific to special education students.

4.2 School leadership, teachers, and staff members hold high expectations for all students academically and behaviorally and inspire their best efforts as evidenced in their interactions, attitudes, and instructional practice.

**FINDINGS**

The APHS vision and mission statements were created in 2005 and are widely displayed throughout the school. However, most stakeholders are not familiar with the statements.

Interviews and observations reveal not all students are being challenged and expectations are not adequate to ensure academic success. Many students are not seen engaged during instruction and often separate conversations are being held in the classrooms.
The district has a student code of conduct policy, but evidence does not reflect it has been formally communicated to students and families. Interviews state that there are inconsistencies with student infractions and there is a need for the policy to be enforced.

Some members of the school community provide a nurturing and supportive environment. However, interviewees state that the principal is not visible or approachable during the school day. Interviews and observations reveal that the SPOT, the school-based youth services program, is a safe haven for students and a supportive link in the building. Services provided at the SPOT include counseling, health, employment, tutoring, life skills, and recreational activities. APHS has a health and social services coordinator (HSSC) who chairs the intervention and referral services committee (I&RS) and the crisis intervention team. The HSSC has an abundance of confidential paperwork that has to be disposed of and is in need of a shredder. The school has four guidance counselors who meet with most students two to three times a month. The guidance office maintains an open door policy and students often drop in. APHS does not have an annual Career Day, character education program, or teacher-student mentoring program. The school offers two elective courses in careers: Career Decisions and Careers and Occupations.

Some staff members interact with students beyond the classroom. These activities include supporting the currently winning school basketball team, the SPOT after-school homework lab, football, soccer, tennis, track, cross country, bowling, cheerleading, wrestling, baseball, softball, National Honor Society, Gentlemen of Distinction, Health Careers Club, Science Club, Spanish Club, Student Council, Ladies of Essence, Literary Magazine, and Yearbook Committee. However, athletic and club participation is limited since many students work after school. Evidence reflects minimum student accomplishments are recognized.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

School leadership, teachers, and staff (with a few notable exceptions) have minimal expectations both academically and behaviorally for students. Students feel that some teachers do care about them, but others, by their interactions or attitudes, do not motivate students to high levels of achievement.

Students receive information on the student code of conduct verbally, and it is written in the student handbook. Among special education teachers there is genuine care and concern evident in many teacher-to-student interactions, but there is scant evidence of high expectations either academically or behaviorally. There is no evidence that each student has an assigned advocate.

Staff and students state that they feel relatively safe within the building. There is, however, a palpable fear of individuals or groups entering from the outside. A total of 16 security monitoring cameras is installed throughout the building; of these two are inoperable. The console for the cameras is located in the principal’s office. There are far more egresses than cameras or security personnel. Students are aware of these gaps and on occasion leave the building or admit other persons.

**4.3 School leadership and teachers accept responsibility for student success/failure.**

**FINDINGS**

Classroom visitations portray an environment where many students are not actively engaged in the learning process. Student interviews reveal that members of the administration visit the upper floors
and classroom primarily when there is a discipline problem. A large number of students are free to walk about the hallways and classrooms with little or no consequences. Interviews with students and teachers reveal that the problems with student discipline hinder the learning process. Some teachers understand the link between teacher efficacy and student performance. Many believe the support mechanisms that impact the learning process are lacking, citing limited resources, outdated technology, and an inconsistency or constant change in the school’s policies and procedures. During some classroom visitations, demeaning comments are made to students by teachers.

The master schedule contains common planning time for teachers to meet. However, teachers seldom reflect upon the impact of their instruction on the success of their students and ways to improve it. This time is generally unstructured and teachers are often reassigned to cover a class during this common planning time. Students are not involved in the evaluation or design of instruction. Some teachers provide students the opportunity to give feedback on instruction. There is no feedback mechanism for student-to-teacher comment on the teacher’s effectiveness.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Interviews and observations reveal that school leadership and teachers have not internalized the link between teacher efficacy and student success or failure. Many cite other factors beyond their control (e.g., home and community environment, attendance, and little parental involvement) as reasons for poor student performance. Few teachers either take responsibility for the impact of their instructional effectiveness on the success of their students or revise their classroom practices based upon student needs.

4.4 **Student achievement is highly valued and publicly celebrated (for example, displays of exemplary student work, assemblies).**

**FINDINGS**

APHS infrequently recognizes student academic success both formally and informally. Interviews and observations reveal that the honor roll list displayed in the school’s main corridor is not current or accurate.

The school has limited student work showcased in the classrooms and hallways; however, there are numerous displays of sports recognition and an APHS distinguished alumni photo display.

Student successes are seldom shared with families and community partners. Parents and students state the need to increase the number of public celebrations.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

School staff members infrequently recognize student accomplishments formally. There is little student work displayed in classrooms or throughout the common areas of the school. Where student work displays exist, much of it is not of high quality. There is widespread pride for the school’s athletic accomplishments.
STANDARD 4 NEXT STEPS

1. Repair the damaged ceiling tile in room #309. (4.1)

2. Increase the availability of supplies for the building, in a timely manner. (4.1)

3. Immediately minimize announcements on the public address system during instructional time. (4.1)

4. School leadership should speak with staff regarding appropriate ways to communicate to students. (4.3)

STANDARD 4 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the need to repair or adequately replace the school’s roof to prevent future water leakage and damage. (4.1)

2. Review the need to upgrade the heating system to establish a consistently comfortable temperature throughout the building. (4.1)

3. Review the need to upgrade the lighting system in the auditorium and relocate the outlets for light bulbs. (4.1)

4. Repair and or replace the non-operating kitchen equipment: refrigerators, ovens, pressure cooker, and kettle. (4.1)

5. Repair and update the school’s security surveillance system with rotating cameras for the hallways, stairwells, and doors, including two monitoring devices: one for the office of the principal or vice principal, who is the school disciplinarian, and one for security officers. (4.1)

6. Repair and/or replace the school’s alarm system. (4.1)

7. Review the need to install classroom intercom systems. (4.1)

8. Review the need to update the current walkie-talkies used by security officers. (4.1)

9. Familiarize all stakeholders with the Asbury Park High School’s Vision and Mission Statement. (4.2)

10. Establish a school-wide gang awareness and prevention program. (4.1)

11. Increase notification of the school/district Code of Conduct Policy to staff, students, and families and consistently implement its guidelines. (4.2)

12. School leadership and guidance should establish a teacher-student mentoring program in which four to five students are assigned to meet with one certificated staff member for a structured period at least once a month. (4.2)
13. District and school leaders should establish clear guidelines and support structures for teachers and administrators to study, understand, and act upon the role of teacher efficacy. (4.3)

SPECIAL EDUCATION
1. School discipline procedures should be more consistently and equitably enforced by all staff. (4.1)

2. Close all exterior doors, except by the main entrance, throughout the day. (4.1)

3. Supervise all entrances and isolated areas at all times to prevent entry of unauthorized persons. Explore and implement a more effective and efficient method to conduct morning security checks. (4.1)

4. Provide building security personnel with access to security camera monitors. (4.1)

5. Teacher qualifications and highly qualified teacher status in the general education content area should be of utmost consideration when they are placed in ICS situations. Whenever necessary, ICS teachers should receive additional content-specific professional development in their areas of expertise.

6. Increase classroom, hallway, and trophy case displays of student work that include rubrics. (4.4)

7. Increase school-wide celebrations of student successes, including assemblies for students, parents, and community members. (4.4)

STANDARD 5 - STUDENT, FAMILY, AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT
The school works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career, and developmental needs of students consistent with 6A:10A-3.6 Supports for Parents and Families and NCLB §1118 Parental Involvement.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:
- Administrator, non-instructional staff, parent, student, director of special services, special education teacher, general education teacher, paraprofessional, I&RS chairperson, child study team, and extended school day coordinator interviews
- Review of NCLB Plan Application, lesson plans, student folders, teacher schedules, IEPs, student work, rubrics, summaries of student assessment analysis, progress reports, parent workshop agendas, I&RS action plans, common planning time sign-in sheets, common planning time topic lists, Asbury Park High School (APHS) Vision/Mission/Philosophy statements, 2006-2007 student planner, district discipline policy, district school safety policy, tardiness and suspension reports, crisis and emergency evacuation report, district parental involvement policy, district homework policy, 2006-2007 school and community perception survey results, 2007-2008 curriculum offerings, Asbury Park Public Schools Technology Plan 2004-2007, supplemental educational services (SES) providers, community partnerships, school Web site, Parent Teacher Student Organization (PTSO), parent/community liaison newsletter, guidance newsletter, and mailings sent to parents/guardians
• Classroom visitations and observations of hallways and stairwells, arrivals and dismissals

STANDARD 5 INDICATORS

5.1 Families and the community are treated as partners with the school and district with frequent communication via take-home notes (in appropriate languages), e-mail, and phone calls when necessary.

FINDINGS

APHS has a parental involvement policy consistent with NCLB regulations that outlines the responsibilities of the district and school. However, lack of parental involvement is a major concern of staff members. The school does have a few dedicated parents who are very supportive. The school parent/community liaison has made substantial efforts to reach out and encourage families to become involved. Many of these efforts, such as telephone contact, newsletters, home visits, open houses, and Parent of the Month incentives, have had limited success. Interviews reveal that often parent work schedules prevent them from being more actively involved. Approximately 30 parents attended the Back to School Night and 48 parents attended the “Meet, Eat & Greet Your Parent Liaison,” both held in September 2006.

The school has a Parent Teacher Student Organization (PTSO) and a district parent task force. The PTSO is actively seeking members and has a current parent volunteer schedule for school events. These events include Back to School Night, Meet Parent Liaison, International Door Decoration Contest Day, Black History Program, Women’s History Program, Parent/Teacher Fashion Show, and Science Fair/Science Project Contest. The PTSO parent liaison has a newsletter to facilitate communication between students, families, and school staff.

Some parents and families feel welcomed in the school and are members of the School Leadership Council (SLC). However interviews reveal that some parents are not comfortable coming to the school.

There are community and family collaborations that provide services and resources for students and families, including Commerce Bank, 4-H Club, Rutgers Cooperative Extension, Asbury Academy Dance, Center for Vocational Rehabilitation, Asbury Works, Visiting Nurse Association (VNA) of Central New Jersey, Boys and Girls Club, and Mercy Center.

APHS has procedures in place regarding school and home communication; however the procedures are not fully implemented by school leadership. Interviews reveal that communication home is not consistent. School leadership states that this is in part due to the constant mobility of students and parents.

Student progress reports have not been sent home at regular intervals. Interviewees state that there was a delay receiving the most recent marking period grades.

Interviewees state that some teachers contact parents to discuss student progress, but most contact is for discipline and behavior issues. Teachers and support staff state that they have difficulty reaching families.
Students are not involved in reporting progress to their families. Some parents interviewed have regular communication with the school to discuss their students’ progress.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The parents of special education students are minimally involved in the school community. Approximately 20% attend IEP meetings and parent/teacher conferences. The special services leadership and members of the special education staff conduct quarterly meetings with special education parents to discuss special education topics, such as the IEP, parental participation in the IEP process, special education program, and options offered within the school. However, these meetings are poorly attended, attracting between four and ten parents per meeting. Special education teachers indicate that parents are more likely to attend programs that are tied to clubs, Special Olympics, or vocationally oriented programs. Teachers indicate that when meals are served in conjunction with the school meetings/programs, there is much better attendance; however, this has not been a recent practice.

Teachers are expected to maintain logs of their parental contacts and all interviewed teachers indicate that they are contacting homes on a somewhat regular basis, but this in not a monitored practice. IEP progress reports are sent home on a quarterly basis. Parental handbooks and the district Web site is not utilized to inform parents of procedures to follow in order to access interventions relative to student concerns.

5.2 The school ensures that ALL students, including special education students and English language learners, are taught what they are expected to learn and are provided with additional instructional programs and services in and beyond the classroom based on documented need.

**FINDINGS**

There is limited evidence that data for APHS extended-school services programs is collected and analyzed for modifications.

APHS provides a night school and summer school program to meet the needs of its students. The guidance department has a tutoring referral form which enables students to be identified for SPOT tutoring. Homework help and tutoring is available at the SPOT on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday from 2:30-3:30 p.m. and also during lunch periods. Additional tutoring is offered from 7 to 7:30 a.m. in the media center and during lunch times per request. The school guidance department, teachers, and SPOT identify students with academic needs to provide tutoring services. The services are to promote individual student achievement, as noted on the tutoring referral form provided by the guidance department. There is no evidence that the program is evaluated and modified as necessary to close achievement gaps.

Title I Supplemental Educational Services (SES) is isolated from the school’s instructional program. The 2006-2007 list of SES providers was sent to parents of eligible students and made available to support staff. However, interviewees state that it was not received in a timely manner. The guidance department was informed of the availability of services after the district cut-off date for enrollment. Guidance requested the extension of the enrollment period to encourage the participation of students within APHS.
The APHS Background Information Form indicates this school year (2006-2007) 379 students are eligible to receive SES and 26 students are receiving services. However there is no supportive documentation and or evidence the services are being utilized (i.e., contract with provider, student name, service provided, hours attended).

The four school guidance counselors collaborate with the school staff and families; however the school does not provide a school-wide guidance program that encompasses support services in life skills and social and career options for all students. Each counselor’s caseload is approximately 125 students. Three counselors are assigned students alphabetically, with one of the three specializing in ELL students. The fourth counselor is assigned to students with special needs. The guidance department recently hosted a “Coffee with the High School Counselors.” Only two parents attended the two-hour event. In an attempt to communicate with stakeholders, the guidance department creates a newsletter which includes topics such as SAT registration dates and deadlines, senior scholarship information, information for juniors interested in college, and scheduled dates of college admission representatives visiting the school. The guidance department is available to parents to address all course schedules and conflicts issues. The department meets with all juniors to provide information on the Junior College Packet. The packet was created to assist students with requirements for college admission, including guidelines for testing, the application process, and financial aid. Counselors assist students daily and have an open door policy to meet students’ needs. Student interviews indicate some students have only met with their counselor one time during the year. Some students state they do not know who their counselor is, while others indicate they prefer to meet with a counselor who was not assigned to them because “you can tell he really cares.” The guidance department is also expected to provide crisis services to students and staff as the need arises.

APHS has a technology coordinator and a district technology supervisor. There is a district technology plan and most classrooms have one to two computers. The total number of computers reported in the building is approximately 300, not including laptops. The school has four mobile carts with 12 to 15 laptops each. Two SMART Boards are in a closet in the media center. The building does not have wireless capabilities. Some computers are not operating; some are antiquated and the mobility of the software is sluggish. Students have access to computers in the nine computer labs located throughout the building. There is no evidence of student distance learning opportunities or virtual high school. There is some evidence of computer-assisted learning for some students to access the common academic core. Teachers can sign up classes to access computer labs on a first-come, first-served basis. The ELL students utilize the new ELLIS program to increase their English language skills.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION

There is no formal intervention program offered during the school day or after school that supports and promotes individual achievement. There is a Wilson Reading course offered to identified students on an elective basis; however students have the option of rejecting this program in favor of other classes in their schedules. Consequently there are a number of students who are in need of this service who are not participating in the program.

There are few instructional programs available to special education students beyond daily classroom instruction. Tutoring can be accessed through the SPOT program on a student-initiated basis and there
is an after-school homework program available. However, these programs are poorly utilized, with as few as two students per day attending the homework program.

Individual and group counseling is offered through the SPOT program, the guidance department, and the CST on a limited basis during the school day and after school. However, teachers feel that the need is far greater than these services can accommodate. They express the need for additional counseling services, such as social problem solving and anger management. In addition, there is no evidence of a character education program in place in order to address values, behavior, and attitudes as they relate to students’ academic and social behavior.

5.3 The school ensures equitable access to a common academic core for all students including special education and ELL students.

FINDINGS
The implemented curriculum provides little challenge and a limited common academic core for all students. There is no evidence that the implemented curriculum and instructional program elicit higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills from students.

The implemented curriculum and instructional program provide limited accommodations for the learning needs of students, particularly those with limited English proficiency. ELL students are required to participate in general education classes with little to no accommodations. There is no evidence of an implemented ELL curriculum or instruction program within general education classes to accommodate the needs of ELL students. Course offerings provide some opportunity for all students to access a curriculum that is aligned to the NJ CCCS.

The curriculum standards and expectations in content areas are occasionally identified and communicated to students. Students interviewed are unable to communicate teacher expectations or an understanding of curriculum standards. Few students are aware of rubrics and indicate they only use rubrics when writing persuasive essays in language arts.

There is no evidence that the SLC has given input to procedures and school leadership has implemented procedures that ensure all students have equal access to the common academic core. SLC members report they are given final products to sign off on, for example NCLB reports, but are not given opportunity for input to procedures ensuring students have equal access to curriculum or instructional programs.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
Asbury Park High School offers its special education students a full range of program options. There are 29 students placed in three self-contained classes, two of which are for behaviorally disordered students and one for cognitively impaired (CI) students. There are 53 students attending predominantly out-of-class replacement classes in English, math, social studies, and science, and 21 students in in-class support (ICS) in English, math, social studies and science. In addition, HSPA classes are offered in replacement and ICS structures. Although all of these classes are available to special education students, as per their IEPs, scheduling conflicts, such as with vocational school placement, sometimes precludes their implementation. In fact, scheduling conflicts are perceived to be a major impediment to providing special education students with needed instructional programs.
The general education curriculum, based on New Jersey Core Content Curriculum standards, is offered in all of these classes. The same textbook is used in all classes, except for the CI class. It is expected that the curriculum will be modified to accommodate the diverse needs of these students. These modifications are, for the most part, based on the IEP and teacher observation of the student’s response to instruction. These modifications are very general in nature, seldom individualized, and rarely based on a child’s preferred learning style or multiple intelligence. They are at best good teaching practices, such as preferential seating, extra time, eye contact, rephrasing, demonstrate task, break into manageable units, and simplify directions. They sometimes indicate that a teacher should use a behavioral management system or instruct at level, with no further direction.

Classroom observations reveal that special education students assigned to ICS classes complete the same classroom activities, assessments, and homework assignments as all other students without modifications, although there are accommodations, such as those listed above, listed in their IEPs. In addition, classroom observations and interviews reveal that there are some students in replacement classes who could derive their greatest educational benefit in an ICS class with more sophisticated modifications and differentiation of instruction, that would encompass content, processes, and products. Teachers indicate that there are issues that mitigate against greater levels of ICS placement for their students. General education teachers have not been adequately trained in the collaborative teaching model and sometimes display a negative attitude toward these children in their classes or the presence of the ICS teacher. Further the general education program is perceived to lack quality in terms of instruction and behavior management and would sometimes provide a hostile environment in which to place special education students.

Finally, although the WRAP program provides the Wilson reading program to some special education students on an elective basis, there are many students who have significant reading deficits that include phonemic awareness, phonetic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension issues and whose needs are not being met in their academic program. Further, teachers, guidance, and CST staff express the need for more classes that will focus on the life skills and vocational needs of these students, and that a strict adherence to the general education curriculum is not affording that opportunity.

5.4 Students who are falling behind receive necessary additional assistance to support their learning in and beyond the classroom.

FINDINGS

Limited opportunities are provided for students to receive additional assistance beyond initial classroom instruction. The SPOT provides some opportunities for students to receive additional assistance with tutoring services as noted above. Extended school services (e.g., before or after school, Saturday, or summer) instructional time is effectively used to support student achievement during the tutoring time with the SPOT, but attendance is low. Additionally, summer school provides support but attendance then also is low.

There is no evidence of collaboration between extended student services and classroom teachers to meet student needs and to close achievement gaps across subpopulations.

There is limited collaboration among classroom teachers and support programs and services to meet student needs and eliminate gaps and overlap in delivery of services supporting student achievement.
Teachers can request tutoring services for students, but there is no evidence indicating further communication is made to ensure the teacher and service provider are modifying services for students to close the achievement gap.

There is no evidence of SES provided to students.

Co-curricular programs support student learning, and all students have equitable access to the programs. The school provides after-school chorus, Gentlemen of Distinction, Health Careers Club, Key Club, Ladies of Essence, Literacy Magazine, National Honor Society, SADD, Science Club, Spanish Club, Student Council, and Yearbook Committee. Students have equitable access to programs, but attendance sign-in sheets indicate limited participation in co-curricular programs. The school provides limited opportunities for service learning with club activities.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Asbury Park High School has established the use of an intervention and referral services committee (I&RS) as a vehicle to provide additional assistance beyond the classroom. Its membership is comprised of the health and social services coordinator, who serves as its chairperson; a CST member; the attendance officer; a guidance counselor; the referring teacher; two teachers; the parent liaison; the parent; and the child. An administrator is always invited to meetings and is considered a member of the team, but does not always attend. The only member of the team that has been formally trained is the chairperson. There is a faculty inservice offered annually to review procedures, when to refer, and teacher responsibility within the process. The committee has received 11 referrals this school year that were primarily behavioral in nature, e.g. cutting class and disrespect. A few of the referrals have been academic in nature relative to homework completion or low achievement. One referral has been sent onto the CST, which did result in classification. The CST indicates that most of their referrals come through parents or other sources and seldom from the I&RS committee.

Given the number of students who are manifesting academic and behavioral problems at Asbury Park High School, this is a seriously underutilized committee. Teacher interviews reveal that it is perceived to be a cumbersome and ineffective process. An examination of the action plans indicates that there are limited interventions available and most are after school and infrequently accessed by students: counseling, tracking, weekly progress reports, some school day counseling, etc. There is no attempt by the committee to influence strategies utilized in the classroom. Its entire focus is on out-of-class interventions. The committee laments the fact that they are not “taken seriously” by the faculty and wishes that there were more interventions available to them. They express the need for a character education program as well as a student mentoring program. They would like to have more power to alter students’ schedules. The committee does not formally reflect on their success as a committee or the lack of utilization by the staff. They do not submit an end-of-the-year report or make recommendations for professional development.

There are other resources within the school that teachers can access on behalf of their students: the guidance department or the school-based youth services program, in which students “enroll” in their intervention and recreational program. There are no clear guidelines, however, as to relative criteria on which to make referral choices, including for the I&RS.
STANDARD 5 NEXT STEPS

1. Increase consistently school mailings to parents and families. (5.1)

2. The school should continue to solicit parents to enroll their children in SES programs. The most current list of all providers must be given to parents for the selection process. Guidance counselors should follow up with telephone communication to all eligible parents communicating the eligibility of their children to tutoring services provided by SES companies. (5.1, 5.4)

STANDARD 5 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the efficiency of the current computer program (Genesis) used to process progress reports. (5.1)

2. Establish a school-based faculty member to monitor and evaluate the SES providers, which would include formalizing articulation with APHS teachers. (5.2)

3. Establish a formal, school-wide Career Day event at APHS. (5.2)

4. Back to School Night should include informational sessions about SES programs to eligible parents to encourage participation. (5.1, 5.4)

5. The school should continue to offer additional assistance targeting students with academic needs and should gather data to ensure instructional time effectively supports closing student achievement gaps. (5.4)

6. Collaboration should occur between classroom teachers and extended school services teachers, using, but not limited to, e-mail, progress reports, and notes.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. Parent participation should be addressed as a primary focus of the school and should be made a component of the school improvement plan with specific action plans, assigned responsibilities, and evaluation components. (3.3, 5.1)

2. Consideration should be given to providing parent training experiences within the community, such as churches and community centers. (5.1)

3. Greater utilization of the parent liaison should be made in facilitating parent attendance at IEP meetings, parent workshop sessions offered by the special services department, and parent-teacher conferences. (5.1)

4. Parent communication logs should be monitored by supervisors on a regular basis. (5.1)

5. There should be a formal, concerted effort by special education teachers, parent liaison, and CST case managers to motivate more special education children to attend the after-school homework assistance program. (5.2)
6. Consideration should be given to increasing the opportunity for more special education students to access the general education curriculum through ICS, with more significant modifications than are now being provided. All student placements should be determined on the basis of where that child would derive the greatest educational benefit and not on whether he or she can achieve at the same level as every other student in that class. This requires that placement discussions begin with the presumption that a child can be educated in a general education class with supplemental aides and services and should only be removed when it is determined that a child can derive greater educational benefit by doing so. The KABC test that is now being utilized as an assessment of cognitive ability by the high school child study team could be utilized, in part, as a criterion for this placement. (5.3)

7. In order to improve the effectiveness of the I&RS, the following should be addressed:
   a. Training for current team members;
   b. Further delineation of the criteria for referral;
   c. Development of a teacher-friendly referral process;
   d. Administrative attendance at each meeting;
   e. Increased focus on classroom-based interventions;
   f. The development of a mentoring program;
   g. The development of a character education program; and
   h. Consideration of a math lab or other tutorial services during the school day. (5.4)

STANDARD 6 - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
The school provides research-based, results-driven professional development opportunities for staff that are consistent with the district’s professional development plan and implements performance evaluation procedures in order to improve teaching and learning.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:
- School and district administrator, teacher, non-instructional staff, parent, and student interviews
- Review of Asbury Park High School (APHS) Vision/Mission/Philosophy statements, 2006-2007 student planner, district discipline policy, district school safety policy, crisis and emergency evacuation report, district parental involvement policy, district homework policy, 2006-2007 school and community perception survey results, 2007-2008 curriculum offerings, Asbury Park Public Schools Technology Plan 2004-2007, supplemental educational services (SES) providers, community partnerships, school Web site, parent/community liaison newsletter, guidance newsletter, mailings sent to parents/guardians, common planning time sign-in sheets, professional development calendar, professional development plan, PowerPoint presentations, memos, letters, e-mails, PIPs, AP differentiation guide, full-day and half-day in-service schedules, student handbook, attendance reports, School in Need of Improvement plan, school perception surveys, and school report card
- Classroom visitations and observations of hallways and stairwells, arrivals and dismissals
STANDARD 6 INDICATORS

6.1 There is evidence of a school-wide professional growth plan that supports collaboration among staff and decreases isolation and fragmentation.

FINDINGS
The school does a limited amount of planning for professional development. Teacher interviews confirm that some articulation occurs weekly, during a common planning period, by various content instructors and grade levels. However, as the common planning time is not designed or implemented with teams in mind, teams do not generally meet. Interviews reveal that there is very little vertical and horizontal articulation among teachers in the building. There is no evidence of a formal plan for vertical or horizontal articulation due to scheduling of staff. The building has a staff professional development calendar.

Teachers at the ninth grade level have a math consultant (provided by the Carnegie Learning program) to provide in-class modeling, assistance, and training to supplement the Carnegie Learning Algebra I program, as an attempt to ensure ongoing, job-embedded professional development in that one area.

The Cognitive Tutor has been in place for almost six months as part of the recommendations provided from the Abbott Secondary Initiative for Academic Rigor I. The program is aligned to the NJ CCCS. It is comprised of standards-based modules. Some professional development opportunities are offered that support the enhancement of leadership abilities for some members of the staff (e.g., administrators only). The district level provides a leadership forum to foster aspiring leaders in the district.

The district provides few opportunities for professional learning teams to collaborate between schools. The district has provided a minimal amount of opportunities for professional learning teams to collaborative vertically and horizontally for the purpose of improving student achievement. The present structure inhibits effective intradistrict collaboration.

Professional learning teams have made little progress toward decreasing isolation and fragmentation among staff. The teachers scheduled within common planning times do not share students nor are they from the same department. There is no evidence that professional learning leaders are trained nor are they available to lead common planning time training activities CPT is not structured to decrease the isolation and fragmentation of departments or teachers with students in common.

There is little attempt to involve all stakeholders in professional development planning. The professional development survey reveals that less than 50% of the instructors participated in the online survey. There is no evidence that the collaborative design of professional development is reviewed by SLC.

FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION
There is little evidence of a sustained, school-wide professional growth plan in place at the school. Misapplication of the common planning time precludes most articulation and formal collaboration among teachers.
6.2 School-based professional development priorities are set by aligning the goals for student performance with the evidence of achievement and with the Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs) of teachers and principals.

FINDINGS

The professional development needs of individual staff members are primarily identified through the evaluation process. Out of district opportunities in the area of professional development are determined by individuals’ PIPs and observations performed by school administration.

Professional development opportunities are aligned with the school’s learning goals for students and the PIPs of staff members. The professional development plan, two-year report on instructional priorities, and the recommendations contained in the Abbott Secondary Initiative for Academic Rigor contain building and district objectives. Most PIPs are standardized with building and district objectives listed.

Professional development opportunities have few avenues promoting the attainment of the goal of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. Some teachers and support staff are enrolled in secondary and post-secondary courses to improve instructional techniques and strategies. The district provides tuition reimbursement to staff for graduate course work.

6.3 Professional development is high quality, job-embedded, frequent, content-focused and school-based.

FINDINGS

Professional development does not emphasize sustained growth and sometimes focuses on content. Professional development via half- and full-day work sessions is implemented on a monthly basis. Teachers have difficulty reporting topics of professional development during the workshops. There is minimal evidence that common planning times are being used effectively. There is some evidence that some structured professional development is planned and implemented. The professional learning communities are in place, but because of scheduling issues the communities are not pure by departments or teams. Professional learning leaders have not been defined or trained.

Professional development provides little time for colleagues to work together. The current master scheduling prohibits collaboration of departments and meeting of co-teachers during CPT. Few teachers can work collaboratively to discuss topics such as differentiation of instruction, behavior modifications, test modifications, curriculum adjustments, grading, and analysis of student work. Professional learning teams do not have clearly identified objectives or do not use protocols or self-designed, structured processes to meet the objectives.

Evaluation of professional development is limited to once each year and is not a high priority. The professional development survey reveals that less than 50% of the instructors participated in the online survey. There is no evidence to show that the collaborative design of professional development is reviewed by SLC.

The school makes limited use of nontraditional avenues to provide professional development. One teacher was exposed to AP teaching techniques via the Internet this summer.
6.4 The school leadership uses the employee evaluation and the individual professional growth plan to connect improvements in teaching practice with individual classroom goals. There is a professional growth plan for the school leader that connects the professional growth goals to improved academic achievement as its highest priority.

FINDINGS
The evaluation of employees and PIPs attempts to correlate with the instructional needs of students and the professional needs of all staff members as reflected in the professional growth plan. School and district administrators state that they evaluate staff and discuss PIPs on a regular basis, address professional needs via evaluation of staff members, and consider the instructional needs of the students.

Some PIPs are collaboratively developed and are differentiated based on individual professional needs identified through the evaluation process. Administrative interviews reveal that PIPs are discussed on a regular basis, although some staff state that some administrators and supervisors discuss PIPs more frequently than others. Some staff state that PIPs are developed collaboratively, keeping in mind improving student achievement, the school goals, and objectives that are outlined in the two-year instructional and professional development plans.

PIPs foster reflection, but do not impact professional practice. Classroom visitations demonstrate that teachers provide limited differentiation of instruction, test modifications, and curriculum adjustments.

School leadership professional growth plan have been developed and established. They were developed with the assistance with AIR (American Institute of Research) and professional development within the district. The focus was on a shared vision of improving student achievement.

STANDARD 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As part of the SLC, establish a separate building-level professional development team that develops the school PD plan and monitors its implementation during the year. (6.1)

2. All building administration should participate in curricular professional development opportunities to enhance their abilities as educational leaders. (1.1, 6.3)

3. Increase and continue to provide job-embedded professional development in differentiated instruction, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), cultural diversity, behavioral management, and any new initiatives. (6.2, 6.3)

   http://www.njpep.org/classroom/bilingual_esl/Sheltered.html

4. Consider the use of the CAPA surveys and rubrics (Standard 6) as a reference to improve the process of observation and evaluation. Administration should implement this standard as part of the normal management. Additionally, data should be reviewed and analyzed to determine individual teachers’ areas of strengths and weakness. (6.4)
5. The school should continue to take advantage of the myriad of professional development opportunities provided by the NJDOE, usually at no cost to the district. (6.1, 6.4) (www.nj.gov/njded/educators/cccspd.pdf)

STANDARD 7 - LEADERSHIP
School instructional decisions focus on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction, high performance expectations, creating a learning culture, and developing leadership capacity.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:
- Principal, assistant principal, district science coordinator, classroom teacher, and student interviews
- Review of NCLB documents, principal’s memos, principal reports to the superintendent and board of education, SLC agendas and minutes (five years), common planning period materials, professional development materials, faculty meeting agendas, and board of education policies
- Classroom visitations

STANDARD 7 INDICATORS

7.1 The principal ensures all teachers have the instructional materials and the training necessary to master the CCCS.

FINDINGS
School and district leaders provide opportunities for two days each year for training. Some of this training may relate to enabling students to master the CCCS in LAL and mathematics. Very little training is related to state assessment data. The information gained from various interviews presents a mixed message at best. Many classes have all the materials appropriate to their curricular area; some don’t have enough texts; many orders of consumable and non-consumable materials are not received until well in to the school year. There are quantities of used texts and workbooks found in several areas of the school. Some staff report that there are new materials that have been ordered and received and never opened. Several teachers indicate that they had to photocopy parts of their texts and other instructional materials because their orders have not been received until well into the school year.

The media center provides some current and appropriate instructional resources to support some areas of the school’s implemented curriculum. There is an absence of current electronic instructional resources. Some interviews reveal that the media center is not keeping pace with the increasingly complex nature of the diversity of the student body.

FINDINGS—DISTRICT
All interviews are consistent with regard to purchasing problems: all purchase orders necessary to provide materials in time for the start of the school year were completed in a timely manner and forwarded to the central business office. At the business office stage of the purchasing process, there appears to be a bottleneck that delays final processing of purchase orders and mailing of orders to the vendors.
7.2 The principal ensures data are analyzed and disaggregated to assist teachers in adjusting their instructional practices.

FINDINGS
A review of faculty meeting agendas and principal’s memos to staff reveal that, consistently over time, the vast majority of meetings and memos address management and procedure issues. While the importance of the latter is not questioned, the dearth of agenda items and memos addressing instructional issues, including data interpretation, clearly indicates that there is very limited effort and time devoted to having the instructional staff address academic proficiency issues.

The principal reviews the analysis and disaggregated data. The principal has a “Cabinet” comprised of the principal, the assistant principals, and subject area supervisors. This group sometimes considers analysis of data in comparing academic achievements of subgroups. Interviews indicate that this group does address analysis of disaggregated data and that student grouping decisions are made at that level and they carry the decisions back to the instructional staff. By contract, the leadership is limited to two one-hour staff meetings per month. The agendas of these meetings focus primarily on management issues.

The common planning time model employed by this high school is, by design, ineffective. The only thing that groups of teachers have in common is their scheduled planning time. They do not instruct a common body of students, nor are they are part of a curriculum area. The groups are an accidental and heterogeneous grouping of teachers. The general feeling among the instructional staff is that this approach to common planning time is ineffective, particularly in terms of school improvement.

The principal does not systematically review disaggregated data with the SLC to adjust instructional practices. As indicated previously, that review function is done by the principal’s cabinet. The school has a very large (28-32 members) SLC, which has been in place for many years and enjoys the participation of a significant number of parents. Membership in the SLC is by self-nomination. While the SLC is in compliance with the Abbott regulations regarding membership composition, a review of the subjects taught by the teachers currently on the SLC reveals an absence of language arts and mathematics teachers. A review of five years of agendas and minutes of the SLC demonstrates that it primarily focuses on annual professional development for the group with a review of the Abbott regulations governing SLCs. There is no evidence that training is provided for data analysis, school goal setting, group dynamics, or meeting management. The SLC members indicate that they use both majority rule and consensus in their decision-making. While the use of the consensus model is appropriate, it is a very difficult process to use with a group that has as many as 32 members. When asked to share one major initiative the group had successfully completed, the group is unable to respond.

7.3 The principal plans and allocates resources, appropriately assigns staff, monitors progress, provides organizational support, and removes barriers to sustain continuous school improvement with a commitment to equity, diversity, and the learning needs of all students.

FINDINGS
There is little evidence beyond interviews that resource allocation is aligned to support some of the learning goals of the school. Where alignment appears, it is not seen as adequate. There is a very limited number of principal reports to the superintendent and board of education. It should be pointed
out that this high school has had five principals during the last seven years. This condition has generated a seriously low level of consistency and stability with the staff of the school. Trust and rapport are low. Such an interpersonal condition presents a serious barrier to school leadership and limits the ability of the leadership to sustain continuous school improvement. If a new face appears in the principal's office every year or two, the new principal is challenged to “get to know” the capacity of the instructional staff, making it difficult to appropriately assign staff, monitor progress, or provide organizational support. There is minimal evidence that data analysis has had any effect. This high school is a traditional high school with 42-minute periods. Discussion by the leadership has been addressing the need to move to block scheduling. Both the design of the master schedule and the individual scheduling of students is still done by hand. The explanation for this is that APHS is a small school with under 500 students.

The school administration indicates that the school community is aware of and sometimes implements practices regarding educational equity and an appreciation of diversity; multicultural considerations are reflected in instructional strategies and seamlessly integrated into the curriculum. Some professional staff indicate that teachers do not normally make curricular connections for the students. This high school has had a large minority student population, primarily African-American, for several decades. More recently Latino and Haitian students have become a significant part of the student population. This change in the student body composition has introduced tension between some student groups.

School staff members are seriously challenged to establish and sustain a culture that minimizes the impact of physical, cultural, or socioeconomic factors on learning. While interviews suggest that bullying is not a major problem, the presence of gangs in the community now influences student behavior in the school. As a result, fights in the school between minority groups is on the increase.

The principal is limited in implementing procedures to ensure that staff member assignments are made to address specific student needs. The size of the school and size of the faculty severely limit the capacity of the principal and leadership staff; there are very few options available. This is currently particularly true with regard to special education assignments. Certification limitations also play a role. In science, for example, certification drives assignment decisions. All teachers are certified to teach in their assigned areas. Classroom assignments may allow informal resource sharing, mentoring, and collaboration among teachers and students, but these arrangements are generally not intentional. No attempts have been made to cluster students of a particular grade level together; nor are teachers’ rooms assigned in a way that would cluster curriculum areas. Within the master schedule, this condition is reflected; there are no common planning periods of teachers who instruct the same students or teachers who instruct in the same curricular area. The individual initiative of teachers is the only avenue available for resource sharing, mentoring, or collaboration.

Instructional assistants (paraprofessionals or aides) are provided in some areas, but the numbers are insufficient to meet needs. For the most part, teachers do not use the few paraprofessionals available in an effective way. Interviews indicate that there has been some effort to maximize this opportunity. Observations and opinions shared in interviews suggest that security personnel are very effective when they are cohesive, but that they are too informal. Informality is seen as decreasing their effectiveness.
7.4 The principal gives highest priority to academic performance, sustaining a learning environment that promotes development of teacher leaders and efficiency of operations.

FINDINGS

The SLC currently has no role in school improvement plan recommendations relative to the requirements outlined in the Abbott and/or Title I regulations. The principal does not engage staff or students in discussions about student academic performance during or after receipt of state assessment results. Staff are engaged indirectly through the cabinet model of communication. But, absent scheduled opportunities within the school day to comprehensively enable this process, effectiveness is severely limited.

The principal is well aware of the connection between NJ CCCS and academic achievement, but does not regularly focus faculty meetings on this issue. When the principal does this it is done in a formal one-on-one setting. It is primarily done by curriculum staff. There is no vertical articulation.

The principal states that she conducts and logs frequent informal walkthroughs and formal classroom observations and provides timely feedback to staff members on their instructional practices. This has not been supported by instructional and other district staff interviews. The principal maintains a looseleaf record of all formal observations and informal walkthroughs. Observations are conducted in accordance with state law and local board policy. The form used was developed mutually by the principal and local Education Association (NJEA affiliate). Discussion of findings and feedback is provided in private sessions.

The principal attempts to create a supportive learning environment, but the issue of frequent administrative turnover can be seen as a barrier. The culture of the school faculty appears to have evolved into an exercise in survival. Every year or two there is a new principal; the new principal is at the beginning, needing to establish an environment of trust. Until trust is established, the role of the principal as change agent cannot begin. This school year the faculty was presented with an all new administrative team: the principal and both assistant principals are new (the principal did begin during the course of the previous school year). The actions of the principal do not yet have a major impact on student academic performance because of the instability and inconsistency caused by the frequent administrative turnover. Trust and respect can only be earned over time, and every time this journey has begun it has been interrupted by turnover.

To the degree possible, the principal has attempted to provide organizational direction, but has not yet developed a distributed leadership capacity. While significant responsibility has been vested in the assistant principals, they are in their first year and find themselves primarily addressing the promotion of a safe and orderly school environment. An analysis of the functions and activities of the SLC suggests that there could be a greater effort on the part of the school administration to develop teacher leaders in the role of change agents for school improvement.

STANDARD 7 RECOMMENDATIONS

SCHOOL
1. A purchase order internal tracking system should be designed to follow the purchase orders from the time they are cut until the day of delivery to the specific teacher. (7.1)
2. The SLC should review its bylaws to improve the representation of the instructional staff and require that, at a minimum, language arts and mathematics teachers be represented. This revision should be in place in time for the annual membership activity. (7.2)

3. SLC professional development activities should be broadened to include data analysis, school goal setting, group dynamics, and meeting management. (7.2)

4. The school leadership is strongly encouraged to restructure the high school into small learning communities. Including the SLC in this initiative is also strongly encouraged. Research must begin immediately, identifying the various models supported by scientific research. A high school of this size could easily be converted to the academy/institutes model: the 9th grade could be an academy, while the 10th, 11th, and 12th grades could consist of a collection of magnets in specialized areas of vocational opportunities, such as creative arts, science, and the like. (7.3)

5. The SLC should immediately address the issue of “culture clash” as represented in the violence between different minority groups. (7.3)

6. The SLC should be trained to participate in the development of the school improvement plans in accordance with Abbott regulations, Title I regulations, and the related Standards and Indicators of the CAPA model. (7.4)

DISTRICT
1. The district business office should review internal purchasing procedures to enable rapid delivery of instructional materials to the school. (7.1)

2. Serious attention should be given to the issues of low levels of staff trust and cohesiveness. Leadership stability and consistency will go a long way in providing a professionally safe, collaborative, and secure work environment. The district leadership, including the superintendent and the board of education, must address the issue of frequent administrative turnover in the high school. (7.3)

STANDARD 8 - ORGANIZATION AND RESOURCES
There is evidence that the school is organized to maximize use of all available resources to support high student and staff performance.

EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:
- Principal, assistant principal, district science coordinator, classroom teacher, and student interviews
- Review of NCLB documents, principal’s memos, principal reports to the superintendent and board of education, SLC agendas and minutes (five years), common planning period materials, professional development materials, faculty meeting agendas, and board of education policies (homework)
- Classroom visitations
STANDARD 8 INDICATORS

8.1 Leadership ensures that staff protects and makes efficient use of time to maximize learning and the school schedule reflects instructional priorities.

FINDINGS
The school leaders have an informal agreement to protect instructional time. This is accomplished by minimizing public address system interruptions during the course of the instructional day. More significantly, as one walks the halls of the school during the times when classes change, one will all too frequently observe students entering into conversations in the halls with little sensitivity to their responsibility to get to their next class on time. Many students arrive at their next class five to ten minutes late. There does not appear to be any one system of managing this problem, as different teachers handle it differently. Consistency across the faculty in this regard is absent.

The classroom management and organizational practices of some teachers ensure that instructional use of class time is maximized. Classroom visitations present both extremes from minimum to maximum use of classroom time. Some teachers have set up classroom routines that are followed to the letter; others start class with a condition of disruption, wasting valuable time because student routines are not in place. Some teachers have clearly written directions including the objective of the lesson and students’ assignments on the chalk board; some do not. The school leadership devoted two months at the start of the school year to professional development in classroom management.

The traditional class day consisting of nine 42-minute periods with four minutes to change presents a significant loss of student instructional contact time. Classes do not begin until all students are present. If lateness prevails, there are only 32 student contact minutes per class. As a class enters the last ten minutes of class time, the focus often shifts to the anticipation of going to the next class. This leaves 22 minutes of contact time. Little can be accomplished in 22 minutes; cooperative learning cannot take place and attention to differentiated instruction is severely limited.

School leadership does not sufficiently adjust the schedule to address instructional needs. The recent ice and snow storm created a situation of high teacher absence (25 teachers or approximately one third of the faculty) because of dangerous roads. This situation led to several classes meeting without a faculty member or any adult in the room. A “late start” plan was not available and had to be developed on the spot. There is an overuse of periods eight and nine for alternate activities such as assemblies. Over a school year, this means that those subjects scheduled in those periods meet significantly less often then periods one through seven.

Teacher expectations are low regarding the use technology for instructional purposes. There are three computer laboratories in the school but few desktop computers in the classrooms. Very few classroom desktop computers are turned on, and the few that are turned on are being used for Internet research. All computers in instructional spaces are connected to the Internet, but there is very little blocking of inappropriate Web sites. There is little evidence that teachers infuse technology into their day-to-day instruction; nor is there evidence that such pedagogy is encouraged or supported by the school administration.
School leadership ensure that programs (i.e. assembly programs, field trips) that occur during instructional time reinforce specific learning goals of students and extend classroom instruction. The science curriculum includes very exciting all-day trips to such places as the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia that have exhibits and experiences that relate to and enhance classroom learning.

Much of the evidence demonstrates that little effort is made to provide quality time that impacts on instruction. The absence of true common planning time and the use of 42-minute periods, coupled with the ineffective current approach to common planning time, severely handicap the instructional staff in providing quality instructional time.

There is no telephone or emergency call system in all classrooms. The majority of the teachers cannot make calls to the school office in case of an emergency, placing students at risk.

8.2 School leadership promotes staff/team planning vertically and horizontally across content areas and grades that is focused on the goals, objectives, and strategies in the report on instructional priorities (e.g., common planning time for content area teachers, emphasis on time on task, and integrated units).

FINDINGS
School leadership does not provide any opportunity for horizontal and vertical team planning by content and/or grade level. The leadership team members all express that the size of the school makes such efforts fruitless.

There is no attempt to provide any version of common planning time that would enable horizontal or vertical collaboration. The common planning time model that is in use is seen by many teachers as ineffective and useless.

8.3 The school matches teacher strengths and experience with the needs of students. The school intentionally assigns staff to maximize opportunities for all students to have access to the staff’s instructional strengths.

FINDINGS
Some students have equal access to all classes. There is conflicting information regarding the model used for grouping students, heterogeneous or homogeneous. While at the high school level it is both appropriate and understandable that in advanced placement courses there will be a degree of homogeneity among those enrolled, all students should be guaranteed placement in any class they choose. With regard to some mathematics and language arts classes, there appears to be some degree of homogeneity, with some of these classes being predominantly made up of underachievers. Some student groupings do cluster this type of student, but such assignment is not permanent.

There is an effective student/teacher ratio for meeting the needs of all students. The overall enrollment of the school enables small class sizes (18 to 1) in most subjects. The school, through the guidance office, has an informal method of making schedule adjustments. Freshman science classes tend to have more than 25 students, but, due to the dropout rate, science class enrollment in the 10th, 11th, and
12th grades decreases. The number of “singleton” (one class section) classes limits flexibility. Due to school and student body size, scheduling students aligned with staff strengths is limited.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Special education students have equitable access to all classes regardless of cultural background, physical abilities, socioeconomic status, or intellectual abilities. There is an effective student/teacher ratio that meets regulation and the needs of the special education students, although in-class support teacher assignments do not necessarily match the strengths of staff to the needs of students. Both general and special education teachers often report that ICS teachers, though qualified by the NJ House Standard, may not have enough expertise in the content area to which they are assigned.

8.4 There is evidence that homework is frequent and monitored and tied to instructional practice.

**FINDINGS**

Interviews with students provide a mix of comments from those who don’t think homework assignments are proper to those who always do their homework. The observed behavior suggests that homework as a part of the student culture of the school is held in low esteem. A common comment among all staff interviewed is that when one observes students coming to and from school, they have no backpacks and are carrying no books. There are several major dynamics that influence the willingness of individual students to do their homework. They see no personal value in it for them. When they leave school each day, they return to their homes and assume the role of parent for their younger siblings, and the environment of the home may not be conducive to doing homework.

The board of education policy governing homework provides guidelines that say, in part, that at the high school level students should have 20 minutes of homework for each subject at least four times per week. Classroom visits provide significant insight regarding the inconsistency of the application of homework guidelines among teachers. Many teachers assign a percentage of the marking period grade, ranging from 10% to 20%, for homework. The inconsistency surfaces with regard to collection of homework, review of homework in class, and turnaround time from collection of homework to return of homework. The assignments of some teachers do exhibit opportunities for authentic applications.

The evidence makes it abundantly clear that there is significant inconsistency among teachers regarding the application of the board of education homework policy guidelines. As well, there appears to be little evidence indicating the building leadership is addressing this problem.

**FINDINGS—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

There is inconsistent application of the district homework policy among special education teachers. While some teachers adhere to the district policy, others do not. Building administration appears unable to cope with this situation.

**STANDARD 8 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. There should be consistency among teachers in the management of lateness. It is strongly recommended that attendance and lateness be managed by computer. Daily attendance/lateness
records should be kept for each period of the day. Provide teachers with wireless laptops that communicate with the school office for the management of this system. (8.1)

2. Classroom management continues to be a problem. While significant professional development has been provided for classroom management, the application of the encouraged practices should be monitored in each classroom by the supervisory staff. (8.1)

3. Develop a rotation schedule in which day one starts with period one and day two starts with period two, working through nine periods. This model will avoid the repetitious cancelling of the same period every time there is an assembly. (8.1)

4. The administration should immediately develop a late start or delayed opening model to provide better supervision of students when an event causes a late start in the school day. (8.1)

5. Please refer to Standard 7 - recommendation #4. (8.2)

6. The SLC should immediately research the issue of inconsistency in the application of the board homework policy and develop building-level interpretation that provides value and guidance and requires all teachers to become consistent in the use of homework. (8.4)

**STANDARD 9 - COMPREHENSIVE AND EFFECTIVE PLANNING**

School leadership and the SLC or NCLB planning committee communicate a clear purpose, direction, and strategies focused on teaching and learning through the development, implementation, and evaluation of the following: vision, goals, NCLB school improvement plan, and report on instructional priorities for Abbott schools.

**EVIDENCE FOR THESE INDICATORS BASED ON:**

- Administrator, teacher, and non-instructional staff interviews
- Review of SLC agenda and minutes, attendance sign-in sheets, school Web page, and 2005-2006 school handbook
- Visitations to classrooms and hallway observations

**STANDARD 9 INDICATORS**

9.1 Leadership facilitates a collaborative process to develop a shared mission/vision and goals which are understood and ingrained in the school’s culture.

**FINDINGS**

Members of the prior administration of the Asbury Park High School adopted the school vision and mission statement in 2005. Interviews reveal that these statements were developed in preparation for the school’s middle states accreditation review. The vision statement states: “The Asbury Park High School is a place people want to be because we are motivated, equipped, and supported in achieving more than we ever thought.” Both mission and vision statements are posted on blue, 8 ½ x 11
laminated sheets of paper. Interviews with teachers reveal that the vision statement is not widespread or used to guide the school’s decisions.

The vision and mission statements are not posted on the school Web site or on the school marquee. Interviews and classroom visitations reveal that the school leadership rarely reinforces the mission/vision statement to set school-wide goals or to use the statements as a basis to guide the decision-making process. During interviews with teachers and staff, few are able to articulate the school’s mission/vision and goals, but know of its recent posting in the classrooms. The school’s goals have recently been revised by the newly appointed school administration, but mission/vision has not been revisited.

9.2 There is evidence that the NCLB Planning Committee or School Leadership Council (SLC) analyzes multiple forms of data to update the comprehensive needs assessment and to develop the NCLB School Improvement Plan or Abbott Report on Instructional Priorities.

FINDINGS
The Asbury Park High School’s School Leadership Council has been in existence for five years and consists of 32 members who are monetarily compensated for their time. Members of the SLC include administrators, teachers, nurse, parents, and community members, but special education is not represented on the committee. The members are appointed/elected for a two-year term. The council convenes on the first Thursday of each month from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Interviews with the committee members reveal that their primary function is to serve as an advisory committee to the principal and break down barriers between the school and community. Recent activities of the committee for the past four to five months involved revising the school’s bylaws, which have been adopted from the Asbury Park Middle School. The committee has an appointed chairperson who is responsible for creating the agenda. Committee members vote on the issues presented; however a majority of the issues voted on are positive in nature and typically are unopposed. Interviews reveal that the committee’s greatest accomplishment since its inception was creating a newsletter that was distributed last year but has been eliminated this year due to budgetary constraints.

The SLC members receive training from the assistant superintendent each year; however, their functions as team members do not include data assessment, the development of the school’s mission/vision statement, or input into the school’s academic planning. The SLC does not have any involvement in creating the school’s goals as outlined in the Abbott School Improvement Plan. There is no process in place for members of the committee to collect, manage, and analyze data. The school uses TerraNova data to analyze student performance.
9.3 Strategies in the NCLB School Improvement Plan or Abbott Report on Instructional Priorities are research-based, align with the school’s mission/vision and student and school goals/objectives, identify resources, and provide for a comprehensive evaluation.

FINDINGS
The CAPA team made several requests to the district liaison and district team members for the NCLB School Improvement Plan or Abbott Report on Instructional Priorities. The team received a large binder which was sent from central office. The binder included over 200 pages of fiscal documents printed from the NJDOE Web site. The plan was not in the binder nor was it presented to the team. However, it is accessible on line. Staff members interviewed are not familiar with the strategies outlined in the plan, the existence of this plan, or the process to develop the plan.

STANDARD 9 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The district should clearly define the role of the NCLB/SLC Planning Committee so that it is in compliance with the NCLB regulations with the following primary responsibilities as noted in the NCLB Act:
   a. Review and analyze all facets of the school’s operation, including student achievement data and the design and operation of the instructional programs, and use the findings from this review to help the school develop recommendations for improved student performance;
   b. Collaborate with school staff, LEA (local education agency) staff, and parents to design, implement, and monitor an effective school improvement plan that will help the school meet its improvement goals;
   c. Monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan and request additional assistance from the LEA or the SEA (state education agency) as needed; and
   d. Provide feedback at least twice yearly to the LEA and to the SEA, when appropriate, about the effectiveness of the school’s personnel and identify outstanding principals and teachers.

2. The school leadership committee should develop a mission/vision statement consistent with the school’s plans and goals for improving student performance and the overarching goal of exiting from NCLB “school in need of improvement” status. The existing committee should begin developing committees and a specific vision/mission statement based upon a shared set of beliefs that focus on improving all students’ academic performance and the instructional climate. (9.1)

3. The NCLB School Improvement Plan or the Abbott Report on Instructional Priorities should be a living document which is created and shared by the staff. The document should be created and revised based upon an analysis of student needs, with the input of the staff on a yearly basis. (9.3)
IN CONCLUSION

Members of the CAPA review team express their appreciation to the staff and community of Asbury Park High School for their gracious welcome and for their open interaction with us during our visit. We encourage the school community to review this report asking themselves reflective questions about the findings of fact and recommendations for action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Information Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Form to be completed by principal and team leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Name – Years in Building:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers in Building:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers meeting NCLB HQT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers with Emergency Certification and Subject Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Mobility Rate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attendance Rate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Classrooms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Special Education Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Special Education Students in Inclusive Classrooms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Special Education Students in Out-of-School Placement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Special Education Students in Inclusive Classrooms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Education Self Contained Classrooms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Inclusive Classrooms and Grade Levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent LEP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of LEP Students in Building for Less than One Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bilingual Classrooms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Receiving Bilingual Services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Receiving ESL Services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attendance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Suspensions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BACKGROUND INFORMATION FORM

(Form to be completed by principal and team leader)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Discipline Referrals</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Continually Enrolled Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leadership Council (SLC) or Title I Planning Committee (PC) Meets Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC or Title I Committee has complete representation including parent</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Parent Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major School Improvement Strategies or Whole School Reform (WSR) Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott only - Status of WSR Contract</td>
<td>Continuing - Discontinued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the School Received a Persistently Dangerous “Warning?”</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Current Number of Students Reading at Grade Level</td>
<td>Test:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a List of Benchmark Assessments Administered and the Timeline for Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYP Subgroups Status:</td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYP Content Areas Missed</td>
<td>Elementary: Language Arts – Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle: Language Arts – Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSPA Language Arts - Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts Program/Textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Program/Textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Offered Choice Option in 2006-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Receiving Choice Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Receiving Supplemental Services in 2005-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Eligible to Receive Supplemental Services in 2005-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Receiving Supplemental Services in 2006-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Eligible to Receive Supplemental Services in 2006-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Attending Basic Skills Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>