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About the SchoolWorks School Quality Review Process

The Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD) envisions 21st Century Schools of Choice in which students will be challenged with a rigorous curriculum that considers the individual learning styles, program preferences, and academic capabilities of each student, while engaging the highest quality professional educators, administrators, and support staff available. As part of Cleveland’s Plan for Transforming Schools, CMSD has adopted a portfolio district strategy that includes: growing the number of high quality district and charter schools, and closing or replacing failing schools; focusing the district’s central office on its role in school support and governance, while transferring authority and resources to schools; investing and phasing in high leverage school reforms across all levels; and increased accountability for all schools in the district through the creation of the Cleveland Transformation Alliance (CTA). CMSD has partnered with stakeholders to create a school performance framework that will be used to provide a comprehensive assessment of the quality of each school in the district. The comprehensive assessment will be an evidence-based process that includes data and information gathered on academic programs and performance, school climate, finance, operations, governance, and stakeholder satisfaction, among other sources.

CMSD has engaged SchoolWorks as a partner in implementing a school quality review (SQR) process aligned to CMSD initiatives and the school performance framework. The SQRs are used as one component of a comprehensive assessment of the quality of each school in the district; they are used to provide formative feedback to schools. Reviews include an action planning process in which the team and the school work together to identify prioritized areas for improvement.

The School Quality Review (SQR) protocol and review process provides a third-party perspective on current school quality for all students. The process will include two days of collecting evidence on site through interviews, classroom visits, and document review. While on site, the team meets to discuss, sort, and analyze evidence it is collecting. The site visit team uses evidence collected through these events to determine ratings in relation to the protocol’s criteria and indicators. In addition, the review will include a half-day prioritization session on the third day to assist the school in identifying root causes of opportunities for improvement and identifying which opportunities for improvement are of the highest priority and most likely to impact student achievement. The outcome of the action planning process is a prioritized plan of next steps, including strategies, resources, and timelines to accomplish goals.

The report documents the team’s ratings for key questions within each of the four domains identified in the SQR protocol: Instruction, Students’ Opportunities to Learn, Educators’ Opportunities to Learn, and Governance and Leadership The final page of the report is used to record the discussion and action plan developed by the team and the school during the prioritization process.
Domains and Key Questions

Based on trends found in the collected evidence, the site visit team assigns a rating to each key question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Level 1: Intensive Support</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Level 2: Targeted Support</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Level 3: Established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Level 4: Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain 1: Instruction**

1. *Classroom interactions and organization ensure a classroom climate conducive to learning.*  
   Targeted Support

2. *Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.*  
   Intensive Support Required

3. *Teachers regularly assess students’ progress toward mastery of key skills and concepts, and use assessment data to make adjustments to instruction and to provide feedback to students during the lesson.*  
   Intensive Support Required

**Domain 2: Students’ Opportunities to Learn**

4. *The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.*  
   Targeted Support Required

5. *The school’s culture reflects a safe, supportive learning environment that reflects high expectations.*  
   Targeted Support Required

**Domain 3: Educators’ Opportunities to Learn**

6. *The school designs professional development and collaborative support systems to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.*  
   Established

7. *The school’s culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.*  
   Targeted Support Required

**Domain 4: Governance and Leadership**

8. *School leaders guide and participate with instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.*  
   Targeted Support Required

9. *School leaders effectively orchestrate the school’s operations.*  
   Established
Domain 1: Instruction

1. **Classroom interactions and organization ensure a classroom climate conducive to learning.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Expectations</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Behavioral expectations are not consistently clear and understood by students.** According to school leaders and teachers, although the school has implemented an incentivized system to increase positive behaviors across the school (Project Success), teachers have autonomy to develop their own classroom rules. While teachers have created classroom rules, leadership, teachers, parents, and students reported instances in which inappropriate student behavior during instruction sometimes interfered with learning. The site visit team observed a lack of clearly understood student behavioral expectations in the majority of visited classrooms (n=12). Specifically, in 33% of observed lessons, the use of strategies to promote clear behavioral expectations was ineffective. In these classrooms, students engaged in inappropriate behaviors (e.g., running in the classroom or shouting at others); these behaviors were not immediately addressed. However, in the 50% of visited classes in which the use of clearly understood behavioral strategies was partially ineffective, teachers employed behavioral strategies, but with varying levels of success. For example, teachers used strategies such as positive narration, ClassDojo, countdowns, red-yellow-green cards, proximity, and verbal cues. In some lessons, learning was interrupted because teachers needed to repeat the same strategies multiple times (e.g., “Excuse me” to the same student; positive narration to the whole class) before students complied. In other lessons, some students ignored teachers’ directions, continued to engage in off-task behaviors (e.g., heads down, side conversations), and teachers moved on with the lesson. As another example, during instruction in one class, the teacher used positive narration and individual desists to correct behavior, but the majority of students continued to have side conversations and leave their seats during instruction, and the teacher re-directed students by lining up the whole class for a bathroom break.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structured Learning Environment</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **The learning environment is not consistently structured, and learning time is not maximized.** In most visited classes, teachers were observed using materials (e.g., overhead projector, handouts, anchor charts) that had been prepared in advance, but teachers inconsistently used strategies to structure and maximize learning time. Specifically, the effective promotion of student learning time within structured lessons was observed in only 17% of lessons. For example, during one 30-minute observation of a lesson, the teacher made students aware of a posted agenda of class activities and used a timer to engage students in three different instructional activities (each 7-to-12 minutes long).

¹ Due to rounding, the percentages for a particular indicator may not appear to total to 100%.
with minimal transition times from whole group instruction to small group and independent learning activities. However, in 84% of visited classes, the use of strategies to maximize student learning time was ineffective or only partially effective, and students were not generally provided with a sense of urgency for learning. In the majority of these classes, lessons were not paced appropriately, and students were not consistently engaged in learning throughout the lesson. For example, in some lessons, bell work activities stretched to 15-or-20 minutes, while students who finished early were not provided with additional learning tasks. In other classes, some students were called upon in sequence to answer teachers’ individually-directed questions, while the majority of students sat passively without being engaged in learning tasks. As another example, lesson pacing was slowed in one class when students were directed not to start the activity described on a provided worksheet until a few students, called in sequence, were asked to read the directions out loud to the class.

2. **Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused Instruction</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Lessons rarely provide students with clear learning goals and focused instruction.** Although leadership and teachers commonly reported that teachers are expected to plan lessons with measurable student learning goals in the form of “I can” statements, in the majority of observed classes, explicit academic learning objectives were not consistently communicated to students during instruction. Specifically, in 58% of observed lessons, the use of strategies to communicate academic content with clear learning goals was ineffective. In the majority of these lessons, learning goals were not posted, referenced, or made explicit during instruction. For example, in one class, the posted “I can” statement, dated for an earlier lesson, did not link with the actual learning activity. In another class, during a math lesson, students were asked to draw shapes without explicit reference to what they should know or be able to do. As another example, the lesson consisted of having students practice reading fluency by chorally reading a passage all together, but students were not provided with any academic content or learning goal beyond the teacher saying that they should be ready to be called upon the next day to read aloud individually. In 34% of visited classes in which focused instruction with clear learning goals was partially effective, provided learning goals were not always clarified for students. For example, during one lesson, the “I can” statement was to be able to identify component parts of objects, but the learning task was to describe objects. In some lessons, when students were asked what they were learning, they were able to state only broad learning goals or describe learning tasks, such as “I’m learning math” or “I’m answering questions from the worksheet.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• A variety of instructional strategies and materials are not consistently used to support students’ diverse needs. Although both leaders and teachers reported that teachers are expected to plan lessons with differentiated groupings, the format of whole group instruction was observed in the majority of visited classes. Further, in 83% observed classes, the use of varied instructional strategies was observed as ineffective or only partially effective. In the majority of these observed lessons, the site visit team noted the general lack of use of strategies to vary student groupings, to engage students in multi-sensory activities, or to differentiate academic content and materials. For example, in the majority of visited classes, even during lessons for literacy and math, observed instruction was primarily in the format of whole group instruction with teacher-dominated voice, and students were working on the same literacy examples or math problems, using the same instructional handouts and materials. As another example, in one math lesson, instruction consisted of the teacher explaining how to do the same four math problems while students passively listened. In another lesson, instruction for sight-word fluency consisted of students chorally reading the same words from the anchor chart. In other lessons, teachers missed opportunities to engage students in authentic paired or small group learning. For example, during one lesson, students were asked to work in small groups on a hands-on learning task, but students worked mostly individually without clear roles or expectations. In another lesson, students were provided with a visual (i.e., historical photograph) to stimulate thinking, but were asked to individually answer related questions on a handout, missing the opportunity to access, or demonstrate thinking about, academic content through engagement in differentiated learning activities such as think-pair-share, role-play, or other artistic formats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• There is limited use of in-class assessment strategies to reveal students’ thinking about learning goals. In 58% of observed lessons, the use of formative assessment strategies was ineffective, and in 33% of lessons, only partially effective. Further, in most visited classes, the site visit team observed a general lack of use of instructional in-class assessment strategies (e.g., think-pair-share, stop and jot, turn and talk, or exit tickets) to gauge student learning in the moment. Rather, in the majority of lessons, formative assessment strategies were not used at all or were attempted ineffectively. For example, in one lesson, the teacher asked students to put thumbs-up if they thought the answer to a question was incorrect, but most students did not comply, and the teacher continued instruction. In another lesson, students were asked to draw a picture to explain their thinking about a concept, but the teacher did not circulate or otherwise probe further to see what students had drawn. During a math lesson, while students were working individually, the teacher circulated to check for understanding, but checked the work of only several students. In some lessons, teachers asked content-based questions during whole group instruction, but called on only a few students to answer questions or to demonstrate their thinking at the board. In several lessons, teachers asked content
related questions to the whole group or to individual students, but answered their own questions without providing sufficient wait-time for students to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Timely, frequent, specific feedback is not provided throughout the learning process.** In the majority of visited classes, students did not receive clear, high-quality feedback related to lesson content in order to inform improvement efforts. Specifically, provided feedback was observed as ineffective or partially effective in 92% of visited classes. In many lessons, provided feedback was either lacking altogether, or it was non-specific, general feedback which did not clarify student’s understandings or guide their work. For example, in several lessons, students received general feedback for answers on worksheets in the form of “right” or “wrong” as the teacher circulated, and students were expected to correct their answers. In some lessons, after students completed learning tasks, teachers directed non-content related, non-specific feedback (“good job,” “awesome”) to the whole class or to individual students. In other lessons, teachers provided content-related feedback that was non-specific (“I like how you sounded that out”) or feedback that was procedural in nature (“What do you do next?”), rather than content-based feedback that informs students’ efforts to improve.
Domain 2: Students’ Opportunities to Learn

4. The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.

- The school has a process for identifying struggling and at-risk students and systematically monitors student progress. Leadership and teachers reported that the school has a Student Support Team (SST) that meets weekly to identify and monitor at-risk students with academic and behavioral needs. Both stakeholder groups indicated that the SST includes the principal, special education interventionist coordinator, and other staff as needed. They further reported that teachers must collect up to six weeks of data based on in-class interventions before referring students to the SST. Review of sample completed SST process documents indicated that teachers use the SST referral form to indicate: the type(s) of issues (academic, learning, behavioral) for which students are referred; the types of interventions used (e.g., moving seat, small group or direct instruction, behavior contract); and the frequency of interventions attempted. In addition, review of sample SST meeting minutes and disposition forms supported that the SST convenes four weeks after initial review to monitor the progress of referred students, in order to determine next steps, including special education assessment, if needed. Leaders and teachers also explained that academic and behavioral data are regularly reviewed to identify students needing additional support, apart from students referred to the SST. To gauge needed academic supports, stakeholder groups explained that they routinely review Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) reading and math Spring and Winter growth scores, as well as grade-level interim assessments (e.g., STAR early literacy, Achievement Network (ANet). To determine needed behavioral supports, leadership reported (and review of sample behavioral data reports confirmed) that they track monthly school wide behavioral data (attendance, Planning Center visits, office referrals, suspensions). Teachers reported weekly tracking of students’ classroom behavior and participation data that is collected as part of the Project Success program.

- The school provides some supports for struggling and at-risk students, although provided supports are mostly voluntary. While leadership and teachers commonly reported that the school provides academic and behavioral supports for students with identified needs, they were unable to describe an explicit system of tiered interventions and supports that are required to be implemented for all targeted students. For example, leadership reported that reading support in K-3 classrooms is provided by a reading interventionist teacher through Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) instruction to targeted students. However, leadership also explained that other K-3 students identified by low NWEA reading cut scores are targeted for academic tutoring support provided twice weekly before school; however, these students are invited, not required, to participate. As another example of supports provided by the school – but on a voluntary basis – leaders and teachers reported that the school offers an after-school intervention program (Horizons) that serves students (n=55) in grades K-to-8 with comprehensive literacy and social-emotional learning supports. Further, review of Horizons program materials and student data records supported that participating students are engaged in online reading and math programs (e.g., Study Island); participate in clubs and activities; and are provided with homework support, daily meals, and family outreach. However, according to leadership and Horizons staff, this grant-funded program is unable to serve all of the students whose families...
request enrollment. To support the academic needs of students who are not in Horizons, the school offers academic tutoring twice a week, and teachers reported offering individual tutoring during lunch and after school.

5. The school's culture reflects a safe, supportive learning environment that reflects high expectations. | Targeted Support
Required

- **The school is working to provide a safe environment to support students’ learning.** Teachers, parents, and students reported that the school generally feels safe. The site visit team noted that the school employs a school resource officer and screens campus entry with a metal detector device. However, these stakeholder groups also expressed some safety concerns. For example, teachers expressed concern about inappropriate behaviors of some upper grade students. Students stated that they see the same group of students who misbehave and do not follow the rules. Some parents reported that their children have complained about disruptive behavior in classrooms, and stated that they were aware of some teasing or bullying behaviors. And during the visit, the team observed some students behaving inappropriately (e.g., running, yelling) in hallways and in the cafeteria. Leaders acknowledged a lack of school-wide expectations or rules for hallway lineups during transitions, but stated that teachers have been asked to monitor common areas for 15 minutes weekly. To improve the school’s emotional learning climate for students, leadership reported that a stated school initiative is to increase the Conditions for Learning (CFL) survey rating for school climate from 84% to 89%. According to leaders and teachers, the school uses the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) social and emotional curriculum in grades K-5. The site visit team additionally observed teachers planning lessons around anger management for students in all grades. In addition, leaders, teachers, and students reported that the school is beginning to implement other positive behavior initiatives such as Not on Our Watch (NOW) for anti-bullying, and Winning Against Violent Environments (WAVE) for peer mediation.

- **The school is working to provide opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults in the school.** Both leaders and teachers explained that to build students’ social and emotional learning (SEL) skills, they have re-organized students and teachers across vertical grades into a house-based system within four school-mascot named groupings (Warrior, Extreme, Thunder, and Mighty Dragons) for the purpose of building family-like, small learning communities, which meet during two scheduled monthly house meetings. They further explained that house teams are expected to plan and engage in one yearly community service learning project around categories such as wellness, environment, homelessness, and outreach. As provided examples, some houses developed “flowers for mom” and “cards for veterans” projects. However, some teachers stated a preference for having even more structured time to work in house teams, as for example, by monitoring students within an advisory program. Leaders and teachers also explained that they are working on developing more structures to engage students in positive social group activities. For example, they reported that some students have participated in the school’s current production of the Lion King musical. Also, the site visit team observed teachers planning a future school-wide field-day program of activities. Students also reported that the school has morning meetings twice weekly, a student advisory council, and offers after-school extracurricular activities, such as Boy Scouts, dance, cheerleading, and basketball; they stated, however, that they would like even more activities.
Domain 3: Educators’ Opportunities to Learn

6. The school designs professional development and collaborative support systems to sustain a focus on instructional improvement. Established

- **Professional development is designed to address school priorities.** Both leadership and teachers reported that provided professional development is aligned with the academic and SEL priority goals that are stated in the school’s current Academic Achievement Plan (AAP). Specifically, they reported (and review of the AAP indicated) that the priority goals are to increase students’ NWEA reading growth scores and to improve students’ social and emotional skills. To address stated school-wide academic goals, leaders reported that they initially provided teachers with training to be able to access and use assessment data (NWEA) and instructional resources (ANet) with fidelity in the school’s teacher-based team (TBT) process. In addition, teachers reported having professional development sessions on related academic goal topics: Ohio state test resources; Journeys K-5 reading assessments; STAR assessments; Accelerated Reader; and collaborative best practices in reading and writing. Further, as a result of data collected mid-year during instructional walkthroughs, leadership explained that they designed professional development activities to help teachers develop lesson plans with specified elements, including clear student learning objectives with “I can” statements, mini-lessons, and differentiated groupings. Leaders and teachers also reported having professional development designed to improve students’ social and emotional learning. For example, the site visit team observed teachers engaged in a form of embedded professional development as they were collaborating around Project Success. In addition, leadership reported that they provided teachers with explicit training to improve instructional practices through deeper understanding of students’ personal experiences (i.e., Trauma-Informed Practice).

- **Educators collaborate regularly to help meet school improvement goals.** Both leadership and teachers reported that teachers routinely collaborate during weekly scheduled meetings to address the school’s identified academic goals within TBT meetings, and to address SEL goals in house meetings. The site visit team observed teachers collaborating in both team structures during the visit. Leaders and teachers commonly explained that the purpose of TBT meetings is to review student performance data on pre- and post-assessments in order to implement specific instructional groupings and interventions to help all students become proficient in learning standards. Review of sample TBT team documents confirmed that teams are identifying learning standards in the form of “I can” statements; collecting and charting assessment data; analyzing data to determine students’ errors and misconceptions; and identifying instructional groupings (e.g., low, medium, high) and strategies (e.g., online lesson, individual tutoring) to inform future instruction. In addition, review of sample TBT and Building Leadership Team (BLT) protocols indicated that TBT teams are provided with instructional feedback from the BLT (e.g., “Be sure learning target verbs used do not lower the level of rigor”). To address the school’s SEL goals, teachers explained that the primary purpose for meeting collaboratively in house teams is to share strategies, plan activities (e.g., field days) and develop structured lessons (e.g., anger management) that build students’ social and emotional skills.
• **Educators’ mindsets and beliefs do not consistently reflect shared commitments to students’ learning.** Although leadership and teachers reported that the majority of teachers share the belief that their instructional practices can positively impact children’s learning and achievement, they also expressed that some teachers do not entirely share this understanding of teacher efficacy. For example, leadership and teachers explained that most teachers talk about nurturing the whole child; however, they stated that some teachers are more focused on students’ personal or home concerns. Further, they stated that while teachers commonly understand that many students and families face challenging circumstances, some teachers see these challenges as obstacles to their own efficacy and impact on students’ learning. In order to support teachers around these challenges, leadership explained that they have attempted to improve mindsets around teacher efficacy by engaging teachers in a study of adverse childhood conditions that have implications for efficacious teaching and learning practices (i.e., Trauma-Informed Practice). As well, leadership explained that they deliberately use assemblies or other visible ways to showcase hopeful examples of children who demonstrate progress or success with academic or social and emotional learning because of educators’ hard work.

• **The school generally reflects a safe, trustworthy, and growth-oriented professional climate.** Both leaders and teachers commonly described the school as being in a transitional period of new leadership, which is attempting to move teachers toward a more explicit focus on professional growth and effective instructional practice. In addition, both stakeholder groups stated that most staff are very positive about shifting the focus to effective practices, using language such as “all in” to describe how teachers feel about this shift. Teachers additionally reported that leadership has taken steps to encourage staff to be open to sharing frustrations around solving challenging teaching and learning problems. For example, teachers shared that leadership has fostered a supportive, open-door policy, and that most teachers feel comfortable seeking feedback or support from either within the leadership team or from colleagues. In addition, most teachers described the overall teacher culture in the school as caring and trusting. Teachers provided numerous examples of instances where colleagues have acted in caring and well-intentioned ways, such as by sharing lessons and materials, offering to provide class coverage, or extending personal support at critical times.
Domain 4: Governance and Leadership

8. School leaders guide and participate with instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.

- **School leaders are working to ensure that teachers deliver high-quality instruction.** Although leadership and teachers commonly reported that leadership has taken steps to provide teachers with instructional feedback, leadership acknowledged that it has been difficult to sustain a regular practice of providing all teachers with frequent, periodic feedback. Teachers consistently reported (and review of sample evaluations supported) that they receive the five evaluative touches required by the state’s Teacher Development and Evaluation System (TDES). Some teachers recalled specific examples of helpful feedback from this process, and provided examples such as receiving suggestions to make instructional groups smaller, or to write anticipated student questions directly on lesson plans. In addition, both leaders and teachers explained that leadership has set an expectation for conducting non-evaluative, informal classroom walkthroughs, using a checklist to provide teachers with oral feedback on lesson planning and instruction. Review of sample walkthrough forms indicated that teachers are observed according to leadership’s stated expectations for lesson planning and instruction. However, teachers generally reported having few walkthrough visits, and some could not recall examples of specific feedback. Leadership further explained that they scaled back their original plan to conduct weekly walkthroughs; rather, they have concentrated on providing differentiated, tiered levels of instructional coaching to some teachers on an individualized, as-needed basis.

- **School leaders provide conditions that support a school-wide data culture.** Teachers consistently reported that leadership has facilitated their frequent use of assessment data to improve instruction as part of the TBT process, and the site visit team observed leadership participating in TBT teams. Teachers also reported that, at the beginning of the school year, leadership provided training on how to access and utilize relevant instructional data tools (e.g., ANet, Accelerated Reader [AR]). Teachers explained that they are expected to develop and utilize a regular cycle of interim assessments at each grade level as a regular instructional practice. In focus groups, teachers and students commonly referenced using student performance data. For example, some students were able to identify their specific academic growth goals in reading or math. Teachers stated that they review and track weekly student data related to Project Success (e.g., attendance, engagement, dress code, service). In addition, the site visit team observed a variety of data walls posted in the school’s hallways, including school-wide attendance data, and data cards from several classrooms on which students had written their individual assessment goals. As well, in the school’s conference room, school-wide academic data and goals were displayed.

9. School leaders effectively orchestrate the school’s operations.

- **School leaders ensure effective communication and inclusive, transparent decision making.** Teachers consistently reported that leadership has taken steps to communicate expectations to staff openly, and to include staff in decision making. For example, both leadership and teachers reported that members of the school’s BLT developed the school’s AAP, but that staff had the opportunity to discuss and take a consensus vote on the plan. As another example, teachers stated that leadership has openly communicated and explained the rationale for expected instructional changes.
Additionally, teachers reported that they have been asked to provide input around wider school decisions. For example, some teachers explained that leadership encouraged teacher input to prioritize the school-based budget. As well, teachers stated that they are required to participate in school improvement committees (i.e., school programs, grant development, and parent outreach) during scheduled meeting times. Further, while these committees were meeting, the site visit team observed teachers discussing and reporting out to colleagues on initiatives such as surveying parents to increase engagement; developing school improvement grants; and planning whole school activities. Some teachers also stated that the use of this small committee model has made it easier to share ideas and make decisions with colleagues before bringing them back to the whole school. In addition, to facilitate school-wide communication with staff, leadership publishes weekly informational bulletins (e.g., procedural expectations, program updates, upcoming events), and the staff routinely uses a Google-doc system (Basecamp) to share and communicate information and progress (e.g., TBT meeting minutes; team meeting notes).

- **School leaders engage community members to support learning.** All stakeholders – leaders, staff, parents, and students – consistently reported that the school has established strong links with community partners. These stakeholder groups cited partnerships that support the school’s focus on arts integration and that support direct services to students. For example, all stakeholders commonly mentioned the school’s grant-funded relationship with Progressive Arts Alliance, which brings artists into classrooms to engage students around arts projects linked to curriculum standards. As an example, the site visit team observed mirrored, glass mobiles displayed in the cafeteria, which teachers explained had been developed in alignment with middle school math standards. Leaders and teachers also reported other examples of arts-related partnerships in the Cleveland area, including Playhouse Square, Blue Water Orchestra, and Cleveland Playhouse. Leadership explained that the school has established these relationships, as well as Horizon Education Center’s comprehensive direct student services program, from grants developed in conjunction with the school’s grants committee. As well, the site visit team reviewed sample letters of request from school leadership to community leaders and organizations to support further funding of these initiatives.
Prioritization Process

The site visit team met with the Paul Dunbar School’s leadership team to review its findings, discuss the school’s areas of strengths and areas for improvement, prioritize areas for improvement, and discuss ways to address the identified areas for improvement.

School leaders and the site visit team agreed that there are significant strengths present in the school. Areas of strength the team discussed included professional development; teacher collaboration; and instructional data culture. The site visit team also noted the following areas for growth: focused instruction; timely, specific feedback for improvement; behavior; and in-class assessment.

The group identified Instruction as the area for growth to prioritize. The group identified the following priority within this Key Question as having the most potential impact on the success of the school as a whole: Differentiated instruction: a variety of instructional strategies are used to support students’ diverse needs.

The team then developed the following goal, success measure, and action plan:

**Goal: A variety of instructional strategies support students’ diverse needs.**

**Success Measure: 50% of teachers will score 3 or 4 by May 18; and 80% of teachers will score 3 or 4 on the developed rubric by December (TBA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Target Dates</th>
<th>Champions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership meet to discuss and define measuring tool</td>
<td>4/4/16</td>
<td>Intern principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate information and measuring tool to staff</td>
<td>4/6/16</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create schedule for peer coaching, observation, feedback</td>
<td>4/13-17/16</td>
<td>Instructional coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine how to provide feedback; create schedule for leadership team</td>
<td>4/20/16</td>
<td>Teacher member, Building Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-assess and plan for next year</td>
<td>5/18/16</td>
<td>Teacher member, Building Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members

The SQR to Paul Dunbar Elementary was conducted on March 14-17, 2016 by a team of educators from SchoolWorks, LLC.

Jake Schmitz, Team Leader SchoolWorks, LLC
Christopher Saheed, Team Writer SchoolWorks, LLC
Appendix B: Implementation Rubric

The site visit team will use the following guidance to select a performance level for each key question. Note that the quality standard for each implementation level is based on the extent to which the site visit team finds multiple types of evidence related to the adoption and/or implementation of a practice or system and the extent to which the site visit team finds evidence of high levels of adoption and/or implementation of a practice or system.

![Evidence Relating to Strength of Adoption/Implementation](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intensive Support Required</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school, or that the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Targeted Support Required</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that is developing at the school, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school’s effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school cannot yet be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a demonstrably positive impact on the school’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 “Multiple types of evidence” is defined as evidence collected from two or more of the following: document review, stakeholder focus groups and/or interviews; and classroom observations.

3 “Multiple sources of evidence” is defined as evidence collected from three or more stakeholder focus groups and/or interviews; two or more documents; and/or evidence that a descriptor was documented in 75% or more of lessons observed at the time of the visit.
Appendix C: Summary of Classroom Observation Data

During the site visit, the team conducted 12 observations, representing a range of grade levels and subject areas. The following table presents the compiled data from those observations. Note: Due to rounding, the percentages for a particular indicator may not appear to total to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Distribution of Scores (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Common Core Literacy Alignment (for all classes other than math)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to content standards</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to instructional shifts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Common Core Math Alignment (for math classes only)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to content standards</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to instructional shifts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Expectations</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent rewards and/or consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation and redirection of misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structured Learning Environment</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning time maximized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supportive Learning Environment</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher responsiveness to students’ needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Focused Instruction</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication of academic content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sensory modalities and materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied groupings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student choice and leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cognitive Engagement</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active student participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Higher-order Thinking</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to new problems and situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assessment Strategies</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of formative assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Adjustments to Instruction</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment of instructional Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment of content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment of organization of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Feedback</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student use of feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>