SchoolWorks
School Quality Review Report

Glenville High School
April 21-23, 2015

SchoolWorks®
Assess. Plan. Achieve.

CLEVELAND
METROPOLITAN
SCHOOL DISTRICT

100 Cummings Center, Suite 236C, Beverly, MA 01915
(978) 921-1674 www.schoolworks.org

Table of Contents

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 process aligned to CMSD initiatives and the school performance framework. The school quality reviews (SQRs) are used as one component of a comprehensive assessment of the quality of each school in the district. The SQRs 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 SQR protocol and review process provides a third-party perspective on current school quality for all students. 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 Leadership. While on site, evidence collection takes place through additional document reviews, classroom visits, and interviews with key school stakeholders. After collecting evidence, the team meets to confirm, refute, and modify its hypotheses about school performance. The site visit team uses evidence collected through these events to determine ratings in relation to the protocol's criteria and indicators. The outcome of the action planning process is a prioritized plan of next steps, including strategies, resources, and timelines to accomplish goals. This report presents the ratings, evidence, and action plan developed on site for the school.

Domains and Key Questions

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

Domains	Rating			
	Level 4: Exemplary	Level 3: Established	Level 2: Targeted support Required	Level 1: Intensive support Required

Domain 1: Instruction	
1. Classroom interactions and organization ensure a supportive, highly structured learning climate.	Level 2: Targeted support Required
2. Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.	Level 1: Intensive support Required
3. The school has created a performance-driven culture, where teachers, and staff effectively use data to make decisions about instruction and the organization of students.	Level 1: 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.	Level 2: Targeted support Required
5. The school's culture reflects high levels of both academic expectation and support.	Level 1: Intensive support Required
Domain 3: Educators' Opportunities to Learn	
6. The school designs professional development and collaborative supports to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.	Level 2: Targeted support Required
7. The school's culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.	Level 1: Intensive support Required
Domain 4: Leadership	
8. School leaders guide instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.	Level 2: Targeted support Required
9. The principals effectively orchestrate the school's operations.	Level 3: Established

Domain 1: Instruction

1. Classroom interactions and organization ensure a supportive, highly structured learning climate.	Level 2: Targeted support Required

- **Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by some students.** In 58% (n=19) of the classrooms observed by the site visit team, behavioral expectations were evident. School leadership, teachers, and students reported that school leadership established school-wide behavioral expectations. All three stakeholder groups explained (and site visit team members observed behavioral signage in classrooms and hallways) that students are expected to be on time, be in dress code, be prepared, be respectful, and be responsible. In the majority of observed classrooms, students followed directions and raised their hands to ask and answer questions. Further, site visit team members noted that some students complimented their peers for displaying positive behaviors. However, in some visited classrooms, students ignored teachers' directives and called out questions and responses. Site visit team members also noted that many teachers did not address misbehavior. For instance, students were heard using profanity, but teachers did not acknowledge or hold students accountable for their language.

- **The learning environment is not highly structured, and learning time is not maximized through effective planning and guidance.** Structured environments were observed in 37% of visited classrooms. Site visit team members noted that insufficient planning resulted in lost learning time in most visited classrooms. For example, prior to the start of lessons, most teachers did not have materials ready, questions written in advance, and activities planned. Further, site visit team members noted that many teachers did not plan for bell-to-bell instruction. Specifically, some teachers ended class up to 20 minutes prior to the bell. However, site visit team members observed that a few teachers posted detailed agendas for students and engaged students in learning tasks (e.g., Do Now) as soon as the bell signaled the start of class.

2. Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.	Level 1: Intensive support Required

- **Teachers do not provide students with clear learning goals.** School leadership and teachers reported that teachers received professional development on writing learning goals. School leadership also stated (and site visit team members observed) that they supplied teachers with laminated learning goal signs to post in their classrooms. Yet, students were provided with learning goals in just 16% of the classrooms visited. In most observed classrooms, learning goals were not evident. While some teachers posted learning tasks, site visit team members noted that the tasks were not tied to broader goals. Examples included: "Describe people, places, and things;" and "Write in journal." Further, when asked, most students could state what they were doing (e.g., making a poster), but could not explain what they were learning and why.

- **Instruction does not require all students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills.** Students were required to use and develop higher-order thinking skills in 21% of the classrooms visited. In most observed classrooms, the instructional focus revolved around the lower-order thinking skills of remembering and understanding. For example, students were asked the following types of questions: "Where does that come from?" and "What happened?" Further, many observed teachers asked and answered their own questions before giving students the opportunity to respond. Observed teachers

did not allow students to think about, and struggle with, concepts before supplying them with information. Site visit team members also observed students engaging in activities that were not appropriately rigorous for their grade level. For example, students were seen copying definitions, making posters, and folding paper into geometrical shapes.

3. The school has created a performance-driven culture, where teachers, and staff effectively use data to make decisions about instruction and the organization of students.	**Level 1: Intensive support Required**

- **Teachers do not routinely use assessment strategies to reveal students' thinking.** Assessments that revealed students' thinking were used in 37% of the classrooms visited. While some observed teachers assessed students by requiring them to verbally explain their thinking (e.g., "Why is it __ ?"), most did not engage students in content-related discussions. Also, in the majority of visited classrooms, teachers did not pose questions to gauge students' conceptual understanding. Rather, teachers asked recall questions (e.g., "What is ___ ?") and mostly called on students who raised their hands. Site visit team members also noted that some teachers circulated during instructional time; however, many checked to see if students were on task, rather than to assess the accuracy and quality of students' work. Further, site visit team members observed limited use of strategies such as thumb tools and exit tickets to gauge student understanding.

- **Specific feedback is rarely provided throughout the learning process.** Teachers delivered feedback to students in 32% of the classrooms visited. In one such classroom, site visit team members observed a teacher facilitating a feedback session in which students provided clarification about lesson concepts to each other. In other observed classrooms, teachers clarified misunderstandings about content to students individually or as a class. However, in the majority of observed classrooms, feedback was not evident or was procedural (e.g., Look at the article) and non-specific (e.g., Good job). Further, some observed teachers did not provide feedback to students who expressed confusion. Specifically, students were heard telling teachers that they did not understand the content presented, but teachers moved on to the next concept or question without first addressing students' misunderstandings. Students also reported (and review of posted student work further suggested) that many teachers do not provide written feedback on their graded assignments.

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.	Level 2: Targeted support Required

- **The school does not yet have systematic processes for implementing academic and/or interventions and supports for students who are struggling and/or at-risk.** School leadership reported that teachers refer struggling and/or at-risk students to the student support team (SST). School leadership explained (and review of an SST referral confirmed) that the SST convenes, analyzes referral data (e.g., assessment scores, functional behavioral assessments, teacher-initiated classroom interventions), and crafts intervention plans. However, when asked, most teachers could not describe the SST process. While a few teachers could explain SST procedures, they indicated that teachers do not attend SST meetings about the students they refer. Further, teachers stated that they are rarely privy to the intervention plans created by the SST and are not responsible for implementing them in their classrooms. Teachers also reported that SST meetings are held primarily to decide if students should be tested to determine if they are eligible for special education services. In addition, school leadership and teachers indicated (and review of the school's staff roster verified) that the school employs 15 interventionists. However, both stakeholder groups explained that they work only with students who receive special education services. School leadership and teachers stated that interventionists do not currently support struggling and/or at-risk students who are not serviced through Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

- **The school provides opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults in the school.** All stakeholders – school leadership, teachers, students, and parents – indicated that the school ensures opportunities for students to engage in positive social group activities. Specifically, school leadership, teachers, and students reported that students attend club meetings every Friday during their advisory period. All three stakeholder groups stated (and review of advisory period artifacts verified) that the school offers numerous advisory club choices to students, including Dress for Success, Let's Talk, What's Cooking, and Test Prep. School leadership, teachers, and students also explained that students have the opportunity to participate in football, basketball, baseball, track, and cheerleading. Site visit team members observed fliers and posters throughout the school that advertised upcoming student events, including a spring talent showcase. In addition, school leadership and teachers reported that the school implemented the Fight for 5 program. Both stakeholders stated that through this program, every staff member is assigned to oversee five students who have chronic attendance issues. Teachers explained that staff are responsible for frequently checking-in and mentoring their five students. Teachers stated that they are fighting for their students to attend school regularly. Further, students indicated that they feel comfortable approaching adults in school for guidance with academic and personal issues.

5. The school's culture reflects high levels of both academic expectation and support.	Level 1: Intensive support Required

- **The school does not yet hold high expectations for academic learning.** School leadership reported that, this year, the school has prioritized school culture over academics. While students described some of their classes as rigorous, site visit team members observed limited instruction that required students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills. Site visit team members also noted that students were working on learning tasks that were below grade level in many of the classrooms

visited. Further, the majority of observed instruction consisted primarily of teachers lecturing or students answering questions on worksheets or from textbooks. Further, when asked, teachers did not reference creating rigorous lessons as an instructional expectation or common practice. However, the school celebrates students' academic performance. School leadership, teachers, and students reported that the school has an academic honor roll and holds quarterly assemblies to recognize students who earned honor roll status.

- **The school is working to engage families in support of students' learning.** All stakeholders – school leadership, teachers, students, and parents – reported that the school tries to involve families in students' learning. School leadership, teachers, and students stated that the school has a school-parent organization (SPO) that convenes monthly. However, teachers and students indicated that SPO meetings are poorly attended. While school leadership, teachers, and students stated that the school hosts school activities (e.g., senior night, open house, and parent-teacher conferences), all three stakeholder groups reported that most events also have low attendance rates. School leadership indicated (and site visit team members observed) that the school has a room specifically designated for parent use. School leadership explained that the parent room is used to host workshops and is equipped with technology. In addition, school leadership and teachers stated that the school employs a full-time family and community coordinator who is working to increase family engagement. Further, teachers, students, and parents reported that teachers communicate with parents frequently through phone calls and e-mails. Students and parents complimented teachers for promptly making contact to inform parents of both positive and negative aspects of student performance in the classroom.

Domain 3: Educators' Opportunities to Learn

6. The school designs professional development and collaborative supports to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.	**Level 2: Targeted support Required**

- **While professional development is active, it is not consistently designed to address school improvement goals.** School leadership and teachers reported that the school holds three all-day professional development sessions throughout the school year. In addition, both stakeholder groups stated (and review of the professional development schedule confirmed) that professional development is held every Tuesday after school for 50 minutes. School leadership and teachers consistently indicated that, this year, the school has prioritized cultivating a positive culture. They further explained (and review of staff meeting agendas confirmed) that school leadership has set the following goals toward improving the school's culture: increasing student attendance, punctuality, engagement, and behavior; and improving family involvement. School leadership and teachers reported (and review of professional development artifacts verified) that teachers have received professional development on the cultural goals, student attendance (e.g., Fight for 5), and classroom management (e.g., No-Nonsense Nurturing). However, when asked, teachers could not explain how or why professional development topics are selected. School leadership indicated that professional development is based on teacher request and need as determined by the results of school leadership's observations. In addition, most teachers could not describe how professional development has improved their practice.

- **Educators have time to collaborate regularly.** School leadership and teachers reported (and review of the school's professional development meeting schedule verified) that teachers are provided with time every Thursday to meet in their teams. Both stakeholder groups stated that weekly team time is dedicated to working with a teacher-based team protocol. The principal and teachers explained that the protocol consists of multiple steps that guide the creation of unit and lesson plans. Review of the protocol indicated that teachers complete the following five steps: collect and chart assessment data; analyze student work; establish shared expectations; implement expectations; and collect, chart, and analyze post-assessment data. However, some teachers reported that the protocol is not a useful tool, indicating that they complete the protocol only because it is required of them. Further, teachers stated that they have not received support from school leadership around using the protocols during their meetings and executing them in their classrooms.

7. The school's culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.	**Level 1: Intensive support Required**

- **Some educators hold shared commitments and convey mutual responsibility.** Due to the school's recent designation as an investment school, school leadership reported that the school will be guided by a corrective action plan (CAP) that calls for many instructional and procedural changes to be implemented in the 2015-16 school year. In consideration of this new plan, school leadership explained that 20% of the staff are completely committed to the CAP; 60% of the staff are undecided about their commitment to the CAP; and 20% of the staff are opposed to the CAP. In focus groups, most teachers could not describe common instructional expectations and practices. School leadership confirmed that staff do not yet share a common instructional vision. School leadership, teachers, and students indicated that the school has established school-wide behavioral expectations (i.e., be prompt, be prepared, be respectful, be in dress code, be responsible), but all three stakeholder groups

stated that the rules and consequences (e.g., lock-out) are inconsistently enforced and implemented throughout the school. In addition, teachers expressed the belief that students' home and/or personal situations prevent them from being successful at school. For instance, teachers indicated that some students struggle academically because their parents are not involved in their education. Teachers explained that – due to disconnected telephones – they often cannot reach parents. Site visit team members also observed that teachers allowed students to opt out of lessons. Specifically, they noted that teachers did not engage or redirect students who had their heads down on their desks or were not participating during instruction.

- **The school does not have a safe and trustworthy professional climate.** Teachers consistently described the culture among the staff as supportive. Teachers explained that they often approach their peers with personal and professional issues. However, teachers indicated that the culture between school leadership and staff varies. Specifically, teachers stated that half of the staff have a positive relationship with school leadership, while the other half have a strained relationship. Some teachers described school leadership as supportive and open, indicating that they feel comfortable bringing concerns to them. Yet, some teachers stated otherwise, explaining that school leadership does not provide support and is not open to receiving their comments. School leadership and teachers indicated that the school's investment status is contributing to the divide. Both stakeholder groups explained that a new CAP was written for the 2015-16 school year. They stated (and review of commitment letters verified) that teachers were asked to sign letters pledging their commitment to the CAP. However, teachers stated that they were unaware that the CAP was being revised for the upcoming school year, explaining that they believed that the CAP that was implemented this school year would guide the school for the next three years. As a result, teachers indicated that they felt blindsided by the revision and stated that the new plan has created an atmosphere of mistrust between school leadership and some teachers.

8. School leaders guide instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.	**Level 2: Targeted support Required**

- **The principals are helping to create a shared vision of clear goals for their school and monitor progress toward achieving the goals.** The principals and teachers reported that improving school culture stands as the top priority for the current school year. The principals and most teachers explained (and review of the goals confirmed) that school leadership crafted SMART (i.e., specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timely) goals around student attendance, student punctuality, student engagement, student behavior, and family involvement. The principals explained (and review of the CAP verified) that the goals aligned with the school's CAP. The principals and teachers indicated that school leadership communicated the goals to staff prior to the start of school during a professional development session and has consistently reinforced the goals throughout the year. For example, teachers stated (and review of newsletters verified) that the goals are referenced during the afternoon announcements and in staff newsletters. The principals and teachers further reported (and review of staff meeting agendas confirmed) that the principals present the school's progress toward meeting the goals. For instance, reviewed agendas detailed goal targets by quarter, goal results by quarter, and the data collection methods used to measure goal results.

- **School leaders are working to ensure that teachers deliver high quality instruction.** School leadership reported that they provided a common lesson planning template to teachers prior to the start of school. School leadership also indicated that, using the given template, teachers received professional development on creating lesson plans. However, school leadership explained that, due to contractual constraints, they cannot require teachers to use the template. As a result, when asked, many teachers struggled to describe their lesson planning process. Further, leadership cannot formally review and provide feedback on lesson plans except when conducting Teacher Development and Evaluation System (TDES) observations. School leadership and teachers reported that school leadership observes teachers in accordance with the requirements outlined by TDES. Specifically, both stakeholder groups explained that teachers receive five visits consisting of announced formal observations, announced informal observations, and unannounced informal observations. However, when asked, teachers could not provide examples of instructional feedback that they have received. Teachers consistently stated that they only received records of what school leadership saw and heard during TDES observations. While school leadership and teachers reported that school leadership observes teachers outside of TDES, teachers indicated that they receive feedback on classroom management, rather than on instruction.

9. The principals effectively orchestrate the school's operations.	**Level 3: Established**

- **The principals allocate resources and manage school operations in order to foster a safe learning environment.** All stakeholders – school leadership, teachers, students, and parents – reported that students feel physically and emotionally safe at school. Site visit team members observed that the principal has allocated resources to ensure a safe environment for students. Specifically, they noted that the principals employ four full-time safety officers and have installed metal detectors at the main entrance of the school. The principals stated (and site visit team members observed) that a safety officer is present at the front door at all times throughout the school day. Further, the principals

reported (and site visit team members witnessed) that all visitors to the school must sign-in and obtain visitor passes prior to gaining access to the campus. Students also indicated that clear lock-down procedures make them feel secure at school. In addition, students and parents reported that the school staff are kind and supportive, explaining that school leadership and teachers make telephone calls and send cards to families experiencing personal struggles, such as a death or illness.

- **The principals engage community members in the educational process.** The principals and teachers reported (and review of partnership pamphlets verified) that the principals have established numerous community partnerships, including partnerships with City Year, the Center for Transformative Teacher Training, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, and the J. Glen Smith Center. Both stakeholder groups further stated that the principals have leveraged these partnerships to improve student learning. Specifically, they explained that representatives from City Year support ninth grade students by assisting teachers throughout the school day during instructional time and providing tutoring to students after school. The principals and teachers indicated that the Center for Transformative Teacher Training holds professional development sessions for teachers and provides coaching to implement practices in their classrooms. Both stakeholder groups explained that Youth Opportunities Unlimited supports students seeking employment by helping them search, apply, and interview for positions. The principals and teachers reported that the J. Glen Smith Center offers students social/emotional (e.g., counseling) and health (e.g., clinic) services. They further stated (and site visit team members heard an announcement that confirmed) that the center opens its food pantry to students in need every month.

Prioritization Process

The site visit team met with the Glenville High 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 were in agreement that there are significant strengths present in the school. Areas of strength the team discussed focused on Organizational Leadership. The site visit team also noted the following areas for growth: Supportive Classroom Climate, Purposeful Teaching, Assessment and Adjustment, Students' Learning Supports, Students' Learning Culture, Educators' Learning Supports, Educators' Learning Culture, and Instructional Leadership.

The group identified intentional, engaging, and challenging instruction as the area to prioritize for growth. 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: Provision of learning goals.

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

Goal: Teachers consistently provide students with clear learning goals.

Success Measure: Teachers will attend professional development on crafting clear learning goals.

Actions	Target Dates	Champions
Define learning goal	April 28, 2015	Co-principals
Plan professional development	May 5, 2015	Teacher representative
Give staff copy of action plan	May 27, 2015	Teacher representative

Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members

The SQR to Glenville High School was conducted on April 21-23, 2015 by a team of educators from the Cleveland Metropolitan School District and SchoolWorks, LLC.

Kate Wheeler	Team Leader	SchoolWorks, LLC
Kathryn Cobb	Team Writer	SchoolWorks, LLC
Marinise Harris	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District
Matthew Linick	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District