

SchoolWorks School Quality Review Report

**Adlai Stevenson School
May 13 - 15, 2015**



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



Table of Contents

About the SchoolWorks School Quality Review Process	1
Domains and Key Questions	2
Domain 1: Instruction.....	3
Domain 2: Students’ Opportunities to Learn	6
Domain 3: Educators’ Opportunities to Learn	9
Domain 4: Leadership	11
Prioritization Process	13
Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members	14

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 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 in each of the four domains identified within the SQR protocol – Instruction, Students' Opportunities to Learn, Educators' Opportunities to Learn, and Leadership. While on site, evidence collection takes place through 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. <i>Classroom interactions and organization ensure a supportive, highly structured learning climate.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
2. <i>Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.</i>			Level 1: Intensive support Required	
3. <i>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.</i>			Level 1: Intensive support Required	
Domain 2: Students' Opportunities to Learn				
4. <i>The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
5. <i>The school's culture reflects high levels of both academic expectation and support.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
Domain 3: Educators' Opportunities to Learn				
6. <i>The school designs professional development and collaborative supports to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
7. <i>The school's culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
Domain 4: Leadership				
8. <i>School leaders guide instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
9. <i>The principal effectively orchestrates the school's operations.</i>		Level 3: Established		

Domain 1: Instruction

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

- **Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by some students.** Clear behavioral expectations, class rules, and/or procedures were observed in 60% (n=10) of classes visited by the site visit team. Teachers and school leaders explained that instructional staff are expected to use leveled color charts (for primary grades) or online tracking tools (for upper elementary and middle school grades) to manage student behavior. Site visit team members noted that the leveled color charts were posted in some classrooms; in one instance, a teacher was observed using the chart to redirect student behavior. During another observation, site visit team members observed a teacher using an online tracking tool that was projected on the board to be visible to students as they were working. However, even in classes where these tools were used, students frequently did not behave according to rules and expectations. Site visit team members visited multiple classrooms in which many students carried on social conversations and engaged in other off-task, disruptive behaviors (e.g., wandering around the room, throwing materials). In addition, in multiple classrooms, site visit team members noted that teachers made little or no attempts to redirect student behavior, or their attempts to do so were ignored by the majority of students. School leaders, teachers, and students reported that student behavior consistently disrupts learning.
- **The learning environment is not highly structured, nor is learning time maximized.** Site visit team members observed highly structured learning environments in 10% of visited classrooms. Transitions between classes and students’ use of the bathroom encroached significantly into scheduled learning times. In addition, teachers were observed using class time to prepare or search for materials. In one instance, students were provided a task to occupy them as they waited close to 20 minutes as their teacher looked for materials needed for the lesson. Further, the site visit team observed multiple classrooms where no direct instruction was delivered to students; the teacher remained mostly stationary and students (who chose to do so) approached the teacher for help. In these classes, there was very little content-related communication with students and there was very little visual information related to the lesson. Further, site visit team members found that, sometimes, teachers were not teaching according to the school schedule. In one example, a site visit team member visited a class expecting to observe a social studies lesson, but, instead, found students working on mathematics tasks.

<p>2. Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.</p>	<p>Level 1: Intensive support Required</p>
---	---

- **Teachers do not provide students with clear learning goals.** The site visit team did not observe any classrooms in which clear and specific learning objectives were posted visually or communicated to students. Site visit team members noted some classrooms in which descriptions of activities replaced objectives. For example, in one class, the posted objective was simply to understand the day’s mathematics activity. In other classes, the posted objective was vague or so broad in scope that it did not reflect the specific learning target from a single lesson. For instance, the posted objective in one classroom was for students to use sounds to spell words. However, in most visited classrooms, the site visit team noted that there were no posted or clearly communicated learning

objectives at all. Further, when asked, neither school leaders nor teachers mentioned learning objectives as a common lesson expectation.

- **All students are not engaged in learning.** The site visit team did not observe any classroom in which all students were engaged in learning. In the majority of observations, student engagement varied greatly; some students chose to work diligently, some seemed to pay little attention to the lesson activities, and others engaged in off-task behavior (e.g., not writing at all, pretending to sleep, play-fighting, wandering around the room). The site visit team did not observe any classrooms in which students participated in extended, content-related discussions with their teachers or with their peers. Further, there were no observed instances of students explaining their thinking. In one class, a teacher asked students to explain their thinking, but proceeded to provide them with the explanation she had just requested from them. In another class, a site visit team member observed an interaction in which a teacher guided a student through clarifying his/her own thinking; however this was an isolated interaction with a single student, rather than a practice utilized to support all students' learning.

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
--	--

- **Assessment strategies are not used to reveal students' thinking about learning goals.** The site visit team did not observe the use of assessments that reveal students' thinking in any of the visited classrooms. The site visit team observed that some teachers used techniques that required all students to respond, such as thumb tools or call-and-response cues. However, in these specific classrooms, it was also noted that the teachers did not seem to follow through by gauging the scope or quality of their students' responses to these tools. For example, in one class, the teacher asked students to "Give me a thumbs up if you got it," without visually scanning their responses. In another classroom, the students replied to varied call-and-response directives from their teacher. However, the teacher did not seem to be using this technique as a check for understanding; s/he did not alter questioning or instruction based on the quality of the responses. Site visit team members also observed that multiple teachers chose not to circulate throughout their classrooms to check on all of the students, instead remaining stationary during their lessons as students approached them to ask questions or have their work checked. In other instances when teachers circulated throughout their classroom to check on students, site visit team members noted that they performed cursory reviews of student progress mainly focused on task completion, rather than comprehension.
- **Assessment results are not used to make adjustments to instruction, and timely, frequent, specific feedback is not provided.** The site visit team did not observe any lesson-based assessment strategies used by teachers in visited classrooms. As a result, assessments of this type were not used to make adjustments to instruction in any observed classes. Assessment and feedback practices commonly found in schools include: thorough and purposeful teacher circulation; the use of student white boards for all students to present answers as part of guided practice; student response systems that provide teachers with instant data on class responses to multiple choice questions; and student hand signals used by teachers to gauge their comprehension. The use of these tools and techniques provide instructional staff with information that allows them to give students clear, descriptive, and criterion-based feedback in relation to learning goals. During a few observations,

site visit team members recorded evidence that teachers assessed student work during their lessons, but did so in a cursory manner. For example, in one instance, three students were brought to the board to show their response to a problem, but none of the other students' work was checked. Other teachers were observed circulating among students. However, they did not visit all students and their interactions with students were not focused on assessing their understanding, but on task completion. During another observation, a student working at the board displayed an incorrect answer and the teacher continued instruction without identifying or correcting the error. To meet the standard of evidence, assessment practices must be administered to all, or the vast majority of, students in a classroom. As site visit team members did not observe any evidence of these practices used to collect detailed information about student learning, they consequently did not find any evidence that teachers used this type of information to make adjustments to their instruction or provide feedback to students. Typically, evidence of teachers utilizing in-class assessments to adjust instruction could include altering student groupings, forming a small group for intensive retouching during the lesson, or identifying what skills need to be retaught before proceeding further into the lesson.

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
--	---

- While the school has a system to identify students who are struggling, it does not yet have sufficient resources to support all students.** School leaders and teachers explained that students who struggle with academic, behavior, or social-emotional issues are referred to the student support team (SST). School leaders described that the SST includes an intervention specialist (who serves as the SST coordinator), the school psychologist, a member of the administration, the referring teacher, the interventionist who will potentially deliver supports, the student’s parent, and, at times, the school nurse. School leaders explained that during the initial meeting of the SST, the team establishes a concrete plan to provide supports to the referred student. School leaders explained that the SST accomplishes this by assessing the interventions that are currently in place, brainstorming additional supports, and selecting methods to track the plan as it is implemented. School leaders reported that after four-to-six weeks, the SST reconvenes for a second meeting to assess if planned interventions have been implemented consistently, and if they have, decide if the student should be referred for a more intensive evaluation if there has been no change in student outcomes. Despite using a coherent system to identify students in need of supports, teachers and school leaders acknowledged that the school does not have adequate staffing or programmatic supports for students who struggle academically, but are not designated to receive special education services. All stakeholder groups reported that the school offers some tutoring to students during the school day. School leaders explained (and teachers confirmed) that tutoring is provided during the school day via a partnership with a community organization called Experience Corps. However, school leaders stated that this tutoring program serves approximately 35 students only and that the program is available to students in kindergarten through third grade only. In focus groups, teachers and school leaders explained that instructional staff generated lists of students to whom this tutoring would be offered, using data from the results of formal assessments, such as the Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) or Ohio Achievement Assessment (OAA). School leaders stated that an additional interventionist position had been established (to be filled for the 2015-16 school year) in order to fulfill some of the needed supports identified via the SST process.
- The school provides some opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults in the school.** All stakeholder groups reported that there are a variety of opportunities for some students to engage in positive social group activities. School leaders described (and teachers confirmed) that after-school activities are offered by staff members, including tutoring, chess club, basketball team, cheerleading squad, and a track team. In addition, these stakeholders also reported that other after-school opportunities are provided through partnerships with community organizations, such as the Cleveland Playhouse Compassionate Arts program, the Cleveland Marathon’s We Run This City program, and the Boy Scouts of America. However, parents and students stated that the majority of these programs are offered to older students only. For example, parents expressed a desire for more programming of this type for younger students. In addition, younger students confirmed that they were not yet able to participate in school clubs, with one student stating, “If I could skip a grade I could be on the basketball team.”

5. The school's culture reflects high levels of both academic expectation and support.

**Level 2:
Targeted support
Required**

- The school is working to provide a safe environment to support students' learning.** According to a review of the results of the Conditions for Learning Survey (CFL) administered to students, 73% of students feel safe in classes, 68% of students feel safe in school hallways, and 54% of students feel safe outside of the school building. School leaders identified increasing students' feelings of safety at school by 7% as one of three main goals for the 2014-15 academic year. To this end, in focus groups, multiple stakeholders reported that the school has implemented initiatives to make the environment more supportive to student learning. School leaders explained that students who earn positive recognition from their teachers can have their accomplishments read aloud to the entire school as part of morning announcements. The site visit team reviewed a form – Principal's Positive Note – used by staff to identify these students and their actions. In addition, teachers explained that, this year, the school has started using a Positive Behavior Incentive System (PBIS) where students are awarded tickets by staff members that are used in raffles for dress-down passes, school apparel, and school supplies. However, students reported that while a few teachers frequently recognize students through using the raffle tickets, many do not do so consistently, and some almost never distribute them. The site visit team's review of CFL survey results also demonstrated that when asked if students are often bullied at the school, 66% of students replied that they agreed or strongly agreed. Further, 67% of students replied that they agreed or strongly agreed when asked if students are threatened at school. Teachers reported (and school leaders confirmed) that the school has an anti-bullying program that uses peer mediation to diffuse tension among students. School leaders explained that the program, Winning Against Violent Environments (WAVE), is run by a faculty member and added that it includes student mediators. School leaders stated that staff refer students to the faculty coordinator who convenes the team of mediators to brainstorm strategies to resolve the conflict. However, teachers reported that they are not confident that the mediation occurs consistently and believe that some peer mediators use the program to get out of class. In addition, students reported that they are sometimes bullied at the school and that they feel significantly unsafe in classes where the teacher cannot effectively manage student behavior.
- The school engages families in support of students' learning.** While parents, teachers, and school leaders acknowledged that family participation rates are low, all stakeholders reported thorough and consistent efforts to communicate with families. Parents are invited to participate in events, activities, and committees. Parents explained that there is a School Parent Organization (SPO) that meets once per month; the principal attends these meetings regularly. Parents also stated that, since the arrival of the current principal, collaboration with school staff in planning events has been much more effective. In focus groups, all stakeholders described regular events hosted by the school to engage families in their children's' education – open houses, parent-teacher conferences, musical performances, fitness nights, and guest speakers. In addition, school leaders described (and teachers confirmed) a red carpet night when families of students who earned proficient or higher on state assessments are invited to the school for a sit-down meal and a celebration of the students' accomplishments. Further, teachers described events designed to engage fathers more in the school community, such as a math-centered game night called Digits for Dad, as well as a Fathers Walk. Teachers reported (and school leaders confirmed) that school staff employ various means to communicate with families. School leaders stated (and a review of school documents confirmed) that the principal prepares a monthly newsletter that is sent home to all families. In addition, the

principal reported (and teachers confirmed) that he uses automated telephone calls to inform families about school events and issue important reminders. In addition, teachers reported using e-mail, telephone calls, handwritten notes, and text messages to communicate with the parents or guardians of their students. For example, the site visit team reviewed a form sent home by teachers to parents that summarizes a child's behavior for each day of the week, using the levels that correspond to classroom color charts that are used in a number of classrooms.

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**

- Professional development is designed to address school improvement goals and is active, intensive, and sustained, but not consistently evaluated.** School leaders reported that the school's goals are to improve CLS results related to student safety, achieve student growth benchmarks on NWEA MAP reading and mathematics assessments, and improve student attendance. Evidence collected by the site visit team indicated that the content of professional development (PD) is aligned with these improvement goals. For example, teachers reported (and a review of the school's 2014-15 PD calendar and presentation materials confirmed) that the school contracted with the Association for Curriculum Development and Supervision (ACSD) to provide year-long training sessions on planning lessons using the Understanding by Design (UbD) framework. In addition, school leaders described (and the school's PD calendar confirmed) an established partnership with the Achievement Network (ANet) to provide training on using assessment data and eventually implementing an interim assessment program. Further, teachers reported (and the school's PD calendar and session agendas confirmed) learning about close reading strategies in sessions facilitated by a professor from Cleveland State University. Teachers and school leaders explained that PD is delivered either during all-day sessions or during morning staff meetings that occur from 8:30 to 9:20 a.m., four mornings per week. Teachers explained that the high frequency of PD sessions and the many different topics addressed have been overwhelming at times, and teachers find it difficult to thoroughly implement what they learn in their classrooms. In light of this evidence regarding the varied impact of PD programs, it is noteworthy that both school leaders and teachers reported that only one PD program from the 2014-15 school year was consistently evaluated for effectiveness by school staff.
- While educators collaborate regularly to learn about instruction and students' progress, the effectiveness of the collaboration is not clear.** School leaders and teachers explained that instructional staff are provided six planning periods and an additional 200 minutes per week to be used to fulfill their professional responsibilities. Teachers and school leaders reported that teachers are organized into grade-level oriented teams, called teacher-based teams (TBT), that meet for 50 minutes each week to focus on improving student achievement. Teachers explained (and a review of TBT protocols for multiple grade levels confirmed) that these meetings follow a specific protocol that includes looking at pre-assessment data, planning to implement specific standards from their scope and sequence, planning post-assessment, and determining how to differentiate their instruction. However, when asked about the effectiveness of the work they do during TBT meetings, teachers' responses varied significantly. Some teachers stated that the process is very helpful with vertical alignment of content and in specifying individual students' academic needs. Other teachers reported that the work of TBTs only sometimes influences instructional choices that they make in their classrooms. In addition, other teachers described the main purpose of TBT meetings as filling out paperwork, stating that the process is not student-centered and not an effective use of their planning time. Teachers also stated that the most productive collaboration they have with their colleagues is done informally – for example, meeting during planning periods or at lunch time to discuss student issues or align instruction between special classes and core content. Outside of the collaborative structures described above, teachers are also required to serve on one staff committee

dedicated to aspects of school culture, such as parent involvement, social well-being, safety and expectations, and the program committee. In addition, site visit team members reviewed staff committee agendas that showed examples of decisions made and topics addressed by some of these committees: planning curriculum nights; composing parent newsletters; staff team building; and after-school clubs for students. Teachers reported that their specific committee assignments were determined at the beginning of the school year, based on their ranked interest in serving on each committee.

7. The school’s culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.	Level 2: Targeted support Required
--	---

- **Educators are developing shared commitments and mutual responsibility.** School leaders stated that the vision of the school is to provide a student-centered environment in which children are able to realize their dreams. School leaders explained that the school vision is reiterated in weekly meetings and included in monthly newsletters. However, teachers’ descriptions of the school’s vision differed. Some teachers’ descriptions included language related to student achievement (e.g., achieving high academic standards, focusing on the business of learning) and student safety (e.g., students feeling safe and comfortable, creating a respectful environment). Other teachers’ descriptions of the vision included components not mentioned by other stakeholders, such as family involvement and providing students with a range of engaging extracurricular activities. In addition, some teachers recalled an inclusive process at the beginning of the year, in which all staff were involved in crafting the vision for the school. When asked, other teachers did not recall being involved in that process and could not identify the source of the school’s vision. Some teachers reported that their colleagues hold them accountable for established improvement goals and tasks. For example, teachers described working together extensively to complete a challenging data analysis task because they did not want to disappoint school leadership. Other teachers stated that, in the process of holding each other accountable, they provide feedback to their peers; however, they explained that while some of their peers take feedback well, others do not. Further, some teachers noted that while the tone of these conversations is usually professional, sometimes they become more antagonistic.
- **The school reflects a safe and trustworthy professional climate.** Teachers reported that the professional climate at the school has greatly improved since the arrival of the current principal. Teachers attributed this change to the principal’s professional, but human approach to his staff and concrete efforts by the administration to demonstrate appreciation for the hard work of the staff. For example, teachers recounted receiving recognition during teacher appreciation week (small gifts, handwritten notes from the principal), being provided substitute coverage the day after staying late in order to participate in staff interviews, and appreciating the supportive way in which the principal interacts with everyone in the school building. School leaders described that the principal has an open-door policy and that the principal has built trust among the staff with his efforts to show appreciation for their hard work. In addition, school leaders explained that the principal aims to support his staff and develop teacher leaders by balancing praise and constructive criticism. Teachers confirmed this, stating that the principal’s collaborative approach has allowed staff to have much better interactions with each other and helped teachers feel more comfortable getting feedback from one another, as well as from administrators. Further, teachers reported that the administration has improved the professional climate by intentionally including teachers in

decision-making processes. For example, teachers reported being involved in deciding the school motto, how to celebrate honor roll students, and determining how students qualify to attend a field trip.

Domain 4: Leadership

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

- The principal is beginning to establish clear goals for the school.** School leaders reported that the goals for the school for the 2014-15 school year included improvements in attendance, academic performance, and student safety. As noted earlier, school leaders explained that they planned to achieve 95% average daily attendance among students, and that they expected students to exhibit 54% growth and 56% growth on their NWEA MAP mathematics and literacy assessments, respectively. In addition, school leaders stated that their goal around student safety was a 7% increase in students feeling safe at school, based on their responses to the CSL survey that is administered three times per year. However, while some teachers could correctly identify the category of each of these school goals, most described them in very general terms with no mention of associated growth measures. For example, some teachers recounted one school goal as growth in reading and math, while others stated that trying to create a more welcoming environment was a goal. In addition, some teachers included descriptions of school goals that were not mentioned by school leaders, such as progress monitoring. Further, a review of the school's Quarter 2 Investment School report revealed somewhat different goals for certain categories of programming. For example, the Investment Report indicated that the school's 2015 target for achievement in reading was for 58% of students to be deemed proficient on the NWEA MAP assessment.
- School leaders are working to ensure that teachers deliver high-quality instruction.** School leaders reported (and teachers confirmed) that the principal completes two full-class and three shorter walkthrough observations of each teacher annually. Teachers and school leaders stated that the full-class observations are required as part of the Cleveland school district's Teacher Development and Evaluation System (TDES). School leaders also explained that the principal does not have as much time to perform informal observations of teachers as he would like. Teachers confirmed that the frequency of these informal observations varied, stating that the principal visited classrooms more frequently early in the school year as he worked to establish his presence during his first few months as principal. Teachers also reported that they are observed by facilitators of the school's PD programs, in addition to classroom visits from their administrators. For example, teachers and school leaders described that classroom visits and follow-up meetings with teachers are an integrated part of their work on the UbD lesson planning model. In addition, teachers stated that they have been observed by a professor from Cleveland State University who directs the school's PD focused on close reading techniques. Evidence collected by the site visit team regarding the quality and frequency of feedback received by teachers varied. Some teachers reported receiving notes from, or having follow-up conversations with, the principal following any observation. Others stated that the feedback they received is limited to part of the TDES process. Other teachers estimated that they received feedback on their instruction about once every six weeks. Some teachers reported that the feedback they received has had significant impact on their instruction. For example, one teacher reported that she is receiving meaningful instructional feedback for the first time in her career, explaining that (from the observation feedback) she learned questioning techniques to

improve the rigor of her lessons. Other teachers explained that the feedback they received at the beginning of the school year was helpful (e.g., how to use the color-coded behavior charts). A review of sample observation feedback by site visit team members indicated both constructive criticism and positive reinforcement of instructional practices. For example, embedded in lesson scripts were suggestions on behavior management (“After you do a countdown and there is no change in behavior, you have to take action.”) and instructional techniques (“When students say the numbers, they should be moved over. Can we ask students to name the place value where numbers should be?”). In addition to this constructive criticism, each observation identified successful practices, such as a challenging do-now question (“Excellent connection!”), visuals posted during the lesson (“Great!”), or time management (“Perfect!!!”).

9. The principal effectively orchestrates the school’s operations.	Level 3: Established
--	---------------------------------

- The principal effectively allocates resources and manages school operations.** School leaders reported that they use the school’s action plan to prioritize spending at the school. As a result, school leaders stated that the majority of funding is dedicated to improving students’ academic growth. For example, school leaders explained that they invested in multiple computer-based platforms for student and teacher use (e.g., *iLit* – a tablet-based reading program for fourth and fifth grade students, and *iReady* – a progress monitoring application). In addition, school leaders stated that available funding is also used to address staffing needs. For example, school leaders explained that funding from the current school year had been set aside to create a position for an additional intervention specialist to be hired for the 2015-16 school year. Further, a review of the school’s staffing list by the site visit team revealed that the school is well-staffed for its size. During classroom observations, site visit team members noted several classrooms that were staffed with more than one teacher. In general, teachers also reported that the principal is managing school operations effectively. Teachers stated that the principal treats his staff as professionals and that he is an adept facilitator who holds his staff accountable and maintains established expectations, but does so respectfully. For example, teachers noted that the principal is organized. For example, he uses color-coded drop folders set up in the office for staff to submit documents by specific due dates and will send a professional reminder e-mail to a teacher if his/her submission is late. In addition, teachers described being involved in school-based decision-making processes on a regular basis. For example, teachers and school leaders reported that the building leadership team (BLT) includes an administrator, three teachers (two appointed, one elected), a special education teacher, the school’s union representative (also a teacher), the nurse, and a paraprofessional. Both stakeholder groups provided examples of the types of decisions made by the BLT, including helping to craft the school’s academic improvement plan (AIP), reviewing CSL survey data to assess effectiveness of PD, coordinating intervention times, student-based budgeting matters, performing interviews, and providing feedback on potential new hires.
- The school engages community members in the educational process and creates an environment in which community resources support learning.** School leaders reported (and teachers confirmed) that a variety of community resources serve to support the learning and overall well-being of students. For example, the school distributes weekly donations from the Greater Cleveland Food Bank to students in need. In addition, two charity organizations, Coats for Kids and Kids in Need, Inc., have donated almost 200 coats during the past winter and dozens of school uniform clothing items. Further, school leaders explained that the school has an established partnership with local

organizations that promote dental hygiene and vision services. School leaders also described that their partnership with Cleveland Playhouse has grown to include summer school programming. School leaders stated that the summer school program is staffed by teachers and resident artists from the Cleveland Playhouse and features a half-day of academic activities, followed by a drama component in the afternoon.

Prioritization Process

The site visit team met with the Adlai Stevenson 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 included Organizational Leadership and Instructional Leadership. The site visit team also noted the following areas for growth: Supportive Classroom Climate and Purposeful Teaching.

The group identified intentional, engaging, and challenging classroom instruction for all students 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: Teachers provide students with clear learning goals and focused direct instruction.

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

Goal: Teachers provide students with clear learning goals and students are able to explain those goals.

Success Measure:

- **80% of teachers will communicate clear learning goals and have aligned activities by the beginning of September 2015.**
- **50% of students will be able to explain learning goals by the end of September 2015.**

Actions	Target Dates	Champions
Professional development on writing clear learning goals (utilizing UbD, KUD, etc.) – ensure alignment to school vision, ensure support for teachers.	August 13, 2015	Principal, teacher representative
Support for teachers' feedback	August 13, 2015	Teacher representative
Teacher-based teams	August 13, 2015	Principal
Professional development on goal-setting and student component	September 1, 2015	Principal
Create walkthrough forms	September 1, 2015	Teacher representative
Implementation plan		

Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members

The SQR to Adlai Stevenson was conducted on May 13-15, 2015 by a team of educators from the Cleveland Metropolitan School District and SchoolWorks, LLC.

Kate Wheeler	Team Leader	SchoolWorks, LLC
Nick Thompson	Team Writer	SchoolWorks, LLC
Nick D'Amico	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District