

# SchoolWorks School Quality Review Report

Louis Agassiz Elementary School  
May 5-7, 2015



100 Cummings Center, Suite 236C, Beverly, MA 01915  
(978) 921-1674 [www.schoolworks.org](http://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 .....	8
Domain 4: Leadership .....	10
Prioritization Process .....	12
Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members .....	13

## About the SchoolWorks School Quality Review Process

---

The Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD) envisions 21<sup>st</sup> 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
<b>Domain 1: Instruction</b>				
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	
<b>Domain 2: Students' Opportunities to Learn</b>				
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	
<b>Domain 3: Educators' Opportunities to Learn</b>				
6. <i>The school designs professional development and collaborative supports to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.</i>			Level 1: Intensive support Required	
7. <i>The school's culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.</i>			Level 2: Targeted support Required	
<b>Domain 4: Leadership</b>				
8. <i>School leaders guide instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.</i>			Level 1: Intensive support Required	
9. <i>The principal effectively orchestrates the school's operations.</i>			Level 2: Targeted Support Required	

**Domain 1: Instruction**

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

- Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by students.** In 93% of the classrooms (n=15) observed by the site visit team, students behaved according to rules and expectations. For example, students quietly entered classrooms, followed teachers’ directions, and physically transitioned into activities in an orderly fashion. In the majority of these classrooms, teachers posted behavioral rules, and used a range of strategies (e.g., count downs, positive narration, hand gestures) to communicate and reinforce (e.g., behavior clipboards, tickets for good behavior) behavioral expectations. In many of these classrooms, students were observed engaging in routines or classroom norms with minimal direction, such as entering classrooms and beginning work on non-instructional tasks, distributing materials to classmates, and pushing chairs back into tables. In focus groups, teachers and students reported that there were minimal classroom disruptions of student learning. The site visit team observed students generally cooperating with teachers’ requests in classrooms and hallways. In addition, the site visit team observed students participating in the school’s daily ritual of reciting its own pledge, which included behavioral expectations.
- In the majority of classrooms, the learning environment is not highly structured, and learning time is not maximized through effective planning.** Highly structured learning and maximized time was observed in 33% of visited classrooms. In these classrooms, teachers structured lessons, provisioned materials ahead of time, and minimized transition time. For example, in one class in which this was present, the teacher labeled tables prior to the lesson and resourced them with needed supplies to facilitate learning activities with quick transitions. Students transitioned from an introductory lesson-hook activity on the rug to a shared group activity at tables and then back to the rug for standards-based direct instruction. In the majority of classrooms, however, students’ learning time was not highly structured or maximized. For example, in some classrooms, students were observed participating in round-robin reading activities or completing non-instructional tasks (e.g., clean-up, silent reading) for extended periods (e.g., 10-to-15 minutes) before the lesson began. In other examples in which classrooms lacked effective planning or maximization of time, students were instructed to put their heads down to wait for further directions, or students were observed waiting in line to show their work to the teacher.

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

- The majority of teachers do not typically provide students with clear learning goals and focused direct instruction.** In 33% of observed classrooms, teachers clarified student learning objectives and linked them to instruction. In these classrooms, learning objectives were clearly referenced and focused instruction drove student activities. For example, during a literacy lesson aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), students were instructed how to read common, high-frequency words by sight, and then practiced using and applying them by writing complete sentences. In the majority of classrooms, however, learning objectives aligned were not posted or explicitly referenced during instruction. In some classrooms, teachers referenced task-based activities instead of student learning objectives. Examples included: “We are writing a book about animals;” and “Complete your

story element organizer.” In some classrooms, students were observed working individually on tasks without direct instruction for extended periods (e.g., up to 20 minutes). In other classrooms, students were observed completing tasks on worksheets (e.g., handwriting practice, calendar) with no evidence that these tasks were aligned with CCSS.

- Instruction does not require all students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills.** The principal and teachers reported that rigorous instruction had been presented this year as a professional development topic. However, students were observed using or developing higher-order thinking skills in only 20% of visited classrooms. In the majority of classrooms, instruction was not focused around learning tasks requiring higher-order thinking skills, such as explaining thinking, applying knowledge, or engaging in thinking that requires students to look beyond what is explicitly stated in the text for answers. For example, in some classrooms, teachers provided answers to their own questions instead of providing sufficient wait time for students to think and respond. In some classrooms, teachers missed opportunities for students to extend thinking by engaging in problem-solving. For example, in one classroom, the teacher asked students how the calculation of area might be used in the real-world, but did not provide students with further opportunities to extend or apply this learning. In other classrooms, students were asked to answer questions that did not challenge students to probe thinking beyond recalling facts. For example, students were asked to identify and label parts of an insect on a worksheet or, while reading a fiction text, students were asked questions such as, “Who is the main instigator?” and “As a consequence, what happened?”

<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Level 1: Intensive support Required</b></p>
---	---

- The use of assessment strategies to reveal students’ thinking about learning goals is limited.** In 31% of observed classrooms, teachers used at least one informal assessment to gauge students’ understanding of learning goals. For example, in one classroom in which this was present, the teacher asked the majority of students to verbally explain their thinking (e.g., “Why did you get that answer?”) while circulating throughout the class. In most classrooms, however, the site visit team did not see teachers engaging with students in extended content-based discussions, or using formative assessment strategies such as checking for understanding (CFU). For example, in some classrooms students were asked to complete worksheets during instructional time, but teachers did not consistently circulate to the majority of students to check or discuss answers. In other classrooms, teachers posed questions during whole group instruction, but called on only a few students to answer. In addition, teachers in some classrooms asked students procedural, not content-based, questions (e.g., “Did you finish?” or “Who knows where we are at?”). In the majority of classrooms, the site visit team observed that teachers generally did not use assessment strategies to gauge students’ prior knowledge or understanding (e.g., Know, Want to know, Learn [KWL] charts), or employ instructional assessment practices (e.g., thumb-tools, whiteboards, exit tickets, think-pair-share) to assess students’ understanding of content or learning goals during lessons.
- Timely, frequent, specific feedback throughout the learning process to inform improvement efforts is limited.** In 31% of observed classrooms, explicit feedback to inform students’ improvement efforts was evident. For example, during a mathematics lesson, students were provided with visual examples of geometric patterns so they could see how their answers compared, and this was probed further by teacher questioning. However, in the majority of classrooms, students were not provided with

substantive, content-based feedback. For example, when teachers were observed providing students with feedback, it was primarily process-based feedback (e.g., “Put your data in the right place on the chart”), or non-specific feedback (“That’s right”). In addition, in most classrooms, students were not observed using rubrics to inform learning goals or progress, and students were not generally provided with examples or models of related student work for purposes of demonstration or comparison.

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

<p>4. The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.</p>	<p><b>Level 2: Targeted support Required</b></p>
---	--

- The school has a process for identifying academic and/or behavioral interventions; however, supports for special education students, struggling students, and at-risk students are limited.** The principal and teachers reported that the school has established processes, including the student support team (SST) and Reading Improvement Monitoring Plan (RIMP), for identifying and providing interventions for students who are struggling and at risk or who need special education support. For example, both stakeholder groups reported that the SST meets weekly to help teachers develop classroom-based intervention plans with timelines, based on student performance data (e.g., assessment scores, behavior, previously implemented strategies). In addition, both stakeholder groups explained that the district identifies at-risk students based on Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) scores, and that teachers are expected to develop RIMPs, using Academic Improvement Measuring Web (AIMSweb) for progress monitoring, every two weeks. Teachers also reported (and review of sample SST referral and RIMP documents confirmed) that teachers use a range of additional progress monitoring assessments (e.g., Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR), Kindergarten Readiness Assessment in Literacy (KRAL), State K-3 Literacy Diagnostic). However, the principal and teachers reported that the school lacks a comprehensive system for providing students with multiple academic and behavioral interventions. For example, teachers reported having challenges developing reteaching strategies substantially different from ones that they already implemented during classroom-based instruction. Specifically, teachers reported that the school lacks supports such as intervention specialists, tutoring options, differentiated materials, instructional software programs, and computers. Both the principal and teachers reported that the school lacks sufficient staffing and supports for special education students and students requiring mental health services. For example, teachers reported that special education teachers are scheduled to teach students placed in self-contained classrooms while serving as liaisons for special education inclusion students placed in regular education classrooms across the school. In addition, the principal reported that the school psychologist is assigned to the building by the district for only 1.5 days each week, creating challenges around meeting the related academic and mental health needs of all students in the school.
- The school provides limited structured opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults in the school, and limited out-of-school academic services.** All stakeholders – principal, teachers, students, and parents – reported that relationships among peers and adults in the school are generally positive. Further, document review of the January 2015 CMSD Conditions for Learning (CFL) survey confirmed that 98% of students in grades 5-8 feel supported by adults in the school. These same stakeholder groups consistently described the school’s culture in terms of feeling like a family. Students reported (and teachers affirmed) that students have positive relationships with adults, explaining that students feel comfortable seeking tutoring help or advice from teachers. However, apart from the school’s conflict-resolution program (i.e., Peacemakers) and tutoring for a limited number of students after school, stakeholder groups did not report having additional school or community-based programs or structures to strengthen students’ academic, social, and emotional skills. When asked about supports, for example, teachers and students did not report having a social

and emotional skills curriculum or related opportunities such as a student council, with the exception of a Boy Scouts chapter that meets weekly in the school. Further, all stakeholders reported that the school recently provided, but currently lacks, after-school academic tutoring programs.

<p>5. The school’s culture reflects high levels of both academic expectation and support.</p>	<p><b>Level 2: Targeted support Required</b></p>
---	--

- The school does not hold consistent high expectations for academic learning.** When asked about high expectations for students, the principal and teachers provided examples of students’ acceptance into challenging high school programs (e.g., Bard Early College High School), and returning students who report success in high school. The school’s January 2015 CFL survey indicated that 96% of students in grades 5-8 reported feeling challenged academically, and the principal and teachers commonly stated that the school holds high standards for students. However, teachers also consistently reported that expectations for student achievement are primarily set by individual teachers, rather than by the school as a whole. For example, in focus groups, teachers did not generally reference any specific, targeted goals or metrics that students are expected to meet. In addition, the site visit team did not observe student performance data posted in classrooms. Some teachers also explained that they are using new curriculums in literacy and mathematics (e.g., *Journeys, Springboard, Math Expressions*), and are working at developing academic expectations and rubrics within these content areas. In addition, the site visit team’s document review of student work samples in literacy revealed that some writing assignments evidenced below-grade-level expectations for student writing. For example, in some grades, students were asked to write short topical paragraphs on provided worksheets, instead of lengthier academic writing with embedded critical thinking. In a focus group, when asked about academic challenge, students reported that academic work was not consistently challenging, and students could not explain how to earn an ‘A’ in most subjects. Students also stated that they are not routinely asked to set academic goals, and that test data (e.g., NWEA MAP scores) are not usually shared with them. As well, students could not easily describe how they understand or track their own academic skills and progress. In addition, teachers, students, and parents consistently reported that the school has limited celebrations to recognize student achievement. For example, students explained that the school publishes an honor roll, but does not regularly hold assemblies to recognize student accomplishments.
- The school provides a safe environment to support students’ learning.** All stakeholders – principal, teachers, students, and parents – reported that the school provides a safe learning environment. For example, students reported feeling supported by adults in the school, and stated that incidents of bullying or other conflicts are fairly handled and provided with follow-up, including (in some cases) by students participating in the school’s Peacemaker program. Parents and students additionally reported that during an assembly at the beginning of the year, the school’s code of conduct was discussed and behavioral expectations were made clear. While observing student behavior in hallways and classrooms, the site visit team noted that the majority of students demonstrated appropriate behavior. In addition, review of the school’s teacher handbook confirmed that safety systems (e.g., fire and security drill procedures) are in place, and the site visit team observed adults, including the school’s security guard, monitoring student safety and behavior across the school.

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

<p>6. The school designs professional development and collaborative supports to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.</p>	<p><b>Level 1: Intensive support Required</b></p>
---	---

- School improvement goals do not drive professional development.** A review of the school’s 2014-15 Academic Achievement Plan (AAP) revealed that the school’s prioritized academic improvement goals were identified as needed growth in literacy, mathematics, and science assessment scores for all students. However, the principal and teachers reported that the implemented professional development plan this year was not primarily focused on deepening teachers’ understanding of content areas or on improving content-based instruction through data-analysis. For example, some teachers reported having district-provided content-based professional development last summer (e.g., *Journeys*), but teachers generally reported not having sufficient content-based professional development this year, including time to meet in vertical (i.e., content across grades) planning teams. In addition, teachers reported having some engagement with the district-developed teacher-based team (TBT) data-driven instructional model, but reported frustration with not having sufficient time or support to be able to effectively implement the plan. For example, some teachers reported that just filling in the TBT report was time-consuming. A review of sample TBT meeting records confirmed that teacher teams did not consistently document expected analysis of student data and reteaching strategies. According to the principal and teachers, the school’s operative professional development plan this year consisted primarily of topical sessions determined by the principal and teachers serving on the building leadership team (BLT). Specifically, both stakeholder groups reported (and sample professional development documents confirmed) having abbreviated professional development sessions on topics that were selected on an as-needed basis, and thus not strategically designed to align with the school’s AAP. Examples of professional development sessions included: rigor, questioning, testing procedures, and HEART training (i.e., **H**ear, **E**mpathize, **A**pologize, **R**espond, **T**hank). When asked about professional development opportunities outside of school, teachers explained they have access to the district’s online professional development program (i.e., PD 360) for self-selected topics, and to the professional development offered in the district’s summer institute.
- Educators have the opportunity to meet regularly; however, expectations for collaboration are not established.** The principal and teachers consistently reported that teachers are expected to meet weekly in TBTs clustered by grades (e.g., K-2, 3-5, 6-8). However, teachers reported challenges to meeting and collaborating. For example, teachers explained that TBTs typically meet with the principal, but that meeting was frequently impacted because the principal was sometimes required to attend meetings outside of the building during scheduled meeting times. Teachers also reported having a lack of shared understandings for exactly how to collaborate, and what to accomplish within and across grade-level teams. For example, teachers explained that the principal brought certain agenda items to meetings, but teams could suggest or bring up items themselves, such as looking at student work or analyzing CCSS. Some teachers reported having meetings where they engaged in data-analysis using the district’s protocol, but other teachers reported minimal engagement with this process. However, teachers commonly reported that grade-level team meetings were used to accomplish varied tasks without a consistent focus on any single area. Review of sample TBT documents confirmed that TBT agendas listed multiple tasks for each meeting. For example, weekly

meeting agendas typically listed 4-10 varied tasks (e.g., prepare for parent conference day, discuss homework sheets and planners) and provided a data-analysis template to document the process (e.g., What did we do? What did we accomplish by looking at the data? What are the implications for our teaching?). Reviewed sample templates, however, lacked notes in the data-analysis section, and thus did not indicate what teams discussed, what actions were taken, or what next steps were planned. However, the principal and teachers consistently reported having an operative system of informal teacher collaboration. For example, the principal and teachers explained that some teachers had volunteered to collaborate around integrated subject-area projects such as a collaborative musical theater production. As well, teachers reported that they seek out individual colleagues for ideas around curriculum and instruction.

7. The school's culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.	<b>Level 2: Targeted support Required</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Educators convey a shared commitment to, and mutual responsibility for, their students; however, educators do not have a shared vision of teaching and learning.</b> The principal and teachers reported that they share a common commitment to supporting students. For example, when discussing students, both stakeholder groups reported that students come from challenging home circumstances. At the same time, stakeholders consistently described students as willing to learn, and described teachers' commitment to students by using the metaphor of a responsible family. Some teachers reported satisfaction with obtaining good results for students, despite having few resources such as technology to support instruction. Teachers also reported that the principal generally trusts them to make instructional decisions without review or oversight. As an example, a teacher described developing some curriculum independently, based on Internet sources and research of state standards, but that the curriculum had not been formally reviewed or approved. When asked if the school had taken steps to implement a shared instructional practice across the school, teachers reported that there had not been any single instructional area to guide teachers in the implementation of common practices. For example, teachers explained that increasing rigor in instruction through higher-level questioning had been discussed, but this practice had not been required as a shared, instructional learning goal for teachers or selected as a common practice to implement across classrooms. </li> <li> <b>The school reflects a safe and trustworthy professional climate.</b> When asked about professional climate, teachers consistently described the school's professional culture as positive. For example, teachers provided numerous examples of reaching out to colleagues for support, such as seeking help from special education colleagues or obtaining advice from teachers with expertise in class management. Also, teachers generally reported a perception that the classroom doors of colleagues are open to them, and teachers typically described the overall professional culture as being safe and non-judgmental. For instance, when discussing educators in the school, the principal and teachers typically used expressions such as "strong staff," "caring staff," or referenced colleagues as "having my back." At the same time, teachers generally reported that the school is undergoing a transitional period, citing the principal's retirement, along with staffing cuts and retirements, as sources of anxiety and uncertainty among teachers for sustaining what they view as the school's largely positive professional culture. </li> </ul>	

<b>Domain 4: Leadership</b>	
8. School leaders guide instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.	<b>Level 1: Intensive support Required</b>

- **The school has not created a shared vision or clear goals that ensure continuous progress.** Document review of the school's 2014-15 AAP indicated that the district publishes guidelines explaining that each school's AAP is intended to serve as its cohesive academic achievement roadmap. A review of the school's current AAP indicated that the school identified specific goals for both academic achievement and family / community engagement. However, when asked in focus groups about the school's academic goals, stakeholders, including the principal, leadership team members, and teachers, did not cite or refer to the AAP at any time. When asked further about the school's AAP development process and use within the school, teachers reported that only a small number of teachers had developed the plan, and that the AAP had not been generally highlighted as a school-wide focus. Further, when describing school goals, teachers provided varied examples and understandings. For example, in focus groups, teachers cited a range of dissimilar school goals, including: setting high standards, improving test scores, treating each other with respect, increasing attendance, and getting students into rigorous high school programs. In addition, while members of the BLT reported having some district training around BLT implementation, they reported being confused about, and expressed difficulty articulating, the BLT's goals and decision-making parameters. Finally, the site visit team noted that, with respect to the school's engagement in the School Quality Review (SQR) process, the majority of teachers reported that they were not informed about, and did not understand the purpose of, the SQR site visit or its relationship to anticipated school growth through the school's participation.
- **The school does not yet ensure that teachers deliver high quality instruction.** In the majority of observed classrooms, the site visit team noted a lack of consistent, high quality instruction. When asked about supervision and evaluation, teachers generally reported that the principal conducts the expected observations and evaluations of teachers required by the state's mandated teacher evaluation process, the Teacher Development Evaluation System (TDES). The principal reported that she had rated nine teachers as accomplished during the prior school year. And, although TDES does not require formal evaluation of accomplished teachers during the subsequent year, teachers rated accomplished generally reported having minimal or no instructional feedback this year. The site visit team also reviewed two sample TDES classroom observation documents; it was noted that these documents did not contain formative feedback. In addition, the site visit team was not provided with any fully completed TDES evaluations for review. Apart from formal TDES feedback, teachers also reported that instructional feedback from the principal has usually been verbal and largely positive in nature. However, some teachers reported experiencing critical feedback in some instances from district-level administrators. When asked about feedback on lesson plans, teachers stated that they are expected to have lesson plans on their desks, but lesson plans were not generally reviewed or used to provide instructional feedback. And, when asked who they turn to for instructional leadership, some teachers stated they could go to the principal, but the majority of teachers stated that they go to colleagues, or seek advice from outside sources such as education courses or teachers they know in other schools.

9. The principal effectively orchestrates the school’s operations.	<b>Level 2: Targeted support Required</b>
--	---

- **The principal manages school operations in order to ensure a safe environment that is conducive to learning.** All stakeholders, including the principal, teachers, parents, and students, reported that the school provides a safe and supportive learning environment. Specifically, teachers described the school as nurturing, and students expressed the ability to talk confidentially with adults about their concerns. Review of the January 2015 CFL report confirmed that 77% of students reported feeling safe and respected in school. Teachers and students alike reported that disruptions of classroom instruction are minimal, and that serious infractions, such as bullying, are appropriately handled and given follow-through. However, the principal and teachers reported that there is need for additional mental health supports, even though the school has developed a strong relationship with the Applewood Center – a community-based mental health social service agency. The principal reported that the Center provides a full-time, school-based counselor and conducts home visits when needed.
- **The school’s engagement of parents and community members in the educational process is limited.** The principal, teachers, and parents commonly reported that parent engagement is limited. For example, these stakeholders similarly reported that, although the school has a school parent organization (SPO), overall parent participation in school affairs is limited. The principal reported that fewer than 10 parents consistently attend SPO meetings. Parents also confirmed that parent participation in school meetings and activities is limited. Parents shared the example of a parent who volunteers each day to greet students and who uses this opportunity to interest other parents arriving with children to get engaged in school matters. Teachers also reported that parent participation at conferences or open houses tends to dwindle as the year goes on, and expressed difficulty communicating with parents, even in cases where teachers provide parents with cell phone numbers. However, all stakeholder groups reported positively on the school’s weekly food distribution program, initiated and coordinated by a volunteer parent in collaboration with the Cleveland Food Bank. The principal and parent coordinator reported that the program distributes food to 190 students and their families every week. However, the principal and teachers also reported that many of the school’s former community resources and partners are no longer actively engaged with the school, and that school engagement with the wider community is generally limited to field trips to cultural destinations like museums and professional theater.

## Prioritization Process

The site visit team met with the Louis Agassiz Elementary 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 the safe environment the school provides to support students' learning. School leaders highlighted the following areas identified by the site visit team as areas for growth: High expectations for academic learning are limited, and Educators have the opportunity to meet regularly; however, expectations for collaboration are not established.

The group identified 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: Assessment results are used to make adjustments to instruction in order to address student learning.

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

**Goal: Teachers use assessment strategies to reveal students' thinking about learning goals.**

**Success Measure: At the end of 12 weeks, participating teachers will have a deeper understanding of formative assessment as measured by the difference in pre- and post- surveys.**

Actions	Target Dates	Champions
Share the positive with staff and share the goal.	5/8/2015	BLTeam
Leadership meeting to discuss materials and resources, first two weeks.	9/11/2015	PD360/Robin as resources
Develop plan for professional development/staff collaboration, at four weeks.	9/25/2015	BLTeam
Invite staff participation in professional development, at six weeks.	10/9/2015	BLTeam
Revisit action plan and celebrate.		

## **Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members**

The SQR to Louis Agassiz Elementary School was conducted on May 5-7, 2015 by a team of educators from the Cleveland Metropolitan School District and SchoolWorks, LLC.

<b>Robin Hull</b>	Team Leader	SchoolWorks, LLC
<b>Christopher Saheed</b>	Team Writer	SchoolWorks, LLC
<b>William Wingle</b>	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District