

# SchoolWorks School Quality Review Report

McKinley Elementary School  
April 8-10, 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 .....	5
Domain 3: Educators’ Opportunities to Learn .....	7
Domain 4: Leadership .....	9
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 process aligned to CMSD initiatives and the school performance framework. The school quality reviews (SQR) 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 site visit 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 site visit team meets to confirm, refute, and modify its hypotheses about school performance. The 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 1: Intensive 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 3: Established
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 1: Intensive support Required
Domain 4: Leadership	
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

1. Classroom interactions and organization ensure a supportive, highly structured learning climate.

**Level 1:  
Intensive support  
Required**

- **Behavioral expectations are not clear or understood by all students.** In 38% (n=13) of the classrooms observed by the site visit team, behavioral expectations were evident. In some classrooms, students followed directions and raised their hands to ask and answer questions. However, in the majority of classrooms, students ignored teachers' directives and called out questions and responses. Site visit team members also noted that many teachers did not attempt to redirect misbehavior. For instance, in some classes, teachers used a saying or gesture to address off-task behavior, but many students ignored their cues. In observed classes, teachers did not hold students accountable when they did not respond to redirection. In addition, the principal, teacher, and students stated that the school does not yet have a school-wide behavior plan for the classroom level. All three stakeholder groups explained that each teacher creates his/her own rules and consequences. Students further reported that misbehavior consistently interrupts their learning.
- **The learning environment lacks consistent structure, and learning time is not maximized.** Structured environments were observed in 15% of visited classrooms. Site visit team members noted that insufficient planning and ineffective procedures resulted in lost learning time in most visited classrooms. For example, prior to the start of lessons, teachers did not have materials ready, questions written in advance, and activities planned. Further, site visit team members noted that many teachers did not give students learning tasks at the beginning of the period. For instance, some teachers gave students directions for up to 20 minutes before instructing them to begin lesson activities. In addition, in many observed classes, teachers facilitated lengthy class restroom breaks during instructional time. Further, many observed teachers did not teach according to their schedules. For example, site visit team members visited classrooms in which students were slated to deliver mathematics instruction but were observed, instead, to be reading. To be noted, testing was taking place for one hour each morning in grades 3-8.

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

**Level 1:  
Intensive support  
Required**

- **Few teachers provide students with clear learning goals.** The principal and teachers reported that teachers communicate learning goals in the form of "I can" statements to students. However, students were provided with learning goals in only 31% of the classrooms visited. Examples of posted "I can" statements included: "I can use concepts to solve addition and subtraction problems with decimals;" and "I can estimate probabilities of outcomes in probability experiments." While site visit team members noted that learning tasks aligned with posted "I can" statements in the majority of visited classrooms, some observed lesson activities did not correlate. For instance, in one visited classroom, the "I can" statement indicated that students were going to learn about phonics, but students were engaged in a mathematics lesson. Further, when asked, most students could state what they were doing (e.g., doing a worksheet) but could not explain what they were learning and why.
- **Few teachers employ a variety of instructional strategies and materials to support students' diverse needs.** Teachers employed a range of instructional strategies and materials in 15% of the classrooms visited. When this was present, in one observed classroom, a teacher presented concepts using an interactive board that allowed students to access the material kinesthetically and visually. However, in most visited classrooms, teachers relied on direct instruction and independent learning tasks (e.g.,

answering questions in workbooks) to deliver content. In addition, most teachers used only whole group questioning techniques and predominantly called on students who raised their hands. While the principal and teachers indicated that the school prioritizes differentiated instruction, site visit team members did not observe any instances of differentiation. In observed classes, students were learning the same content in the same way. Furthermore, peer learning was observed in just 8% of the classrooms visited. Site visit team members noted that many classrooms were physically arranged to promote peer learning. For instance, desks were grouped together rather than arranged in rows. However, most teachers did not employ cooperative strategies such as turn-and-talk and think-pair-share.

- Instruction does not require students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills.** The principal reported (and review of the student-based budgeting plan verified) that increasing instructional rigor is a school-wide priority. Yet, students were not required to use and develop higher-order thinking skills in any of the classrooms visited. In 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: “How old will you be?” and “What happened in the story?” 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 completing low-level worksheets.

<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>
---	---

- Assessment strategies are infrequently used to reveal students’ thinking.** Teachers reported that they frequently employ formative assessments through questioning and checks for understanding (CFU) methods (e.g., individual white boards, exit tickets). However, assessments that revealed students’ thinking were utilized in just 38% of the classrooms visited. While one observed teacher 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 that gauged students’ conceptual understanding. Rather, teachers asked recall questions (e.g., “What month is it?”) and only called on students who raised their hands. Site visit team members also noted that some teachers circulated during instructional time; however, observed teachers checked to see if students were on task but did not assess the accuracy and quality of students’ work. Further, site visit team members did not observe white boards or exit tickets being used in any of the classrooms visited.
- Specific feedback is not provided throughout the learning process to inform improvement efforts.** Teachers did not deliver feedback to students in any of the classrooms visited. While some teachers reported that teachers refer to rubrics throughout instruction to supply feedback, rubrics were not used during observed lessons. Some teachers provided procedural feedback (e.g., “You should be doing lesson seven”) and non-specific feedback (e.g., “Good job”); however, content-related feedback was not in evidence. In addition, site visit team members observed students asking a teacher for clarification, but noted that feedback was not provided. Rather, the observed teacher instructed the class to skip the problem. Further, students reported that they often do not get their graded classwork, homework, and tests back. Students explained that they think they earned a good grade when their work is not returned to them.

**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 3: Established</b></p>
---	--

- The school has a process for implementing interventions and supports for struggling or at-risk students.** The principal and teachers reported that teachers refer struggling and/or at-risk students to the student support team (SST). Both stakeholder groups explained that the SST convenes, analyzes referral data (e.g., assessment scores, previously implemented classroom interventions, functional behavioral assessments), and crafts intervention plans for teachers to implement in their classrooms. Teachers stated (and review of the student-based budgeting plan verified) that the SST prescribes pull-out sessions with interventionists and small-group instruction, as well as software-based interventions such as Achieve 3000, Study Island, Accelerated Reader, ABC Mouse, and Reading A-Z. In addition, the principal and teachers reported that students with low Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) test scores are flagged by the school district. Specifically, both stakeholders stated that the district provides the principal and teachers with a list of students who scored below proficient and requires these students to go on Reading Improvement Plans (RIMP). Teachers explained (and review of a RIMP verified) that RIMPs identify students' specific skill deficiencies (e.g., reading comprehension) and outline interventions (e.g., pull-out with reading interventionist) that will be implemented to support students. The principal and teachers stated that students on RIMPs are progress monitored bi-weekly through Academic Improvement Measurement System web (AIMSweb) testing. In addition, the principal, teachers, and students reported (and review of the schedule confirmed) that the upper grades have a daily intervention period before lunch. Teachers and students explained that students in need of support receive one-on-one and small-group instruction and/or complete software-based intervention programs during this time. Further, parents praised the support the school provides to struggling or at-risk students.
- The school provides adequate opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults in the school.** The principal reported that she has prioritized the development of students' social and emotional skills. The principal, teachers, and students explained that the school has implemented a number of programs that support the growth of these skills. Specifically, all three stakeholder groups indicated that the school runs a book buddies program that pairs students in the upper grades with students in the lower grades. Teachers and students reported that older students read to the younger students during lunch. Students and teachers also indicated that students in the upper grades tutor pre-kindergarten students in mathematics and science twice a week. In addition, the principal, teachers, and students stated that the school implemented a student-led conflict resolution program. Students reported that students in the upper grades are nominated by staff to become conflict resolution mediators. Students further explained that they attend a three-day training to be taught how to mediate conflicts such as bullying and disagreements between their peers. Further, the principal, teachers, and students indicated that the school ensures opportunities for students to engage in positive social group activities. Specifically, students reported that the school offers extracurricular sports, including basketball and track. All three stakeholder groups also stated that the school takes students on field trips (e.g., the aquarium) throughout the year. Further, students reported that they feel comfortable approaching adults in school for guidance with academic and personal issues. Review of the 2014 Conditions for Learning survey results confirmed that students feel safe going to staff; 80% of students indicated that they feel emotionally supported and cared for at school.

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

- **The school lacks high expectations for academic learning for all students.** While all stakeholders – the principal, teachers, students, and parents — reported (and review of the 2014 Conditions for Learning survey indicated) that the school holds high academic expectations, site visit team members observed otherwise. While students consistently stated that their classes were rigorous, site visit team members did not observe any instruction that required students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills. In addition, students indicated that they were learning challenging concepts; however, site visit team members noted that students were working on content that was below grade level in most of the classrooms visited. Further, students explained (and site visit team members observed) that instruction consists primarily of completing problems and questions in their textbooks and workbooks. Students explained that, once they finish assignments, their teachers go over the answers. Students further reported that they often do not get their graded work or assessments back from their teachers. Review of student work further confirmed the absence of critical feedback from teachers. Rather, reviewed work did not provide any comments or offered feedback that lacked clear direction (e.g., “Loved the table”).
- **The school engages families in support of students’ learning.** All stakeholders – the principal, teachers, students, and parents – reported that the school involves families in students’ learning. Parents stated (and review of the handbook confirmed) that the school has an active school-parent organization that convenes regularly and communicates frequently with the principal. For instance, parents explained that members of the organization meet with the principal at the beginning of the school year to confirm that tentative event dates do not conflict with school assessment schedules. In addition, all stakeholders stated that the school further engages families by hosting school activities. For example, the principal, teachers, students, and parents reported that the school recently held a movie night at which families watched *Charlotte’s Web*. The principal, teachers, and students explained that students who signed-up to attend movie night received, read, and completed a project based on the book prior to viewing the movie. All three stakeholder groups indicated that students discussed their projects and compared the movie to the book after watching the film. In addition, all stakeholders stated that the school holds other events, such as Muffins for Mom, and Dogs for Dad. Review of the school-parent organization event list showed additional school activities, including a Halloween parade, turkey bowl, and Chuck-E-Cheese night. Further, teachers and parents reported that teachers communicate with parents frequently through telephone calls and e-mails. Parents complimented teachers for promptly making contact to inform them of both positive and negative occurrences in the classroom.



**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 2: Targeted support Required</b></p>
---	--

- Some professional development addresses school improvement goals.** The principal and teachers consistently reported (and review of the student-based budgeting plan verified) that the school's goals are to improve Conditions for Learning survey results pertaining to school culture and to ensure that students achieve 5% growth on NWEA MAP reading and mathematics assessments. Review of the student-based budgeting plan showed that the school has set additional goals around increasing instructional rigor and implementing a co-teaching model to ensure inclusive instruction. The principal and teachers reported that the school holds three all-day professional development (PD) sessions throughout the school year. In addition, the principal stated that she holds additional PD sessions on Wednesdays before school. The principal and teachers indicated that the principal dedicated one of the three PD days to team-building. Teachers further stated that the team-building PD benefited the staff because it enabled new employees to interact with veteran staff, offered strategies to improve how staff work together, and allowed general education teachers and special education teachers time to collaborate with one another. In addition, both stakeholder groups stated (and review of PD agendas verified) that PD around analyzing NWEA MAP data and increasing instructional rigor was also delivered during all-day sessions. However, teachers indicated that supplemental PD and implementation support around data and rigor has not been provided. In addition, when asked, teachers could not describe how PD has improved their instructional practice. Moreover, the principal stated (and review of survey results verified) that PD topics are often determined by the results of staff surveys rather than school goals. Further, the principal and teachers reported that weekly Wednesday PD has not been delivered consistently since the first semester of school.
- Educators have the opportunity to meet regularly to learn about students' progress; however, there is not a clear link between meetings and their impact on delivering effective instruction.** The principal and teachers consistently reported (and review of the school's meeting schedule verified) that teachers are provided with time to meet in their teams every Tuesday. 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 five steps (i.e., planning standards and unpacking learning targets, administering and analyzing pre-assessments, designing instructional plans, teaching and assessing, and reflecting and crafting reteach plans) that guide the creation of unit and lesson plans. However, some teachers reported that the protocol is not a useful tool, stating that they only complete the protocol because it is required by the principal. While the principal indicated (and review of feedback forms and meeting schedules confirmed) that the building leadership team convenes once a month to review and provide critical feedback on protocols, she stated that teachers are not required to make adjustments to their protocols based on leadership's feedback. Review of completed protocols showed that the amount of detail provided for each step varies widely among teams. For instance, some protocols detailed specific strategies (e.g., think-pair-share) and explained how they would be used during instruction, while others listed broad strategies only (e.g., cooperative learning) without any explanation. Further, review of protocols revealed high failure rates on both pre- and post-assessments; most reviewed protocols did not include re-teach plans.

<p>7. The school’s culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.</p>	<p><b>Level 1: Intensive support Required</b></p>
---	---

- **Educators do not convey shared commitments and mutual responsibility.** The principal and teachers reported that teachers have autonomy when making instructional decisions and setting classroom rules. Both groups indicated that a school-wide shared vision about instruction and discipline has yet to be established. In addition, teachers expressed the belief that students’ home and/or personal situations prevented them from being academically successful at school. For instance, teachers explained that many students are below grade level because they move frequently. The principal and teachers also indicated that recurrent testing impedes student achievement because it takes away from instructional time. 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. Further, while teachers expressed commitments to their students, teachers did not indicate that all students enrolled in the school are their responsibility. For example, when asked how they support special education students, some teachers indicated that such support is the primary responsibility of special education teachers and paraprofessionals. In another instance, leadership reported that students with special needs were overlooked when other students took part in a whole grade field trip.
- **The school does not reflect a safe and trustworthy professional climate.** The principal and teachers reported (and review of the academic achievement plan verified) that improving school culture, as measured by the school’s mid-year report, stands as a top priority. Teachers consistently described the culture among the staff as supportive. Teachers explained that they often approach their peers with personal and professional issues. However, the principal and teachers indicated that the culture between school leadership and staff is strained. Both stakeholder groups stated that the newly implemented Teacher Development and Evaluation System (TDES) has contributed to the tension. Teachers reported that TDES expectations have not been clearly presented to them. Teachers further explained that, as a result, many teachers were confused about instructional requirements and post-observation conference guidelines. For instance, some teachers indicated that they erroneously thought they could provide documentation of teaching practices that were not observed by the principal during her evaluations. Teachers explained that the misunderstanding negatively affected their TDES scores. In addition, the principal, teachers, and parents reported that the school is merging with another school after the 2015-16 school year. Teachers explained that they have not been informed about the staffing plan for the merge; they stated that they are concerned about keeping their positions at the school’s new location. Teachers indicated that the stress imposed by the upcoming merge also contributes to the divide between leadership and staff.

**Domain 4: Leadership**

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

- While the principal communicates a clear short-term vision for student growth, there is a lack of clarity regarding specific student achievement goals.** The principal, teachers, and parents consistently reported that the school set goals around student growth; specifically, the principal and teachers stated that students need to achieve 5% growth on NWEA MAP reading and mathematics assessments. The principal explained that growth goals were communicated to teachers during a PD session that was held before the start of school. The principal reported that a 5 point growth goal was set by the school’s superintendent; however, stakeholders could not clearly explain the growth goal. In addition, review of the school’s strategic plan, academic achievement plan, and PD documents showed that growth goals are written differently in various plans. For example, the strategic plan states that students will increase their reading and mathematics scores by 5 points on the Ohio Achievement Assessment (OAA) and improve their reading scores by 15 points on NWEA MAP assessments. The academic achievement plan states that students will increase their reading and mathematics scores by 10% on state-mandated assessments, but does not detail goals around NWEA MAP. A PD document states that students will increase their scores by “5% points on value-added assessments.” In addition, site visit team members observed that the school has a data wall that displays NWEA MAP data. However, review of the data wall indicated that scores are not color-coded or organized in a meaningful way to demonstrate progress toward meeting growth goals. Further, the principal stated (and review of student-based budgeting and academic achievement plans confirmed) that growth goals are set for the current school year only.
- School leaders do not yet ensure that teachers deliver high-quality instruction.** The principal and teachers reported that teachers are required to have basic lesson plans. However, teachers indicated that specific expectations around lesson planning have yet to be established. For instance, the principal and teachers stated that teachers can use any template or format when crafting lessons and reported that teachers are not required to include specific lesson components. Review of evaluation artifacts verified the lack of common expectations; the reviewed artifacts indicated some plans identified “I can” statements (i.e., lesson objectives) and activities, while others listed topics and materials. While the principal stated that she requires teachers to place their lesson plans on their desks for reference during observations, site visit team members did not observe plans on desks while visiting classrooms. In addition, the principal stated that, due to teacher contract regulations, she cannot formally review lesson plans or provide feedback on the plans except when conducting TDES. In addition, while the principal and teachers stated that the principal observes teachers in accordance with the requirements outlined by TDES, teachers could not provide examples of instructional feedback they have received. Review of evaluation artifacts showed that the principal captured what was seen and heard during lessons but did not provide critical feedback about her observations. Examples included, “Anchor chart of sentence types is displayed,” and “Students explain what it means to be a great friend.” The principal and teachers reported that the principal includes questions for teachers to answer in their observation feedback. However, teachers explained (and review of evaluation artifacts confirmed) that the principal does not provide feedback about their answers. Examples of questions included, “How can you include goals and assessments into lesson plans?” and “How can we display student work in the classroom?”

- While some conditions exist to support a school-wide data culture, it has not yet been established.** The principal and teachers reported that the school administers multiple assessments, including NWEA MAP, AIMSweb, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), and OAA tests. The principal and teachers also stated that they have access to assessment results. In addition, the principal and teachers indicated (and review of the school’s meeting schedule verified) that teachers are provided with time to analyze data during their 200 minutes of weekly, uninterrupted planning time. As previously reported, both stakeholder groups stated that they convene in their teams every Tuesday to utilize a teacher-based team protocol. The principal and teachers explained that the protocol requires them to analyze unit pre- and post-assessment data in order to make instructional decisions. Yet, teachers could not explain how they analyze and apply the assessment data. Furthermore, review of completed protocols indicated that the data analysis was shallow. Assessment results are broken down into four categories: number of students who took the assessment; number of students who are advanced; number of students who are proficient; and number of students who are below proficient. The principal and teachers confirmed that teachers do not conduct an item analysis to examine trends on specific questions or standards missed. Moreover, when asked, teachers could not explain how their data analysis specifically informed their instructional plans when following the protocol.

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

- The principal has a process for hiring and evaluating staff.** The principal and teachers uniformly reported aspects of the hiring process that are used to select candidates to fill instructional vacancies. The principal stated (and review of a hiring memorandum confirmed) that applicants indicate that they are interested in pursuing a position at the school by submitting Interest to Interview forms to the district; the district then distributes the forms to principals. The principal explained that she reviews the forms and then selects candidates to interview at the school. The principal and teachers reported that applicants interview with a panel. The principal stated that the panel includes herself, a special education teacher, and a general education teacher who will be working with whomever fills the position. Both stakeholder groups also reported that candidates submit sample lesson plans to the interview panel. In addition, the principal and teachers consistently reported that the principal ensures the evaluation of staff in accordance with the guidelines outlined by TDES. Both stakeholder groups explained that the principal observes teachers five times (i.e., two announced formal observations, one announced informal observation, two unannounced informal observations) throughout the school year. The principal also indicated that she works to develop teachers who do not earn adequate scores from observations. Specifically, the principal stated that, due to TDES scores, she placed one teacher on an improvement plan this school year.
- Although the principal allocates resources to school operations, the procedures that ensure a safe learning environment are not implemented with fidelity.** The principal and teachers reported that the school currently lacks numerous forms of technology, including computers in classrooms, computer labs, computer software, tablets, SmartBoards, and document cameras. The principal explained (and review of the student-based budgeting plan confirmed) that she purchased two sets of 30 iPads in order to reduce the technology deficit at the school. The principal also stated that she allocated funds for PD on how to use the iPads in instructional contexts. In addition, the principal, teachers, and students reported (and review of the staff roster verified) that the school employs a full-time school safety officer. However, students stated (and the 2014 Conditions for Learning survey results confirmed) that they do not feel safe at school. Students explained that staff do not respond

in a timely manner to physical and verbal altercations. Students perceive that the school provides inadequate supervision during lunch and recess, even though they are supervised by staff. Further, site visit team members observed that the school does not enforce visitor check-in procedures. Specifically, site visit team members were buzzed in to the building on the first floor. Yet, the main office is located on the second floor. Site visit team members directed themselves to the office but were not asked to produce identification, sign-in, or wear visitor badges. Moreover, site visit team members observed that the school possesses metal detectors, but noted they were not in use.

**Prioritization Process**

The site visit team met with the McKinley 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 Students’ Learning Supports. The site visit team also noted the following areas for growth: Supportive Classroom Culture, Purposeful Teaching, Assessment and Adjustment, Students’ Learning Culture, Educators’ Learning Supports, Educators’ Learning Culture, Instructional Leadership, and Organizational Leadership.

The group identified classroom interactions and organization that ensure a supportive, highly structured learning climate 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: Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by all students.

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

**Goal: Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by all students in 50% of classrooms by the close of first quarter.**

**Success Measure: Fifty-percent of students will demonstrate understanding of behavioral expectations through end-of-quarter surveys by all grades, data points (e.g., number of referrals tracked by teachers), and unannounced walkthroughs.**

Actions	Target Dates	Champions
Establish 2015-2016 Climate Committee. Charge committee with the task of researching effective, researched-based classroom management plans.	April 28, 2015	Teacher representatives
Messaging to staff.	April 28, 2015	Principal, Teacher representatives
Schedule time for committee to meet.	May 5, 2015 May 13, 2015 May 20, 2015	Principal
Climate Committee presents three plans to the staff and solicits feedback. Committee selects plan based on feedback.	May 26-27, 2015	Principal
Administration will work with the Climate Committee to establish guidelines for the plan (e.g., research-based, simple, developmentally appropriate).	Ongoing	Principal
Celebrate the successes.	October 2015	Principal
Develop surveys for students.	October 2015	Climate Committee

## Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members

---

The SQR to McKinley Elementary School was conducted on April 8-10, 2015 by a team of educators from the Cleveland Metropolitan School District and SchoolWorks, LLC.

<b>Robin Hull</b>	Team Leader	SchoolWorks, LLC
<b>Kathryn Cobb</b>	Team Writer	SchoolWorks, LLC
<b>Marinise Harris</b>	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District