

SchoolWorks School Quality Review Report

Scranton Elementary 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	5
Domain 3: Educators’ Opportunities to Learn	7
Domain 4: Leadership	9
Prioritization Process	11
Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members	12

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, and 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 team's ratings for key questions within 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 additional document reviews, classroom visits and interviews with key school stakeholders. After collecting evidence, the team meets to confirm, refute and modify its hypotheses about school performance. The site visit team uses evidence collected through these events to determine ratings in relation to the protocol's criteria and indicators. The outcome of the action planning process is a prioritized plan of next steps, including strategies, resources and timelines to accomplish goals. This report presents the ratings, evidence, and action plan developed on site for the school.

Domains and Key Questions

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

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

Domain 1: Instruction	
1. <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 2: Targeted 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 1: Intensive 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 2: Targeted support Required
9. <i>The principal effectively orchestrates the school's operations.</i>	Level 3: Established

Domain 1: Instruction

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

**Level 2:
Targeted support Required**

- **Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by students.** In 83% of lessons observed (n=18), behavioral expectations were clear and understood by students. In nearly all lessons observed, students behaved appropriately and followed either spoken or implicit expectations or directions given by the teachers. Additionally, across focus groups, leadership and teachers reported that the school has some consistent school rules, such as wearing uniforms and no gum-chewing. They also reported that teachers have autonomy to create their own behavior management systems in their classrooms that work well for their particular group of students. This was observed in multiple classrooms. Teachers had various behavioral systems posted, such as stoplights, anonymous student cards with color codes assigned based upon behavior, and class dojos. Students were aware of these systems and were able to self-regulate in some classes. For example, in one lesson observed, the student informed his/her teacher that he/she did not complete the homework, so his/her card needed to be moved to yellow. In another lesson observed, a student was assigned to the Smart Board to allocate class dojos to students who behaved appropriately. Finally, school leadership reported that many students are well behaved; however, leadership also noted (and the site visit team observed) that some teachers would benefit from some classroom management professional development.
- **Classroom interactions provide limited opportunities for cooperative and/or peer learning.** In 22% of lessons observed, students were provided with opportunities to work cooperatively with their peers and participate in peer learning. In one lesson, for example, a teacher was working with a small group of students and realized one student was struggling with the content. The teacher noted that another student was mastering the content and turned to that student and stated, “Professor X, your colleague is struggling with this and you seem to understand it very well. Can you please help him with this?” In the remaining classrooms, however, opportunities to work cooperatively and build on each other’s knowledge were not evident. For example, in one lesson, a teacher provided students with a worksheet and reminded them that they were working independently and that the assignment was not a group project. Overall, the site visit team observed few opportunities in which students engaged in discussion with each other around the content. In general, students were observed working independently at their desks on learning activities, many of which included worksheets – despite there being multiple adults in each classroom who could form small groups to allow for cooperative learning. Students confirmed that there are limited opportunities for peer learning and stated that they usually sit at their desks and complete worksheets.

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

**Level 1:
Intensive support
Required**

- **Few teachers provide students with clear learning goals and focused, aligned instruction.** In 28% of lessons observed, teachers either posted or communicated clear learning goals to students with aligned instruction and lesson activities. In one lesson, for example, the objective, “I can determine the geometric nature of a given triangle based on angle measurement,” was posted; half-way through the lesson, the teacher stopped and asked students what the objective was; students responded by putting the objective in their own language. However, in the remaining classrooms, lesson objectives were either not posted or were not aligned to the learning activity. For example, in one lesson observed, I can... statements were posted around the classroom, but none of the statements corresponded with the learning task students were completing. In another lesson observed, no lesson objective or I can... statement was posted, and the lesson goal was to reflect on things that “bug me.” Students, however, were participating in an activity that involved cutting and pasting, instead of reflecting. Overall, many lessons did not include lesson objectives or I can... statements at the beginning of the lesson and objectives were

not referenced or reinforced throughout the learning process, despite leadership and the Academic Achievement Plan indicating a focus on I can... statements.

- **Instruction rarely requires all students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills.** In 11% of lessons observed, instruction required all students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills. In the majority of lessons, students participated in low-level activities that involved recall of knowledge and comprehension, and did not provide students with opportunities to apply new knowledge or ask meaningful questions related to the lesson’s objective. In one lesson, for example, students completed a worksheet that contained facts about three different categories; despite the worksheet including different categories, students were not asked to compare and contrast the information in the different categories and, instead, were asked low-level questions. In other observed classrooms, teachers posed questions, but the questions were often in relation to the procedures of the assignment instead of asking students to explain their thinking. Overall, the site visit team observed the use of a large number of worksheets that were low level and did not require students to develop higher-order thinking skills.

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 2: Targeted support Required
--	---

- **Assessment strategies reveal students’ thinking in some classrooms.** In 50% of lessons observed, teachers employed assessment strategies to reveal students’ thinking. For example, in one lesson, the teacher employed cold call to check whether the students knew the sound a letter made. In another lesson observed, the teacher was beginning to read a story to the class; the teacher showed the students a picture and asked students to predict what the book would be about, based on the image. In another lesson observed, students were given a task on cell reproduction; the teacher posed questions to assess their thinking and provided ample time for students to work on the problem and then explain their thinking. The teacher continued to assess and push until all students understood. In the other 50% of classrooms, teachers did not assess students’ thinking. Instead, teachers circulated or used questioning to determine if students understood the procedures for the learning task or the assignment. For example, students were asked, “Did you understand the process? No? Let me help you do the process.” In many classrooms, assessments were procedural as opposed to content-based, which did not provide teachers with information regarding students’ thinking.
- **The use of assessment results to make adjustments to instruction or provide feedback to students throughout the learning process is limited.** In 17% of lessons observed, teachers used assessment results to make adjustments to instruction; in 39% of lessons observed, teachers used the results to provide feedback throughout the lesson. For example, in one lesson observed, the teacher collected a quiz from students; the teacher quickly looked at the results and identified that more work was needed; many students did not appear to understand the concept/content. The teacher then made a connection to the previous lesson and altered instruction as a result of the assessment. In another lesson observed, students were independently writing paragraphs; the teacher was purposefully circulating; after providing the same feedback to multiple students, the teacher called for the class’s attention and redirected students to the rubric posted on the board and again reviewed the components of a paragraph with students. In the remaining classrooms, however, assessments were not used purposefully to adjust instruction or provide feedback. For example, in one lesson observed, students were asked to complete a worksheet; however, the majority of students did not complete the worksheet until the teacher went over the answers with the class. The teacher did not utilize the activity to adjust instruction. despite the fact that many students had not filled in the answers. In another lesson, a student had completed his/her work early and was asking for a more challenging assignment; the student asked, “Can we do grade X [his/her grade] work?” to which the teacher responded, “Not now.” The teacher did not adjust content based on the student response.

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 3:
Established**

- **The school has a process for implementing academic and/or behavioral interventions and supports for special education, English language learner (ELL) students, and struggling students.** According to leadership and teachers, the school has a student support team (SST) that is used to identify students in need of additional support. Student support staff reported that the SST meets every Wednesday at 10:30 a.m. and includes the principal, psychologist, intervention specialist, and a teacher. Support staff further reported that the SST plans to meet before or after school next year in an effort to involve more teachers/individuals in the process. Teachers, leadership, and support staff reported that students are referred to the SST and the referral requires six weeks of interventions, progress monitoring, and documentation. After the six weeks, the SST determines if more/different interventions are needed. Teachers reported that the process is tedious and time-consuming. In addition to the SST, teachers and leaders reported that the school uses encore teachers (non-core teachers) to provide interventions and tutoring to students who are struggling. Teachers reported (and leadership confirmed) that these staff members pulled students four times per week for the first half of the year and provided supports to the lowest-performing students. Currently, the classroom teacher provides interventions to the lowest performing, and students are pulled approximately once per week by the encore teachers. Further, according to staff members and leadership, the school employs four ELL bilingual aides; there is one per grade band. Leadership and support staff reported that students are identified based on their Lau code and then support staff collaborate with the classroom teachers at the beginning of the year to identify the ELL bilingual aides' schedules. Finally, in addition to academic interventions, teachers, leadership, and students reported that the school has a planning center for behavioral interventions. Teachers reported that the planning center is effective and students return to class with altered behaviors. Students, as well, spoke positively of the planning center.
- **The school provides opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults.** In focus groups, students reported that the school provides ample opportunities for students to get to know their classmates and adults in the building through activities such as basketball, dance, and field trips. A review of documentation provided by the school leader confirmed that the school provides many activities for students, including the We Run This City Marathon Program, boys' basketball, girls' cheerleading, Girl Scouts, Student Council, and more. This documentation also indicated a number of field experiences provided for students, such as the Rock 'N Roll Hall of Fame, Great Lakes Science Center, Aquarium, in addition to many others. Student support staff reported (and the principal confirmed) that after-school activities and clubs were brought to the school by the school leader. Student support staff also indicated that the principal works to form positive relationships with students and that he plays with students at recess; students noted that they see the principal "all the time" and that the principal knew the name of every student in the school the first day. Teachers confirmed that the principal does not just know students' names, but also knows who is struggling. Further, teachers reported that the school's student council is responsible for onboarding new classmates. For example, teachers shared that on a recent field trip, some students noticed that new students were sitting alone and went over to speak with them. Teachers reported that students help each other and support new students. Finally, according to the Conditions for Learning Survey, 95% of students in grades 5-8 and 90% of students in grades 2-4 reported that the level of student support was adequate or excellent; this area measures how much students feel listened to, cared about, and helped by teachers and other adults in the school.

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

**Level 2:
Targeted support
Required**

- **High expectations for academic learning are not commonly held throughout the school.** Teachers and support staff reported that the principal has high expectations for academic learning and understands what students need to achieve academically. Teachers indicated that leadership communicates through shout-outs what he believes is important for teachers to deliver to students. Leadership confirmed this and indicated that the expectations are set through the things he celebrates and the data he shares. While leadership has high expectations for students' learning and some teachers and staff members echoed these high expectations, many teachers did not express high expectations for students. In multiple focus groups, teachers blamed students' home lives, language, or living situations for why their students cannot read or are not performing well. Teachers also reported that the curricular resources – in particular, Springboard – are too challenging for their students. Students, however, reported that they did not feel challenged in the majority of their classes. Leadership confirmed that not all teachers have high expectations for student learning. Furthermore, when asked about writing products in relation to high expectations (leadership and stakeholders all reported a focus on writing this year), students reported low-level assignments despite their grade level. For example, eighth grade students reported that they are asked to write at least two-to-three paragraph book reports. Leadership confirmed that expectations for writing varied across the school and noted that some of the younger grade teachers hold higher expectations for writing products than the higher grade teachers.
- **The school provides a safe environment to support students' learning.** In focus groups, students reported feeling both physically and emotionally safe at the school. Students indicated that when there is bullying, for example, they go to the teacher and the teacher immediately addresses the issue. Parents also reported that their students are safe while at school. Further, leadership, teachers, and parents reported that the school has a peer mediation program; leadership noted that approximately 10 students participate and this occurs during the lunch period. Peer mediation allows students to bring issues/concerns to their classmates and have peers mediate the situation. Leadership and teachers also reported that the planning center teacher conducts mediation as well. As noted earlier, students spoke positively of the planning center and the teacher who runs the center, as did teachers and leadership. Finally, the site visit team observed a safe school. For example, staff were positioned at the door welcoming students; staff were also observed walking students to the next class. Overall, the environment was safe and inviting.

Domain 3: Educators' Opportunities to Learn

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

**Level 1:
Intensive support
Required**

- **Professional development (PD) is not designed to address school improvement goals.** Across focus groups, stakeholders reported a goal and focus on writing. Leadership reported (and teachers confirmed) that some PD has been conducted on writing; however, leadership noted that the PD has not necessarily been aligned to the school goals and or focus. While teachers reported that PD occurs on Wednesday afternoons for 100 minutes, teachers also noted (and leadership confirmed) that it occurred more regularly at the beginning of the year and that PD has not been as frequent lately. When asked about the provided PD, teachers described a variety of sessions, including the Teacher Development and Evaluation System (TDES), student learning objectives (SLO), CPR training, writing in *Journeys*, and more. Teachers consistently reported that the most valuable PD was CPR. Teachers also reported that many of the Wednesday PD sessions were spent on business items, such as awards ceremonies, field trips, and graduation, as opposed to sessions designed to improve their instructional practice.
- **Opportunities for educators to collaborate exist; however, few educators use this time to learn about effective instruction and student progress.** Leadership and teachers reported that teachers are provided with 200 minutes of professional time each week. As indicated earlier, 100 of those minutes are spent after school on Wednesdays, during which time teachers participate in various PD sessions and team planning. Leadership and teachers further indicated that teachers are required to come before or after school on Tuesdays and Thursdays (50 minutes each day) for the remaining 100 minutes. Leadership indicated that these 100 minutes are not monitored; teachers confirmed that they have autonomy to use the 100 minutes as they see fit. Some teachers reported collaborating during this time; however, others reported collaborating on the fly. Further, leadership and teachers reported that at the beginning of the school year, part of the 200 minutes was intentionally used for teacher-based teams (TBT), which a review of agendas and schedules confirmed. During this time, teachers and leaders analyzed assessment data and held structured conversations about teaching and learning. However, both leadership and teachers reported that TBTs were abandoned not long into the school year after teachers and the Union grieved them. Overall, while the school has some structures that could allow for collaboration, it is not intentionally using the time to provide meaningful opportunities for collaboration.

7. The school's culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.

**Level 1:
Intensive support
Required**

- **Not all educators convey shared commitments and mutual responsibility.** In focus groups, educators conveyed differing levels of commitments or beliefs about students. Some teachers, for example, indicated that their expectation for their students is different than the expectations for a suburban school. Others described students' personal or home situations as reasons for why students are not learning and did not convey the belief that learning is their collective responsibility. Leadership confirmed that not all teachers have a shared commitment and feel mutually responsible for the academic performance of students. For example, leadership noted that some teachers will commonly say, "I have the special education kids/ELL students, they can't do that." Leadership explained that approximately half of the staff are committed to the changes that need to take place to move the school forward.
- **The school does not yet reflect a safe and trustworthy professional climate.** In multiple teacher focus groups, teachers expressed high levels of stress and reported a lack of feeling safe emotionally and professionally. Teachers attributed this to TDES and indicated that they believe TDES is used to target teachers. Some teachers

also reported being unwilling to take instructional risks for fear of repercussion. For example, teachers indicated that they will only follow the curricular resources as prescribed and will not veer from the resources and use professional judgment to teach in different ways. There were, however, some teachers and support staff members who indicated that they trust the school leader and feel safe emotionally and professionally at the school.

Domain 4: Leadership

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

**Level 2:
Targeted support
Required**

- **While the principal has developed goals for school improvement, he has not articulated a clear vision to ensure continuous improvement.** According to school leadership and teachers in multiple focus groups, school leadership has created and shared goals with school staff. Across stakeholder groups, the shared goal of reading and writing was reported and if teachers were unable to state the goals specifically, teachers reported that the goals were posted in the newsletters; a review of the principal's weekly updates confirmed this. A review of the school's Academic Achievement Plan (AAP) also confirmed that improving reading and writing instruction in all grades were two of the school's primary goals. In order to reach the goals, leadership and teachers reported that all teachers teach writing despite their grade level or content area. While goals have been developed, when asked about the school's vision, stakeholders expressed varying visions. For example, leadership reported a broad vision of moving students forward academically, socially/emotionally, preparing students for the real world, and taking ownership for their learning. Teachers, on the other hand, reported a vision of having students be on track for reading; other teachers reported a vision that students become life-long learners and well-educated citizens. Overall, a common vision for school improvement was not stated across stakeholder groups.
- **School leaders are beginning to encourage conditions that support a school-wide data culture.** A review of the school's newsletters revealed that the principal shares data on a regular basis with parents and students. For example, the February newsletter to parents celebrated the top 10 First in Math students and those students with perfect attendance. School leadership also reported, and teachers confirmed, that the principal shares data with staff on a regular basis in his weekly updates. For example, the February 10, 2014 newsletter highlighted student attendance, staff attendance, and Accelerated Reader results. Shout-outs in the weekly newsletters also acknowledged staff members who conducted or were prepared for various assessments the school administered. While school leadership works to emphasize data and results, teachers reported that the school administers too many assessments. They also reported that the assessments they find most useful are their own assessments; however, according to teachers and leadership, these assessments are not monitored for validity. Further, multiple teachers reported that the school used to administer the district's benchmark assessments and from those assessments, they were able to conduct item analyses. The district, however, no longer administers those assessments and, instead, administers the Northwest Evaluation Association's Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP). Both leadership and teachers indicated that item analysis is not available through NWEA MAP. Additionally, teachers indicated that the new assessment results, particularly the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), will not be available until next school year. Finally, as noted previously, school leadership began the school year using TBTs as an opportunity to analyze data and create a school-wide data culture; however, TBTs disbanded and opportunities to discuss data on a regular basis are no longer provided.

9. The principal effectively orchestrates the school's operations.

**Level 3:
Established**

- **The principal ensures the evaluation of all staff, acknowledges the accomplishments of teachers, and has a focus on recruiting talent, as well as working within the system to dismiss those who do not meet standards.** Both leadership and teachers reported that the principal uses the district's TDES to evaluate teachers; they indicated that the process requires five touches throughout the school year. The principal indicated (and the site visit team observed) that the touches are tracked on the wall of the principal's office. Further, leadership reported (and teachers confirmed) that the principal works to acknowledge the accomplishments of teachers; teachers reported that they or their colleagues have received shout-outs in the weekly newsletters. A review of the weekly newsletters to staff corroborated that shout-outs occur regularly. Additionally, leadership reported that in order

to recruit talent, the school has been intentional about finding and identifying candidates who are the right fit. For example, leadership indicated that the school hosted a fair in an effort to not only interview candidates, but also allow candidates an opportunity to interview and see the school. Leadership reported that he has already identified some new hires for next school year. He further reported that he has worked within the system to dismiss those who do not meet standards. More specifically, leadership reported a focus on trying to get the right people on board to do the work that needs to be done. Leadership noted that, this year, three individuals will not be returning based on their choice; also, one is a non-reappointment.

- **The principal engages parents and community members in the educational process and creates an environment in which community resources support learning.** Leadership reported that the school offers multiple events and opportunities for parents to become involved in the school. For example, leadership noted (and multiple stakeholders confirmed) that the school recently held a wax museum to which parents were invited. Nearly all stakeholders referenced (and the site visit team observed) the upcoming international day held on Friday, May 15, where parents were also invited to attend. A review of the Title I Parent Involvement Action/Activity Plan binder revealed that parents are fairly active in the school. For example, a review of sign-in sheets indicated that more than 300 parents/guardians attended the open house/annual Title I meeting. Leadership also reported (and a review of documents confirmed) that the school hosts Donuts for Dads and Muffins for Moms. Parents reported that the school actively communicates with them in both English and Spanish through both written and oral means. They described various school events such as international day, awards ceremonies, parent/teacher conferences, open house, the Christmas program, and more. They also reported that the school always uses translators at school events. In addition to actively engaging parents, school leadership indicated that the school has multiple partnerships with community organizations. For example, leadership indicated that they have a partnership with Nestle that provides financial support for the YMCA camp and food for local events; in addition, Nestle is invited to school events and to judge the science fair. Leadership further reported that they have a partnership with Pilgrim Church that donates supplies and provides food for the staff appreciation celebration. Other reported partnerships include relationships with City Life, Horizon, and St. Ignatius Church. A review of school documents confirmed these partnerships and many more.

Prioritization Process

The site visit team met with the Scranton 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, students' learning culture, and organizational leadership. The site visit team also noted the following areas for growth: purposeful teaching, assessment and adjustment, and educators' learning supports.

The group identified educator's learning supports 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: Professional development is not designed to address school improvement goals.

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

Goal: Professional development is designed to address one school improvement goal.

Success Measure: By November 1, 2015, 80% of the teachers surveyed indicate deeper knowledge of the Response to Intervention (RtI) process as measured by pre-/post-test.

Actions	Target Dates	Champions
Finalize focus, design, and give Response to Intervention (RtI) Survey	Design by 5/20/15 Give by 5/26/15	Building leadership team and intervention specialists
Schedule planning meeting for fall and figure out resources for PD	Schedule by 5/15/15 Resources by 6/23/15	Building leadership team
Assign when and what to do with professional development	6/24/15	Building leadership team
Deliver RtI informational professional development; explore compensation	End of October	Building leadership team/staff
Design post-test RtI survey; measure impact of focus of PD	Design by 5/20/15 Measure by 11/1/15	Building leadership team

Appendix A: Site Visit Team Members

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

Robin Coyne-Hull	Team Leader	SchoolWorks, LLC
Sarah Rapa	Team Writer	SchoolWorks, LLC
Matthew Linick	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District