SchoolWorks
School Quality Review
Report

SchoolWorks®
Assess. Plan. Achieve.

CLEVELAND
METROPOLITAN
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Table of Contents

About the SchoolWorks School Quality Review Process

The Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD) envisions 21st Century Schools of Choice in which students will be challenged with a rigorous curriculum that considers the individual learning styles, program preferences, and academic capabilities of each student, while engaging the highest quality professional educators, administrators, and support staff available. As part of Cleveland's Plan for Transforming Schools, CMSD has adopted a portfolio district strategy that includes: growing the number of high quality district and charter schools, and closing or replacing failing schools; focusing the district's central office on its role in school support and governance, while transferring authority and resources to schools; investing and phasing in high leverage school reforms across all levels; and increased accountability for all schools in the district through the creation of the Cleveland Transformation Alliance (CTA). CMSD has partnered with stakeholders to create a school performance framework that will be used to provide a comprehensive assessment of the quality of each school in the district. The comprehensive assessment will be an evidence-based process that includes data and information gathered on academic programs and performance, school climate, finance, operations, governance, and stakeholder satisfaction, among other sources.

CMSD has engaged SchoolWorks as a partner in implementing a school quality review (SQR) process aligned to CMSD initiatives and the school performance framework. The SQRs are used as one component of a comprehensive assessment of the quality of each school in the district; they are used to provide formative feedback to schools. Reviews include an action planning process in which the team and the school work together to identify prioritized areas for improvement.

The SQR protocol and review process provides a third-party perspective on current school quality for all students. The report documents the team's ratings for key questions in each of the four domains identified within the SQR protocol – Instruction, Students' Opportunities to Learn, Educators' Opportunities to Learn, and Leadership. While on site, evidence collection takes place through document reviews, classroom visits, and interviews with key school stakeholders. After collecting evidence, the team meets to confirm, refute, and modify its hypotheses about school performance. The site visit team uses evidence collected through these events to determine ratings in relation to the protocol's criteria and indicators. The outcome of the action planning process is a prioritized plan of next steps, including strategies, resources, and timelines to accomplish goals. This report presents the ratings, evidence, and action plan developed on site for the school.

Domains and Key Questions

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

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

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

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

- **Classroom behavioral expectations are not consistently or clearly communicated, nor are they understood by students.** Teachers and school leaders reported that educators have autonomy to determine behavior management strategies in their own classrooms. Students and teachers stated common practices for the uniform policy, attendance, and transitioning in hallways and shared school spaces. However, few stakeholders mentioned school-wide expectations for classroom behavior. In 50% of observed classes, expectations for behavior were clearly demonstrated by students and enforced by teachers. For example, in the primary grades, a stoplight system was used to track and communicate behavioral expectations; similar strategies were used across classrooms. However, in other classes, students wandered around classrooms, negative behaviors were ignored, and students held side conversations during instruction. Often teachers repeated requests to be quiet or sit down that did not result in improved student behavior. For example, in one class, a student was asked to read in front of the class; as she read aloud, another group of students in the back of the room were talking and laughing. Their behavior was not addressed by the teacher. In another classroom, a teacher and student were working at the board; although the teacher expected students to listen, they were having side conversations, putting their heads down, and facing away from the board; these behaviors were not corrected.

- **The learning environment is not highly structured, and learning time is not maximized through effective planning and guidance.** Multiple stakeholders reported that teachers are not required to create lesson plans. Some teachers reported they rely solely on commercial curriculum and district-mandated programs to plan learning time. In 44% of observed classes, instruction was paced appropriately and there was clear evidence of effective planning. For example, in one class, students were working in groups that had been pre-identified and represented with cards. Each group's card and manipulatives were readily available and tables were set up for small group work. However, in many classes, teachers approached site visit team members to tell them that there was no teaching or learning occurring because there were field trips planned later in the day or because the year was wrapping up. In many classes, there was insufficient planning – there were lengthy transitions, lack of prepared materials, and texts and questions had not been selected ahead of time. In some classes, teachers spent more than 20 minutes giving directions, delivering materials, and reviewing directions for the learning activity. In an upper elementary class, there was a seven-minute transition between a writing activity and lunch line-up in which students collected papers, put away materials, asked the time, and determined a leader for the lunch line. Although only two students were given instructions to do so, more than half of the students in the class left their seats during this transition. In a middle school class, the entire class was cleaning their lockers throughout the observed instructional time.

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

- **Teachers do not consistently provide students with clear learning goals and focused direct instruction.** School leaders reported that there are few common instructional practices in the school, and posting learning objectives is not required. The site visit team observed posted objectives and

clear learning tasks aligned to those targets in 44% of visited classes. For example, in some lower elementary classes, students worked in small groups and were able to state that they were practicing sight words and learning how to read. In another class, the learning objective was not posted, but students were able to describe that they were engaged in a learning activity that was teaching them to tell time. However, in the majority of classes, objectives were not posted and learning targets were not clearly evident during instruction. For example, in an upper elementary class, there was a poster with "I can" statements on a sideboard, but the objective did not match the observed instruction. In this class, when asked what they were learning, a student said "reading poetry," but could not state a goal or objective associated with those poems. In other classes, students were able to express their learning in terms of the questions or content of their worksheet only, but did not know the goal of the lesson's task.

- **Not all students are engaged in learning.** In many elementary classes, students were engaged in learning centers and whole-group activities on the rug; these classes were characterized by clear directions, challenging tasks, and eager transitions. Students were observed using manipulatives, assisting peers with their learning, and building off prior knowledge. Many other classes included students who were disengaged, having side conversations, or putting their heads down on the desk during instruction. For example, in one classroom, seven students were seated in the back of the class working on a poster assignment, but their focus was on coloring and off-topic conversation, rather than cognitively engaging in the learning task. In another class, a student was working independently on a computer-based program; he had the option to select a number to represent the factor and he consistently chose "2." When challenged to use a different number, he indicated that would make problem-solving more difficult and he "…had to think too much."

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

- **In-class assessment strategies are not used to reveal students' thinking about learning goals.** In focus groups, teachers reported that based on their teaching experience, they know when students are mastering material or struggling with concepts. Teachers further reported that they measure student understanding through informal assessments; however, specific examples were not provided. In 22% of observed classes, instruction included strategies for monitoring student progress and diagnosing misunderstandings. When observed in one class, students used multiplication to check division problems while the teacher circulated to assess accuracy before releasing students to work on the same skill in a project-based activity. However, in most observed classes, teachers did not oversee students' learning or use strategies that accurately gauged students' thinking. For example, in one class, a teacher read site words aloud while students pointed to the corresponding word. The teacher did not use visual checks to see that students were correctly identifying words before moving on. In many classes, teachers asked only basic recall questions and did not require students to engage in discussions that would reveal their cognitive processes. For example, in one class, a teacher was engaged in reading with a small group; she paused to ask if they knew the meaning of a certain word and after defining the word, they continued to read aloud without further discussion of the word's significance in the story.

- **Teachers do not provide students with specific, frequent feedback to support their learning.** When students were asked how they know if they are doing well in classes, they reported they could ask

their teacher or check progress reports. Students received feedback to inform their progress in only 11% of observed classes. In some classes, students indicated they were confused or lacked information, but teachers did not clarify misunderstandings. For example, in one lesson, students were using manipulatives to practice representing six o'clock. A student said "I thought six meant 30;" the teacher moved on without addressing the misconception or the distinction between the long and short hand on a clock. In another class, students were asked to compare two pieces of writing. A student read a sentence from a text and identified a literary device being used; the teacher said "Good job" and moved on, although the student's response indicated he did not understand how to compare two texts. In other classes, feedback was vague or failed to inform improvement efforts. For example, in a mathematics class, students were graphing information and explaining the mathematical reasoning behind the data points. Students used their arms to indicate the positive and negative slope, rather than using mathematical language to describe the problem; the teacher did not give feedback or clarify terms.

Domain 2: Students' Opportunities to Lear2: Students' Opportunities to Learn

4. The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.	**Level 2: Targeted support Required**

- **The school does not have an effective process for implementing academic and behavioral interventions and supports for struggling and at-risk students.** Teachers and leaders acknowledged that the school has a student support team (SST) that meets monthly to review student referrals. The team offers teachers strategies to implement interventions and progress monitor. However, school leaders reported that teachers do not effectively gather data on students' progress, so the teachers and SST have no clear evidence of student growth. Teachers reported that due to the lengthy referral process and the SST's heavy caseload, many students do not qualify for support services for up to nine months. Many teachers reported that the school does not have sufficient resources to administer interventions to support diverse learners. Some teachers reported that they use repetition, slower pacing, or other informal strategies such as floating struggling students among other grade-level teachers to provide small group instruction or a break. Leaders acknowledged there are few systems to strategically support struggling students. Teachers are not trained to use early warning indicators such as attendance, progress monitoring, or in-class assessments to systematically determine students' areas of need. According to stakeholders, all students attend a mathematics intervention class that uses the computer-based program, Do the Math, as its primary curricular tool. However, staff reported a lack of clarity about how students are placed in mathematics intervention classes, whether classes are grouped by students' levels, and how curriculum is chosen and implemented to meet students' needs. Teachers stated that students in need of behavioral support are sent to the planning center or to the main office to talk to the principal or assistant principal. Some teachers reported that interventions and consequences for behavior vary greatly and there are few systemic approaches to student discipline.

- **The school provides limited opportunities for students to form positive relationships with peers and adults in the school.** Stakeholders reported that social-emotional learning (SEL) supports are in place and professional development related to SEL has been ongoing throughout the school year. Teachers and leaders identified this focus as one of the school's strengths – a focus over the last two years. The school has adopted the positive alternative thinking strategies (PATHS) program at the lower elementary level. However, there are no clear delivery mechanisms or accountability for SEL outside of PATHS; also, there are no programs at the upper elementary or middle school levels. Leaders reported that the school psychologist is shared across two schools, and the school does not have a full-time social worker or counselor. Stakeholders mentioned that counseling supports required for students' individualized education plans (IEPs) are available, but did not describe personnel devoted to social-emotional supports for all students. Some stakeholders mentioned a relationship with Applewood – an external agency that provides counseling services to students and families. Teachers reported that – due to an hour-long intake process and/or a reluctance to share private family information – some families hesitate to participate in Applewood services. Teachers further reported that Applewood planned to start a boys and girls group, but for unknown reasons the groups had not yet been established. Similarly, students reported (and teachers confirmed) that the school started a mediation and anti-bullying club, and students received training in conflict-resolution. However, because cases were not brought to the club for resolution, the initiative did not continue. Students

also reported the school has a basketball, track, cheer, and drill team available to seventh and eighth grade students; however, elementary students were not eligible to participate in these activities.

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

- **The school does not hold high expectations for academic learning.** School leaders stated that their academic goal was to help students make at least one year of growth, but did not address the need for students to make more than a year of growth in order to bring all students up to grade level. One group of teachers characterized the performance index goal as unattainable. Teachers claimed their goal was to "try to keep kids at grade level," and described much of the district-mandated curriculum as overwhelming; they further stated, "The level is too high for our kids." Instructionally, in upper elementary classes, many students were seen engaging in coloring, cutting, and pasting for extended periods of time. In one class, the teacher said they were writing an essay when students were actually copying the same sentence multiple times from the board to their paper as a consequence for bad behavior. In a focus group, all elementary students rated their work as very easy. Other students further reported that their work is rigorous, but not challenging. When asked for clarification, a student said that you have to put in the effort to get it done, but the work itself is not difficult. Classroom targets focused on quantitative goal setting; for example, many classes displayed Accelerated Reader and First in Math charts on which students tracked the number of words read or points accumulated. However, no class-wide goals were posted and students were not able to describe the connection between the numbers on the charts and their academic growth. Similarly, students reported they had seen their Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) scores, but the numbers were not meaningful to them; they were unable to make any connection to their learning. Stakeholders reported that students have the opportunity to earn honor roll status, but there are no other awards for academic achievement, merit, or goal completion. All stakeholders were able to describe the school's goal to raise attendance, but few were able to make a specific connection between attendance and academic achievement.

- **The school does not provide a consistently safe and clean environment to support students' learning.** All stakeholders reported a lack of consistency in discipline procedures and consequences. Students reported that some teasing and bullying occurs, but there has been an improvement from years past. Teachers and students stated that there are systems to walk students through the halls and to the restroom to supervise and ensure a safe environment. Parents, however, reported unsafe dismissal procedures – specifically, a lack of supervision to ensure that students are accounted for and receive safe passage from the building at the end of the school day. Volunteers reported they have been asked to supervise students, although they were never required to submit a background check. The site visit team observed two security and safety officers who supervise the main entrance and hallways. Based on observations of the start of the day, students are required to pass through metal detectors and undergo a cursory backpack check while entering the school building. Signage indicated all visitors needed to show identification, sign in with security and the main office, and wear a visitor's badge. However, the site visit team observed an unidentified man who came to the building; the security guard asked his purpose, and admitted the visitor without sign-in, identification, or badge. In general, building conditions were poor and classrooms, offices, and hallways had missing tiles, peeling paint, trash collecting in corners, and areas that showed signs of not having been cleaned for some

time. Additionally, the school is not at full capacity and many empty classrooms are unlocked and accessible despite their unsafe conditions, such as stacked furniture. When asked what they would change about their school, all students expressed their desire for it to be repainted, cleaned, and safer.

Domain 3: Educators' Opportunities to Learn

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

- **Professional development (PD) is not yet designed to intentionally address school improvement goals.** Teachers identified some efforts to improve attendance or raise test scores, although few knew the specific success measures or targets. Stakeholders reported that the majority of PD sessions are focused on procedure, rather than content. For example, school leaders and teachers said they received training on the implementation of SEL, NWEA MAP, AimsWeb, and other district-mandated programs, but due to a lack of follow-through on these initiatives, they have not seen a measurable impact on instruction. Although teachers reported they receive updated data and a protocol for data analysis for use in their teacher-based teams (TBTs), they characterized the protocol as confusing and reported they have not received sufficient support to translate student data into instructional changes. Teachers also reported they do not know the school's mission or vision. Although it appears at the top of their school newsletter, it is not actively instituted in the daily practices of the school. Teachers reported they do not generally know how PD time will be spent; it is nearly always listed as "to be determined" on their weekly newsletter. Leaders acknowledged that PD time is not always planned, and it is often used to address gaps in teachers' knowledge or review district-mandated programs. When asked for a PD calendar, the principal produced the district's PD calendar, and referred the site visit team to the instructional support staff for further documentation. Instructional leaders also reported they did not create a PD calendar, but provided the site visit team with a list of the sessions that included trainings on NWEA MAP, AimsWeb, and TBT progress monitoring. The topics were listed according to the date of the PD session, but did not include any details concerning methods for training or monitoring implementation.

- **Professional development, as implemented, is not active, intensive, and sustained.** Stakeholders indicated that PD is focused on distributing information rather than facilitating adult learning. For example, teachers indicated that many PD sessions focused on procedural knowledge for assessments, district-mandated programs and computer-based resources, but did not provide time for teachers to make links to instructional practices. Teacher-based teams are not implemented with fidelity at all grade levels and due to the testing schedule, TBTs met infrequently during the second semester. A review of TBT minutes indicated an adherence to the protocol, although all minutes were from the first semester. Stakeholders also reported that instructional leaders' time is predominantly spent on low-level tasks, such as test coordination and paper work. Although some teachers reported that these leaders have connected them with instructional materials, most stated that limited time is dedicated to modeling instruction or offering feedback. Teachers further reported they have frequent discussions with colleagues about students' progress; however, these conversations generally happen on an informal, ad-hoc basis. Teachers noted that the school dedicates 200 minutes per week to PD through four 50-minute sessions. According to stakeholders, these sessions are devoted to parent contacts, planning, whole staff meetings, and TBTs. Planning time is largely unstructured; most teachers reported they plan individually, grade papers, or prepare class materials during this time. Few teachers reported on the content of their TBTs, but some stated the meetings are intended to be a time to discuss student growth based on data and target skill development. However, most teachers admitted they do not consistently meet or accomplish these goals. The weekly 50-minute whole staff

session is used for various purposes, including faculty meetings, committee meetings, and targeted PD trainings. Most teachers stated that PD expectations are unclear and there is rarely continuous learning or follow-through based on PD initiatives. Teachers reported there are no opportunities to give input on the focus of PD, or feedback on its quality. Some teachers said they sought external PD opportunities, but support from the school was limited.

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

- **Not all educators convey shared commitments and mutual responsibility.** Although some members of the leadership team frame their decisions in terms of student growth, they also indicated that not all teachers put students first. Teachers and leaders stated that many teachers consistently operate within their comfort zone and that moving educators to take risks is an aspiration among select stakeholders. Educators did not convey a shared vision or common values about teaching and learning, and few instructional norms exist across the school. Some teachers conveyed they have seen many programs and initiatives come and go, and as a result, they are no longer invested in these efforts. Some teachers described seeking feedback for improvement, while others stated they prefer to be left alone to teach the way they see fit in their classrooms. Select teachers attributed students' abilities as limited due to unstable home environments, and expressed a desire to return to being a gifted and talented school. Although the majority of teachers reported that they believe all students can learn, they did not hold other teachers accountable for expressing contrary beliefs.

- **While the school staff reflects a friendly rapport, the school does not reflect a safe and trustworthy professional climate focused on student outcomes.** Nearly all stakeholders reported they have collegial relationships with staff members and feel comfortable asking for support in sharing curricular materials, asking for help with individual students, and relying on their teams. The site visit team observed friendly relationships among the staff, including colleagues offering help when needed and acknowledging one another's successes. Staff generally characterized the school's leadership as student-centered, well-intentioned, and caring. However, teacher and leadership teams reported they rarely come together to plan around student outcomes or to target students' needs. Many teachers said the schedule lacks structured time for teachers to collaborate and share their own instructional practices, and this is negatively impacting professional culture. When asked about the purpose of TBT meetings, many educators characterized them as problematic, because other colleagues have students with different skill levels and cannot be expected to compare high- and low-level students. Some teachers reported that rather than working through challenges with colleagues and school leaders, they simply opt to operate in isolation.

Domain 4: Leadership

8. School leaders guide instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.	**Level 1: Intensive support Required**

- **The principal has not created a shared vision and clear goals for the school to ensure continuous progress toward achieving the goals.** Stakeholders reported that the school's vision and the plan for school improvement are unclear. The majority of stakeholders were unaware of the school's mission and had limited understanding of the school's improvement strategies (aside from compliance with district initiatives). When asked what instructional shifts would help them meet their academic and performance index goals, teachers referenced standardized assessments. However, teachers reported they have limited understanding about how to use assessment results to adjust instructional practices and impact student results. A review of documents, including "Wilbur Wright data and goals 2014-2015," as well as posters hung throughout the school, showed goals to improve the school's value-added score by 5-to-10%. However, when asked how the value-added tool would help the school identify sources of positive change, teachers and leaders were unable to describe how value-added tool measured growth. Similarly, although many stakeholders mentioned the attendance goal, few were able to link attendance targets to academic achievement, or discuss the impact of student absence on learning.

- **The principal has not established collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote the learning and achievement of all students.** The principal has taken initial steps to establish a building leadership team (BLT) and TBTs, but stakeholders reported these teams rarely meet, and that meetings are often cancelled and lack focus. Members of these teams reported that expectations, roles, and responsibilities are often unclear. The instructional leaders reported that the school year started very strong and they began early planning for the academic progress plan (APP); however, team members also stated they did not continue the process throughout the academic year and are only now finishing the APP with limited staff input. Multiple stakeholders reported that the principal does not provide clear and timely communication around expectations, opportunities, or academic initiatives. Many stakeholders were unaware of the purpose of the SQR or assigned meeting times for focus groups. Community members reported that the school newsletter is often sent out late and does not include relevant and timely information. BLT members discussed the need for more distributive leadership and further training to increase their team-building capacity. According to teachers, there are opportunities for teacher leadership if teachers are interested, but it is generally the same people who do the work. Teachers reported they are not held accountable for implementing school PD initiatives. Teachers reported feeling safe to voice opinions and concerns and that the school leaders are receptive to that feedback, but do not consistently act on it.

9. The principal effectively orchestrates the school's operations.	**Level 2: Targeted support Required**

- **The principal generally manages school operations in order to support a productive learning environment.** The principal reported (and site visit team observations confirmed) that she greets students daily; there were clear signs of relationships, as well as efforts to keep students accountable to expectations. For example, when one student tried to rush by with his hood on, the principal called

him back and he said he was having a bad day. After a short conversation and some reminders about daily goals, the student removed his hood, made eye contact, and committed to improving his day. Additionally, the principal complies with all district requirements for teacher evaluation through the district's Teacher Development and Evaluation System (TDES), and teachers described a fair and consistent observation process. Also, teachers characterized the principal's informal feedback as positive and helpful; the site visit team observed the principal supporting and solving problems with teachers. However, with regard to materials, teachers reported there was a lack of materials; in particular, some materials are not regularly replenished, such as consumable workbooks, science kits, and textbooks. When asked how resources are managed, stakeholders did not understand the process for creating or accessing the school-based budget or district resources. When asked how programs change over time or adjust for budgetary reasons, teachers stated they were not aware of any programs that were eliminated or changed in response to the school's needs.

- **The principal works to engage parents in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support learning.** According to all stakeholders, the school has made an intentional shift to engage families. The principal identified family participation as a priority and it is a source of pride for the leadership team. Teachers and students also acknowledged an increase in parent participation and were able to provide examples of parent involvement in the math, literacy, and game nights. Teachers also identified family and student engagement as one of the principal's strengths and acknowledged a rise in family participation under her leadership. Leaders reported that a student-parent organization (SPO) has been formed, and that a select group of parents have demonstrated an ongoing commitment to hosting SPO events, increasing family engagement, and collaborating with students and staff. Although the extent of parent involvement was unclear, all stakeholders agreed there has been a marked improvement from years past.

The site visit team met with the Wilbur Wright 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 strengths present in the school. Areas of strength the team discussed included the principal's ability to manage operations, and the leadership team's ability to engage families and leverage parental support to increase academic achievement. The site visit team also noted the following areas for growth: structured learning environment, maximized learning time, student engagement, interventions and supports, high expectations, and intentional professional development.

The group identified school culture 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: High expectations for academic learning.

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

Goal: The school demonstrates high expectations for all students.

Success Measure: Achieve goals aligned with becoming a "B" school.

Actions	Target Dates	Champions
Establish building-wide behavior norms	August 2015	Assistant principal
Provide guidance on high quality lesson plans—specifically lesson plan formats that identify high expectations for learning including: • Rigor and differentiation • Questioning techniques • Higher-order thinking	August 2015	Teacher leader
Look at daily 50-minute blocks for most purposeful use of time	May 2015	Principal and AAP team
Establish BLT time as "set in stone"	May 2015	Teacher leader
Set interim academic goals to get to the big goal of "B"	June 2015	Academic superintendent and principal

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

Kim Wechtenhiser	Team Leader	SchoolWorks, LLC
Amber Leage	Team Writer	SchoolWorks, LLC
Marinise Harris	Team Member	Cleveland Metropolitan School District