PSC 4.0 Evaluation Rubric
Superintendent's Review Panel

| Section of Proposal | Characteristics of an Exemplary Response | Comments
What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness? | Follow Up Questions |
|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Vision and Instructional Philosophy** | The vision statement communicates the school's fundamental beliefs about student learning and high expectations/rigorous standards for both students and adults. The vision statement and explanation of the vision provides a clear statement of values that will lead to the success of the school's future graduates. The key priorities of the school are meaningful, measurable, ambitious yet attainable, and appropriate for the target student population, as are the instructional strategies. | **Strengths of the Plan:**
• The vision for students succeeding as collaborators, communicators, and critical thinkers is powerful.
• The plan acknowledges that it must continue to prioritize the needs of students in its decision-making.
• The narrative is clear, coherent and embraces the adoption of the Common Core State Standards within the "Academic Method."
• The vision seems to be a continuation of the currently existing successful magnet school. The success of the magnet school forms the justification of an independent school.
• The vision has a very academic focus.
• Faculty agreeing to take on additional responsibilities beyond the school day is commendable.

Concerns/Areas of Weakness:
• There is a concern that the tone of the vision, as written, is not balanced and discounts creativity.
• The vision does not address how school life and student growth will resonate in the community.
• The proposal doesn't seem to expand the opportunities for students who would benefit from the rigor found in this type of program.
• Rather than offer a different school concept, the plan seems to expand on the status quo.
• The balance between college-readiness and career-preparedness isn't clear.
• Project-Based Learning needs to be more fully defined.
• The "turn-around" aspect of this plan isn't readily apparent.
• Other than "seceding" from the school at-large to assume control over budget, staffing, etc., the rationale for becoming a stand-alone school isn't strong.
• The program is high performing under the current structure; as such, the request for waivers seems unwarranted.
• It appears that the design team is embracing a pilot model | • How does what you are proposing expand the opportunities for students who would benefit from the rigor of this type of program?

• How do you seek to recruit a wide range of students into your program?

• How are you preparing students for both college-readiness and career-preparedness? How are the two integrated?

• How do you seek to expand the access to include students that could benefit from the program who may not necessarily be college-ready?

• If the school is currently successful in its current configuration, why move to a turnaround model?

• Is the school specifically targeting students who haven't had a strong academic track record in the past?

• What current need is there for intervention and how is that determined given that most students are passing the CAHSEE on the first try?

• Given the current performance, is collaboration really a problem? |

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
		although it isn't stated explicitly. • The vision is very strong and sound, but the connection between the priorities identified and the needs are missing. • It appears as if there is no agreement as to how teachers will work together. • There is a concern among the reviewers that the program, as described, does not seek to serve all students. It reads as if the program seeks to "cream" only the best students. • The plan, as drafted, seems more like an expansion of the college-prep program. • The statement asking for more control over staffing seems somewhat disconnected.	
B. School Data Profile/ Analysis	A wide range of data is used to conduct a thorough, in-depth analysis—at a minimum the review must discuss (a) areas of strengths and concerns; (b) areas of improvement over recent years; (c) both positive and negative trends over the past few years; and (d) underlying root causes of persistent trends. The data analysis conveys a highly complex and profound understanding of the school community and whole student, including physical, emotional, social, and academic needs. The application focuses in on three to five critical issues that are highly relevant to the school and will have far-reaching impacts when improved upon. The issues identified cover instructional, behavioral, and operational needs, rather than focusing solely on one area.	**Strengths of the Plan:** • The magnet school is to be commended for all the success it has experienced. • Evidence shows that current magnet students are very involved in after school activities. • Data show effective implementation of DARTS program. • Graduation rates, attendance data, and low suspension rates point to an exemplary and improving academic model. • Data shows that 75% of Magnet students are socio-economically disadvantaged. **Concerns/Area of Weakness:** • More than a plan of action for turning around a struggling school, the plan celebrates the many successes found in the current configuration. • Very small representation of El and SpEd students. • No examples of peer-mentoring, social justice, or connections to senior centers, adult school programs, or philanthropic causes existing in the neighborhood are evident. • More detail needs to be provided as it pertains to parental involvement. • A more in-depth analysis of the CST math performance would help identify the issues preventing growth. • The plan celebrates the successes of the school but also paints the designers as a handful of disgruntled teachers who want to leave.	• If the data shows that the current school's performance has been successful (increase in ELA, social sciences) why is there a need to secede from the larger school? • How does the team propose to reach out to those struggling students and families not fitting into the current mold? • How will they raise the bar on themselves? • How does the team propose to recruit students from the EL and SpEd community?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
		• The plan seeks to continue the forward trajectory of the current model while also removing those teachers who don't want to get on board with what they want to do. • Data supports all of the positive things the school is doing, but it fails to address those students who are not doing well. • There is no evidence that the design team will raise the bar further to push themselves and their students.	
C. School Turnaround	Overall, the strategies, practices, programs, and policies identified in this section are linked to the vision statement of the school and the results of the team's data analysis—it is clear that when the strategies are fully, effectively implemented, the priority area will be addressed. The plan is clear, concise, and provides evidence that the school will accelerate student achievement fairly quickly, over the next few years. Evidence is provided to show that the strategies for turning around the school culture, into one that promotes the intellectual and social development of all students, are effective as well as realistic given the context of the school. Systems and structures will be established to support the transition to a culture/climate that supports the vision of the school and success of each future graduate. The plan demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the current school community and its stakeholders, including staff, students, parents and community members. This knowledge was used to develop thoughtful, tailored strategies to share, communicate and generate interest and create excitement for the school turnaround plan. The plan recognizes the need for a differentiated approach in order to fully engage each of the various stakeholder groups	**Strengths of the Plan:** • A strong case is made for the lack of resources and the limiting influence that has had on the school. • The program has done well despite the current budgetary crisis. • This section is articulate, specific, and comprehensive in targeting effective areas of need to maximize academic input. • There is evidence of systemic rigor. • Research-based instructional models are clearly defined. • The plan reflects very strong instructional practices; teachers appear to truly believe in what they do. • There is clear appreciation of, and clearly defined objectives, to develop interdisciplinary curricula. **Concerns/Areas of Weakness:** • The challenges identified are not strong enough. • The loss of staff positions appear to be the impetus for proposing this plan; also, the need for a principal. • The designers do not appear to have any real knowledge of the responsibilities inherent in gaining various autonomies, including control of their budget. • More thought should be given to the proposed model of growth and expansion. • If the issues are around staffing support for students and families, maybe more thought should be given on developing teacher leadership. • Consideration should be given to expanding targeted outreach for students who would not ordinarily choose this program. • Parents don't have access to data that reflects just the magnet school; the design team should disaggregate the data by location code. • There is a need for linked professional development.	• Where is the turnaround in the plan? How is this plan a turnaround? • What is the plan for sustaining a level of support over the long haul? • How will the school recruit students to align with the needs of their program? • How will the leadership capacity of teachers be developed and sustained?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
D. Implementa-tion	The benchmarks for determining progress are clearly articulated and will provide an accurate measure of whether or not the strategies, practices, programs, policies are having the intended impact. The timeline and process for measuring progress will be frequent and regular, enough to ensure that the team can spot trouble areas immediately and make mid-course corrections as necessary. There is a clear understanding of the realistic challenges that the school may face in turning around the school. The ideas for counteracting these challenges are thoughtful, applicable, creative, and within reason.	**Strengths of the Plan:** • The high-leverage areas of focus have been appropriately identified. **Concerns/Areas of Weakness:** • The levers for maintaining strong achievement: Professional Development, a shared commitment on the part of staff and being a collaborative partner with other schools who will be on the campus need to be addressed. • There is a need to connect with the larger community. • There is only a very brief description of how parents will be involved in the process; this speaks to a continuation of an existing situation on the campus. • It appears that the design team knows what needs to be done; the question is, how will they do this with everyone? • In terms of true implementation, the design team is going to face a lot of challenges because they are going to have to re-prioritize. • The concept of teacher-developed assessments is strong and needs to be more fully developed; this should be done before any decision is made relative to the approval of their plan. • It appears that a very narrow group of people worked on this proposal. • There needs to be an organic kind of implementation team besides the people who worked on the plan. • There are other people's voices that are not being heard and who have been successful. • Very little description is given on how the school will coexist with the other models on the campus.	• What is the balance in the implementation of your phase-in plan to move away from district-based assessments to the common core? • What is your vision for working with the other schools at the site – student interactions, faculty and staff interactions, etc.? • What formal and informal communications and interactions do you anticipate might create a problem on the campus? • What opportunities for collaboration do you see to potentially support the larger learning community at Franklin? • What is the plan for having existing teachers become part of the leadership team to successfully move this plan forward? • What is the composition of the implementation team? • How will it be organized? • How will you engage those teachers who were not part of the design team? • What organic implementation structures will be in place to involve everyone in working through the details of the plan?
E. Alternative Governance Models & Autonomies	The plan presents a clear rationale for the chosen alternative governance model as well as any requested autonomies and how these elements fully support the school's vision and instructional philosophy. A thorough explanation is provided for how the selected model will allow for high levels of academic achievement among the target population of students. Plan provides a thoughtful, comprehensive rationale for why each requested autonomy is necessary to support student achievement at the school. The plan	No change.	

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	explains what steps the school will take to ensure that a culture of shared leadership and decision-making focused on high student performance is in place to effectively implement the governance model and requested autonomies. Where applicable, evidence of staff input from UTLA members (e.g., petition, vote tally) is attached to the plan. *Governing School Council (pilot schools only):* Composition of the Governing School Council is in compliance with state regulations. Membership selection process is fair, equitable and also in compliance with state regulations. Roles and responsibilities of governing council is clearly articulated and broader than School Leadership Council. A draft of the Elect to Work agreement is attached. *NOTE: All pilot school applications will also be reviewed by the Pilot School Steering Committee.*		
F. School Planning Team	Members of the school planning team were identified by a fair, equitable, transparent process; the team is diverse and representative of the entire school community, including faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members. All members, including the leader, fully participated and actively contributed to the plan development/writing process. Member contribution is noticeable and extended beyond those typically attributed to them (e.g., parents contributed in more ways than in discussions solely related to parent engagement). Parents and students were specifically engaged as plan writing/developing members and as leaders in the process. The process of developing the plan included equitable delegation of work and responsibilities, a comprehensive communication strategy to ensure all members are fully informed of decisions, and a conscious effort to regularly update the school's community-at-large (beyond the members of the school planning team).	<u>Strengths:</u> None noted. <u>Concerns/Areas of Weakness:</u> • Although some representation of the various stakeholder groups is apparent, It doesn't appear as if the team is representative of the entire school community. • The use of the word "majority" is a concern in the absence of hard numbers.	• How representative of the various factions of the faculty is this applicant team? • How were other stakeholder groups involved in the planning phase? • How engaged is this community with the school? • What is your plan for engaging and educating parents about your program? • How are you reaching out to and engaging those parents who are not typically active in the daily life of the school? • What new concerns and challenges do you anticipate now that you are going to be a stand-alone school as it relates to parent engagement and education?

PSC School: <u>Franklin High School</u>   Planning Team Name: <u>Franklin Magnet</u>

School Visits
Did your Review Team conduct a School Visit? (circle one) YES / **<u>NO</u>**

Planning Team Interviews
Did your Review Team conduct a Planning Team Interview? (circle one)   YES / **<u>NO</u>**

Final Recommendation to the Superintendent

<u>**Overall Rating:**</u> (circle one)   Beginning   **Developing**   Well-Developed   Exemplary

<u>**Overall Comments:**</u>
The magnet school wrote a plan to expand upon their existing program and provided good evidence of the current successes their students have experienced. They have a solid academic model and a powerful vision with an academic focus. The instructional models identified are clearly defined and the plan offers strong instructional practices, including an interdisciplinary curriculum. The plan did not, however, provide a clear picture of how their expanded program would push their limits nor did it clearly articulate how all students in the community would benefit from their program. There was a question as to whether the school would in fact serve all students, or only those already prepared for college or those who would ordinarily select their program. This was of notable concern to the reviewers as this population seemed to have been forgotten in their plan. It was also noted that support for English Learners and Special Education students is not apparent in the plan; intervention and remediation programs for those students who are not achieving are also not addressed. Details regarding parent and community engagement were lacking as well.

Another major concern shared by the reviewers is that it appears the impetus for writing this plan is the loss of staff positions, the need for a principal, and the desire to continue the current programming as-is, without a deeper look at what more could be done to push success and achievement for all students within the Franklin HS community. Overall, the reviewers saw some promise in the plan, but felt the team may not fully understand where they need to go. It may be that the team can be coached into refining this plan into one that can be implemented, but the concern remains that it is unclear whether the team is truly addressing a need to improve the achievement of all students.