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.	<u>Strengths:</u> • The plan emphasizes a vision to educate the whole child. • According to the plan, the school already has set up a Professional Learning Environment (PLE) and is organized into Professional Learning Communities (PLC). • Vision is that students will master academic and social skills and includes collaboration, vertical teaming, and communication. <u>Concerns:</u> • Difficult to visualize the matriculating student from their school. Plan lacks explicit details on how all of this will actually take place. • Concepts were not well-connected, well-developed or tied to the actual plan. • Vision was for student to become a whole person, primarily through self-reflection, but it is unclear how this connection will be attained. It is difficult to visualize how the teachers are going to teach self-reflection and how students would actually learn and use self-reflection in the classroom. • Sounds as though the team believes literacy is the key to achievement but this is only mentioned at the very end, as though it were an afterthought. • In general, it seems there is a misconception of PLCs and what they are—PLCs are supposed to be a set of systems within the school to help everyone commit to achieving the vision. At times, the plan seems to conflate the terms "PLCs" and "SLCs".	
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	<u>Strengths:</u> • Data section provided a thorough analysis and a clear analysis of the trends. It was clear the team had invested time looking at past 5 years to show trends. • Plan showed a strong grasp of the student population. • Several critical issues were identified: algebra, ELA across all subgroups. Plan also point out low scores for ELLs. • Straightforward in identifying poor staff attendance and student attendance/transiency rates as major issues. • Root causes for the critical issues were identified as quality of instruction and lack of vertical articulation, and it does seem that these are probably the main issues for them. <u>Concerns:</u> • Plan states the school has been working in PLEs, which led reviewers to question why the school is not seeing improvement in teacher attendance, student attendance, and classroom instruction. It seems something positive should have happened to change the climate/culture if they were in PLEs. • Algebra, general math, and ELA are the foci, but the plan did not bring expand upon the major problem with attendance—this thread was missing. The reviewers would have expected to see elements of this issue show up in the vision, as well as in their strategies for improvement.	

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	cover instructional, behavioral, and operational needs, rather than focusing solely on one area.	• The plan does not address in any detail the specific "operational, behavioral needs" that the plan references. In fact, at the end of this data section, the plan references behavior needs, but again (similar to parts of the vision section), it seemed it was dropped in as an afterthought to respond to the prompt, without a thoughtful analysis or understanding of what operational or behavioral needs needed to be addressed at the school. The reviewers would have liked to see some data about the operations of their school, which is also important information—especially for this particular school, it seems. • The vision section stated the importance of development of mastery in academic AND social skills, but there was no focus on the social aspect in the data section—if students are not coming to school, they review the data on this and discuss what they are going to do about it. The plan did not look at survey data or dig into information on school culture and student's social needs that would have been very valuable. Instead, the plan went straight to academics and forgot about the other pieces. • School is 27% EL but they do not talk about a full-scale curriculum for this population or addressing their particular needs—this seems like something the school should look at given their size in the population. They will always have a problem with literacy if they don't address this particular population's needs. • The plan states that delivery of instruction is a major root cause for some of the key issues, but no real analysis or data are provided as evidence to show that this is lacking. Similarly, no real data or information are provided to show that vertical articulation is in fact an issue. The reviewers acknowledge that these may truly be the major issues the school should tackle, but would have liked to see more evidence to show that the school conducted a thoughtful, thorough analysis to reach these conclusions.	
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.	<u>Strengths:</u> • Focus on on three specific strategies, two of which are currently used: (1) professional teaching and learning cycle ; (2) questioning techniques based on Socratic Seminar; (3) service learning (new strategy to be implemented beginning August 2013). • Additional strategies noted include PLEs, block scheduling, SDAIE, Project Based Learning (PBL), among others. • Math, Algebra, ELA are identified as the three priority issues. • Plan describes systems and structures, grade level collaboration, vertical teaming, and other positive structures. <u>Concerns:</u> • Although the plan states that two of the three strategies are currently in place, there is no information given about whether or not these strategies are working well. Plan does not indicate whether teachers are implementing the strategies well; nor does it explain whether teachers are coordinating and collaborating well as part in their PLE. • Teachers play a big role in implementation, but the plan does not describe how teachers will be involved in the development of these programs. The described programs require a major paradigm shift, but this has not been addressed. PLEs are the place to discuss instructional focus, but have they actually begun to have these conversations? It seems they would not have the issues they identified if their PLEs were functioning well, so this would have been a good thing to address—it may be that the school needs to work on further developing their PLEs. • If they have a teacher attendance issue, how will they ensure they have good Advisories and high-quality	What are successes so far from the 2 major strategies they have begun implementing? Who gets the training? All teachers? How will teachers be trained for Advisory?

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 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.	service learning programs? These programs could not be effective with substitutes. Furthermore, the plan mentions that teachers will be asked to volunteer their time, but the reviewers question the feasibility of this because of the previously identified staff attendance issue. • The vision talks about supporting the "whole child" and the data clearly showed an absenteeism issue among students and teachers; however specific strategies were not mentioned to address this. In addition, parent involvement is hardly noted in the plan—one would imagine that parents would be an integral part of the strategies. • Plan stated that service learning will improve student knowledge of content areas, but it feels like an assumption because the plan does not thoroughly explain *how* the team will ensure this connection happens. Throughout this section, it feels that the explanation of *how* is missing. • Too many things are included in this turnaround plan. The plan is not well-connected or realistic. Reviewers would recommend the team to focus in on the vision and think about what structures they need to put in place to truly make the vision reality. • Plan states that the Socratic seminar methods will impact ELA. But Socratic methods are intended to lead to critical thinking, so they should think about how it will develop skills in ALL areas, not just ELA. Reviewers were concerned that the plan seems to stop short at identify this as a strategy primarily for ELA. • Team clearly knows the current school culture and community, but it seemed to the reviewers that their lack of monitoring data consistently is probably one of the main problems here—it was not apparent that they are consistently looking at data. For example, despite the fact they seem to know the needs of their students, especially the socio-emotional needs, the plan does not identify any safety nets that the school can provide to meet students' needs.	
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 for counteracting these challenges are thoughtful, applicable, creative, and within reason.	<u>Strengths:</u> • Concrete example about what can be done in a block schedule (pg. 13). <u>Concerns:</u> • They do not discuss whether they will use periodic assessments, or whether they'll use the Districts, their own, or the publishers. • Benchmarks are not explicit enough. The plan states an assumption that student achievement will increase because their critical thinking will increase. But how and how often will they check to see/measure that critical thinking is actually improving? • No timeline or process was provided. • Section only mentions monitoring of academic priorities—the social skills were left out. • This also connects to the concern raised in the Turnaround Section by the reviewers—it seems that they do not a system for clear, constant data monitoring.	How will then measure some of what they propose? Will they use common assessments?
E. Alternative	The plan presents a clear rationale for the	<u>Strengths:</u>	

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
Governance Models & Autonomies	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 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.	• There was staff involvement in operating the ESBMM model. <u>Concerns:</u> • Lacked detail and specific rationale in how these autonomies can support their programs. They also did not articulate why the current model does not work and they want to switch. • Regarding curriculum autonomy, it is not clear what they mean by stating that they will "*supplement the standards-based instructions.*" Their rationale, here and throughout the plan, frequently references the "*various needs of their current students*" but this is vague and doesn't fully address why they need this curricular autonomy. • Plan notes increasing funding through ADA, but earlier portions of the plan identified an attendance issue so but how will they ensure this happens? • Looping and multi-age classrooms are strategies noted on under the request for autonomy of Teacher Assignments (p.15), but this was the only place they were mentioned. It seems that strategies such as these should have shown up in other parts of the plan. • It did not appear to the reviewers that the autonomies were necessarily connected to the rest of the plan. A solid rationale is missing.	
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	<u>Strengths</u>: • Planning Team members volunteered; members represented all core content areas including PE, SPED. • Second Step is a nice program and it is enough to be taught all semester. <u>Concerns</u>: • No parents or students on the planning team. • No evidence for how the team members were all engaged. • Noted that parents were giving feedback that student safety was an issue but this issue was not addressed throughout the plan. Also parents mentioned electives, but this was also not well-developed in the plan. • Concern with Second Step being implemented during Advisory, but the Advisory teachers also have to implement Service Learning--and all of this is on block scheduling. This just seems like a lot for the teachers to have to manage and coordinate.	How many parents were included and how did they get their input? Will all teachers have advisory?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	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).		

School Visits

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

Planning Team Interviews

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

Final Recommendation to the Superintendent

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

<u>Overall Comments:</u> Overall, it seems that many necessary details are not included in the plan and many elements from the rubric are missing overall in the plan. While the plan answered all the questions, it is not coherent or well-aligned. In fact, reviewers commented that they had to read the plan several times because it lacked coherence. There was no flow, sequence, connections within the plan and it seemed to be all over the place. The team proves they have a solid understanding of their key issues, but the plan lacks specific details for moving them along in terms of progress monitoring. Math and ELA are noted as their primary issues, but their entire vision of a social, academic whole person is missing from the turnaround section of the plan. The plan is honest, but they are not giving measurable, attainable, realistic steps of how they are going to deal with the needs of students, especially regarding their behavioral/social needs. They should have at least acknowledged an academic AND a social factor in their priorities. They have not addressed the behavioral challenges—it would seem that these things will need to be addressed before jumping into strategies such as Socratic seminars. PLEs also need to be more developed and they need to ensure they are implemented well.

A positive was that the data analysis was very honest. However, they did not explain very thoroughly where they are now and what successes they have seen so far to convince the reviewers that they are prepared to move forward. Ultimately, the reviewers are not confident that the team could develop a solid plan, even with a rewrite. The Review Team wavered between Beginning and Developing—one rated Beginning while two reviewers were undecided between Beginning and Developing (one was strongly leaning towards Developing).

Please note that the rating and comments above reflect the review of the Superintendent's Review Panel members. The Superintendent agreed with many of the areas of strengths/weaknesses noted by the reviewers and, given the numerous and serious concerns he identified, his final decision was to rate the plan **<u>Beginning</u>.*