PSC School: <u>Harte Prep MS</u> **Planning Team Name: <u>Sankofa Educational Alliance</u>**

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> • This plan created a clear picture of the vision for what they wanted to accomplish for the students. Students will be prepared for the 21st century, especially in math and science. • Reviewers greatly appreciated the focus on minority students, especially how the plan addressed the issue that not enough AA and Latinos are in engineering, science and math. • The reviewers commented that, as a parent, they would want their student to be in the kind of environment described by the school. • Connection between science and math through visual and performing art—this was very innovative and the plan provided research to support this approach. • Artful Thinking actually looks very concrete and it seems like a good program. <u>Concerns:</u> • "Academic literacy" was not a well-developed concept or integrated into the program—it was unclear how this was connected to everything else. • The instructional philosophy lacked clarity and a timeline. In particular, the reviewers wondered how the school would support the staff to deliver quality STEM instruction. • Much explanation was provided, but it was still not clear whether the vision is possible, because some important evidence was lacking. For example, reviewers would have liked to see evidence of other schools and places where similar programs had been used before. • The vision seemed somewhat disconnected from the Harte Prep student—it was difficult to determine how appropriate these key priorities are for the students at Harte Prep. For example, do students truly need/want an arts-integrated STEM program? • The plan will require extensive PD and training to develop a complete paradigm shift; serious curriculum training will be necessary.	How will they find the resources for the work they have proposed? How will you measure the critical thinking, or "principle centered young adults"?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
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.	<u>Strengths:</u> None noted. <u>Concerns:</u> • This may be their weakest section. Data did not seem connected to the current student population. Information skipped around between CST and API and it was confusing just to read the document itself. The analysis also lacked a thorough review of *why* the data is what it is. • Reviewers questioned whether the team understood/knew the student population they would be serving. In fact, the plan itself noted that they did not have full access because they were not actually on the school site. • Given the tremendous gaps in knowledge, Harte Prep students really need significant additional support, but the plan did not address this well. Reviewers had hoped to see more analysis related to the demographics and community along with an identification of specific students' needs. Unfortunately, plan does not call out a sense of urgency around any specific issues and does not go deep enough or provide a full understanding of the students at Harte Prep. • Mentioned AMAO scores as a strength, but did not really dig deep enough. • Plan presented a pattern, but the team does not seem to know what the priorities are exactly. The plan did not clearly focus in on the 3-5 critical issues. Achievement gap is mentioned, but they don't say why it exists. It lacked in identifying issues that were operational, instructional, and behavioral. • Reviewers noted that they did not see some pieces of information they were hoping to see, such as special education, school safety, etc. • Community partnerships are noted (e.g., Safe Passage) but this support appears to be minimal. It is unclear how they will ensure student safety on a regular basis and parent comfort with the level of safety. • Did not fully address Question 2 in Section B. Instead, the key priorities are noted in the following section of the plan, Section C: School Turnaround. • The plan lists "academic literacy" as a key priority, which was surprisingly given that their focal point is math/science—these do not actually appear in their priority list.	
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	<u>Strengths:</u> • Electives and homework center seem like positive features, although the	Also, how will they get the staff that are their coaches,

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	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.	reviewers felt they should probably should not be optional features, as noted in the plan (seems that the electives are up to staff and student choice. **<u>Concerns</u>**: • Connection between the priorities and strategies is unclear. • Too many programs are included, making it nearly impossible to do all at once. There is little to no evidence of systems and structures in place that will ensure these programs are accomplished—instead, the plan feels like a list or good programs. • There is not enough evidence to show they will have a strong literacy program. • Constructivism is discussed, but not included into the PD program, so it is unclear how they will ensure teachers have this background. • General lack of evidence that strategies will accelerate student achievement or turn around school culture. Plan is very philosophical and does not seem realistic—it is difficult to determine feasibility because details are not provided. For example, the plan discusses promoting social and academic development, but there is no evidence of strategies that will make this happen. Instead, this section reads much like the Institute for Learning (IFL) book, without offering a deeper analysis. • Individual Growth Plans are mentioned, but not expanded upon. IGPs are a good practice that should actually already be happening so that they know the needs of all students; the reviewers felt the plan should have initiated a full discussion on this piece. • The reference to "art and music electives descriptions to be added" seems like an afterthought and is not detailed enough (p. 10). • It was somewhat unclear, but it appeared as though students requiring intervention will not have the option to take electives. The plan explains that the elective wheel is for 6th grade only, while 7th and 8th graders get a choice of another elective. But the plan does not explain how students would be placed into these electives. • Overall, the plan seemed to lack knowledge of the school community and its stakeholders. Priority 4 lists a lot of programs that are great, but they are do not articulate what is best for the students in the community. It is also unclear whether they have a sense of which strategies are appropriate for the school level, because some seem more applicable to ES than MS.	trainers, etc.—these critical positions? Robotics would be a great program, but is very expensive—how will they pay for it?

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. Implementation	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>: None noted <u>Concerns</u>: • Would have liked to see more specific benchmarks. It is not clearly articulated how they are going to monitor their efforts. Simply giving the periodic assessment is not enough. • No response was provided for Question D2, regarding the anticipated barriers. • Teachers who do not understand Artful Thinking will not be comfortable teaching/implementing this new innovative program. This will be a major challenge that the plan should have been addressed. It will take considerable time to make this shift but this inevitable challenge is not at all addressed in the plan.	What percent of teachers current give the assessments? Are they doing periodic assessments? How well the teachers are trained in teaching to the standards? Will they meet to discuss standards and student learning?
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 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.*	• NA. Will apply for Pilot in the following year. • No autonomies were requested. However, the reviewers felt that the team may need some autonomy to adjust their curriculum as requested, so they should have included a thoughtful rationale and request for some autonomies.	
F. School Planning	Members of the school planning team were identified by a fair, equitable, transparent process; the team is diverse and	<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
Team	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).	• There was a great resume provided for the leader of the team. <u>Concerns</u>: • Plan listed only two members out of the four individuals who participating in the writing of this plan. Would like to have seen more information about the Planning Team, because it feels as though this plan was written in isolation. • Only two teachers are on the team. It also seems that community members are missing from the team. Parent contribution is missing. • The plan often noted that the Planning Team is not on-site, which made it difficult to accomplish certain tasks (e.g., including parents on the team). • Not much information was provided about parent and student engagement. • Question 2 seems to be missing the last sentence.	

PSC School: <u>Harte Prep MS</u>   **Planning Team Name: <u>Sankofa Educational Alliance</u>**

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>

Strengths: The plan provides a very clear vision of the student who will matriculate from the school—the vision is lofty but attainable and threaded, for the most part, throughout the plan. This was a major strength in the plan. The academic program in literacy, professional learning opportunities, and training will really lead to a paradigm shift, which is needed. Plan has focus and it is connected and reflects a school that will provide rich student learning. The plan proposes programming that students at a place like Harte Prep could really benefit from.

Concerns: The plan did not answer all the questions and felt too general overall. The major concern was around data—it seemed that the analysis was not well connected to the students. It did not seem as though the team understood the school and community well enough. The plan did not identify some of the critical urgent issues—instead, went straight to a surface level data analysis. It also seemed as though the plan was based on the vision or philosophy of the team, but it was not necessarily connected to the students and community. (Note that one reviewer felt this was in some ways a strength--that the team brought a new perspective to the community and had a very clear picture and vision for a plan they wanted to create. This reviewer noted that the plan, while under-developed, could provide some good educational programming. This reviewer also stated, however, that the plan definitely needs to be revised to give more detail about how teachers will be trained, as well as do a better review of the data.). The reviewers wanted to better understand how the team has the capacity to rapidly turnaround the school. It felt as though the plan explained the curriculum, rather than the support structures that would be in place and how they would implement. There was also a concern about not enough community and staff representation on the team—is it feasible for two teachers to pull this through?

Final Thoughts: One reviewer wavered between Developing and Well-Developed but leaned towards Well-Developed—it was noted that the plan has a lot of great elements but needs to provide further detail in the areas discussed. According to the reviewer, there are certainly still a lot of questions to be answered, but this reviewer did not necessarily agree with all the concerns put forth by the other two reviewers. Two reviewers rated the plan as Beginning, the greatest concern being that the team did not seem to fully understand the needs of the school community and its students. There was much debate regarding the overall recommendation.

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 **Beginning.*