



## INSTRUCTIONAL WALKTHROUGH OVERVIEW

Instructional Walkthroughs for all Opportunity Network contract programs focused on the instructional vision and implementation of the vision at the classroom level required to deliver high quality instruction to students. Instructional Walkthroughs assessed program performance across three domains: 1) Overall Management; 2) Instructional Delivery; and 3) Conditions for Learning. Taken together, the three domains encompass key instructional expectations that are required to ensure effective instruction that facilitates meeting the program’s contract requirements with The School District of Philadelphia, as well as applicable federal, state and local laws.

Instructional Walkthroughs are one part of the School District’s three-part approach to the formal annual evaluation of all contracted Opportunity Network programs. In addition to Instructional Walkthroughs, Operational Walkthroughs and Alternative Education Progress Reports (AEPR) provide qualitative and quantitative data for program performance that inform decisions related to contract renewal, termination, and program expansion. This report summarizes the program’s performance for each of the three domains reviewed during the Instructional Walkthrough. Each domain has been considered, in terms of key indicators for the domain area, and were rated by the walkthrough team on a four-point scale. In addition, this report provides ratings for select contract requirements indicating whether the program met those requirements or standards based on evidence reviewed during the Instructional Walkthrough, interviews with key stakeholders, and observations in the classrooms.

### GENERAL INFORMATION

**Walkthrough Date:** April 5, 2019

**Contract Term:** FY 2018 - FY 2022

**Program Type:** Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

### CONTACT INFORMATION

1952 East Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19134

**Phone:** 267-571-1952

**Webpage:** <https://www.liguoriacademy.org/fortis-program/>

### INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

Liguori Academy Fortis offers a blended learning model where students work with online platforms supplemented by three days a week of direct instruction with a classroom teacher.

### PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

**Michael Marrone**, Chief Executive Officer and President

**Rebecca M. Tomlinson-White**, Chief Operating Officer

**Gina Craig**, Director of Academic Affairs

**Patrick Durkin**, Director of Climate and Culture

**Rachel Szychulski**, Director of Special Education

### WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

**Dawnlynne Kacer**, Executive Director, Opportunity Network

**Dr. Tracy Ocasio**, Director, Instructional Resources, Opportunity Network

**Majeedah Scott**, Director, Office of Multiple Pathways to Graduation

**Rachel Malloy-Good**, Special Education Program Specialist

**Tanya Hoard**, Technology Program Specialist, Educational Technology Group

## PROGRAM OVERVIEW

---

Liguori Academy Fortis is an Opportunity Network contracted program that offers students the opportunity to participate in an accelerated high school program to increase the students' opportunities to gain high school credit and ultimately graduate from high school. The program is designed to provide students with blended learning where classroom instruction is offered along with content on the online platforms made available to students. The program offers a compliment of high school courses that are tied to modules on the online platform.

**Daily Structure** - the instructional day consists of a full academic schedule

- Students attend classes as outlined by the master schedule receiving direct instruction three times weekly
- Each class period is comprised of teacher-led instruction tied to the content that students learn on the online platform

**Teacher Feedback**

- Site administrators provide feedback using the Danielson model and offer informal feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Lesson plans are reviewed by site administrators; teachers submit lesson plans electronically on Fridays
- Teachers select their own curriculum resources; the administrative team reviews this as they review lesson plans

**Intervention**

- The team reported that intervention and differentiation is available to students using the self-paced online platforms.
- Teachers monitor students and offer individualized instruction during the online learning component

**Professional Development** – the instructional staff have received instructional opportunities to grow their practice in the following ways:

- Teachers are provided professional development during specific days designed to offer this opportunity
- Administration and teacher leaders have been focusing on collaborative learning, differentiation in the classroom and providing leveled questioning to offer opportunities for higher level thinking
- The focus has been on providing differentiation and increasing student engagement

**Parent Communication** – parents receive information from the program staff as needed and during regularly scheduled times for sharing progress

- Parent communication is provided by teachers during parent conferences
- Administrators and staff provide ongoing communication as needed

**Use of Data** – the administration and instructional staff use the following to monitor student performance

- Students take the MAP assessment and various other assessments associated with the online platform

## SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- The program emphasizes a connection to integrating technology to support student learning.
- Teachers create a welcoming environment in their classrooms and have developed effective classroom expectations.
- Teachers shared that they are committed to providing a curriculum that is relevant to the students and engages them by connecting to their interests.
- Teachers were passionate about the work they were doing with students during teacher interviews.
- There was evidence that many teachers worked to establish a good rapport with their students and demonstrated appropriate affection and effective relationships with the students.
- Teachers indicated that they have opportunities to collaborate with one another.
- Students interacted appropriately in the classroom during direct instruction with no evidence of disruptive behavior.
- Teachers and students demonstrated enthusiasm for the content that was being taught.
- Low teacher – student ratios were maintained during classroom instruction.

## PERFORMANCE SUMMARY ON THE THREE DOMAIN AREAS

The table below summarizes performance by category on elements that are conducive to effective instruction and are consistent with the academic performance measures in the contract during the 2018-2019 Instructional Walkthrough.

DOMAINS	PROGRAM PERFORMANCE	TOTAL POSSIBLE	PERCENTAGE
Domain I: Overall Management	11	20	55
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	9	28	32
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	21	28	75
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>54</b>

DOMAIN 1: OVERALL MANAGEMENT

Management for a Safe and Orderly Environment	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
<p><b>1. The program is welcoming and inviting.</b></p> <p><i>Classrooms are bright and staff are friendly. Teachers are welcoming to students as they enter. There were repairs needed to the facility that had not been completed after the operational walk-through. There were issues that relate to safety; for example, the sink in the female bathroom was propped with wood to keep it from falling.</i></p>			X		
<p><b>2. School - wide rules and procedures operating effectively.</b></p> <p><i>There are posters that reference school-wide expectations, but these were not being followed by large numbers of students in the common area where students complete work on the online platforms. Students were not disrespectful but were engaged in conversations and activities that were off-task and not appropriate for the learning environment. This differed from the behavior in the classrooms where students received direct instruction.</i></p>			X		
<p><b>3. Classroom rules and procedures are operating effectively.</b></p>				X	
<p><b>4. Acknowledgement of students who are/are not following rules and procedures is evident in classroom/school-wide.</b></p>		X			
<p><b>5. Teachers display awareness of conditions.</b></p>				X	

Summary: The program has posted school-wide expectations that are not consistently reinforced in the larger group instructional space where students work on the online platforms. The students in this space were observed engaging in conversations and behavior that were not appropriate for the learning environment with some attempts from the staff to redirect them. The success of the attempts to redirect students in this space varied. Students were engaged in appropriate behavior during direct instruction provided by a teacher in the classroom setting.

1. **Articulate with the staff the expectations that will be consistently followed by all students throughout the program and communicate these expectations as well as reinforce them with the student population.** Create a space for staff to discuss school-wide expectations and opportunities to teach those expectations and reinforce them with the entire student population particularly as students work on the online platform.
2. **Assist staff with utilizing appropriate strategies for redirecting behavior.**
3. **Complete necessary repairs to the facility to create a safe and orderly environment that is welcoming to students.**

## DOMAIN II: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

Components of Effective Instruction	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
<p><b>1. Teachers model the thinking and learning process.</b></p> <p><i>Teachers in most classrooms did not effectively use the gradual release model. There was inconsistent evidence of scaffolding to higher levels of thinking and limited use of tiered questioning. Teachers prompted students to respond; however, they did not allow students to demonstrate their thinking on the content. The activities and questioning was at low levels requiring little processing on the part of the student.</i></p>			X		
<p><b>2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.</b></p> <p><i>In making the curriculum relevant for students, teachers have used materials that are not at grade level. Teachers indicated that they plan and develop lessons that are based on student interest; however, they are not anchored to grade level standards.</i></p>			X		
<p><b>3. Lessons are rigorous.</b></p> <p><i>Lesson activities and materials are not consistently aligned to grade level standards. Higher levels of thinking and complex materials were used less frequently providing students with inadequate opportunities to demonstrate grade-level thinking. Students did not consistently engage in thinking activities that would deepen their understanding of the content in several classrooms. Materials selected by instructional staff were not appropriate for providing grade level instruction. Lesson plans did not consistently identify grade level standards.</i></p>		X			
<p><b>4. Students are working harder than their teachers.</b></p> <p><i>The level of challenge in the work varied across classrooms, but in most every classroom, students were not required to complete grade level work aligned to the state standards. The standards were not appropriately identified in lesson plans, some of which were incomplete. Collaborative opportunities were not incorporated in the classrooms that were observed despite this was the focus in the instructional vision identified by the administrative team.</i></p>		X			

Components of Effective Instruction	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
<p><b>5. Evidence of data is visible.</b></p> <p><i>The use of data was not evident. There were binders with some reports from the MAP assessment; however, the reports did not readily suggest that staff would be able to use them to inform instruction. There was no indication during the interviews that staff use them responsively in planning their instruction and the team mentioned that they have been receiving more instruction by the company on how to read and interpret them. The grouping of students for various classes and intervention did not seem to reflect a thorough review of the assessment data and many were inappropriately grouped together. For example, students above grade level were also in groups where content far below the grade level was the focus of the group intervention.</i></p>		X			
<p><b>6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency.</b></p> <p><i>Teachers questioned students infrequently resulting in some students responding more than others in many classrooms. The focus of the tasks and level of the questioning was not at the level of the standard.</i></p>		X			
<p><b>7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity.</b></p> <p><i>Questioning did not require students to engage in higher level thinking. Most questions were lower level questions that were below the level of thinking required by the standard. The focus of the activities observed in many classrooms were focused more on project completion without reference or connection to the standard. Some classrooms did not offer students the opportunity to expand on their learning or respond in a manner that exceeded simple repetition of the teacher's delivery of the content.</i></p>		X			

Summary:

The program requires teachers to incorporate the blended learning model where they offer direct instruction three days a week to supplement that content that students are learning online. A common lesson plan format was not evident in the plans reviewed and some lesson plans were incomplete with sections that were left blank. Many lesson plans did not identify the correct grade level standard or any state standard for the content area. The administrative team described the instructional vision as including evidence of differentiation, opportunities for collaboration and the incorporation of higher-level questioning. These things were not observed in any of the classrooms.

Opportunities for Growth:

- 1. Ensure that students are appropriately rostered into courses that are credit bearing.** Ensure that credits are awarded correctly per the guidelines of the state. For example, some courses (i.e., psychology, sociology and geography) were not linked to the appropriate content area for awarding credits.

2. **Support teachers in ensuring that their objectives are a direct reflection of the standard in terms of the student outcomes and the complexity of the thinking required by the student outcomes.** Consider how teachers might anchor the work in each part of the lesson to furthering students demonstrating knowledge and skills required by the appropriate grade level standard. Require teachers to identify the standard on their lesson plans and address inconsistency and inaccuracy during lesson plan reviews.
3. **Assist teachers with identifying the appropriate resources, complex texts and learning experiences to expose students to rigorous content and to connect them to practical real-world experiences.** Assist teachers with selecting the appropriate grade level resources to connect each day to mastering the appropriate grade level standards to ensure adequate exposure and coverage throughout the year. Consider mapping out the coverage of the standards prior to the onset of the year.
4. **Provide teachers with professional development to better construct activities and tasks that ensure mastery of the standards for the module through daily activities that increase in complexity in an effort to provide ample opportunities for students to demonstrate the skills and knowledge for each of the standards.** Consider how teachers might ensure that each lesson relates to providing students with opportunities to engage with the content and demonstrate appropriate standards - aligned outcomes that demonstrate their learning of grade level concepts.
5. **Support teachers in identifying and implementing collaborative opportunities that will support student engagement as well as ensure that students are mastering the content through opportunities to summarize, respond and evaluate content experiences.** Assist teachers with understanding how to use these activities in such a way that it reinforces the academic content and behavioral expectations.
6. **Support teachers in better understanding how to implement the gradual release model to provide opportunities for students to do the thinking.** Consider providing professional development that assists teachers with preplanning specific questions that provide them insight to student understanding at varied levels for the content they are teaching. Assist them with understanding how to select instructional strategies that support the gradual release of responsibility for learning and increased ownership of the standards-aligned outcomes through deepened understanding.
7. **Assist teachers with better understanding the MAP data and how to plan responsively to meet the needs of students.** Consider and evaluate the information that this assessment yields to monitor student progress towards grade level outcomes. Review the use of this data source to group students appropriately for intervention and enrichment.
8. **Assist teachers with looking at the alignment to the online platform to ensure that students receive adequate instruction to demonstrate mastery of the state standards.** During the interviews, there was minimal evidence regarding how the work students do on the online platform is connected to the direct instruction students receive in classrooms. It was clear from the interviews that there isn't a curriculum plan that ensures adequate exposure to the state standards and teachers share that they select standards to cover based on what they feel students are interested in learning.

## DOMAIN III: CONDITIONS FOR LEARNING

Establishing Conditions Necessary for Learning	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
1. Teachers are aware of non-engagement.				X	
2. Teachers use a variety of engagement strategies.				X	
3. Students appear to be engaged in the lesson.				X	
4. Students are interacting appropriately with other students.				X	
5. Teachers show interest in their students.					X
6. Students are appropriately responsive to teacher interactions.				X	
7. There is evidence of the school-wide focus in the classrooms.			X		

## Summary:

The staff seemed to have worked on establishing norms and procedures that would be conducive for setting the learning conditions as evidenced by the conditions for learning observed in the classrooms, which differed from those in the larger group space. However, the teachers were not demonstrating that they were aware of the expectations in the instructional vision during observations or during the interviews.

## Opportunities for Growth:

1. **Ensure staff understand the instructional vision of the program as articulated by the administrative team.** There was no evidence that teachers understood the focus of the instructional vision. Teachers did not indicate that they received professional development on the topics that were identified by the administrative team and there was nothing to suggest that they have been implementing the strategies that would have been covered during these sessions.