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: March 25, 2019

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

2709 N. Broad Street, 4th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19132

Phone: 215-769-0340

Webpage: https://yesphilly.org/

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

YES Philly is an accelerated high school program that supports classroom learning with integrated technology with a blended model program using the Summit Learning platform that is supplemented with classroom instruction.

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Taylor Frome, Executive Director

Shanta Richardson, Team Lead Special Education, Postsecondary, and Compliance

Dave Moore, Team Lead for Blended Learning

Melvin Davis, School Climate Coordinator

Lisa Hickson, Academic Lead Teacher

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

Elvis Mucaj, Strategy Analyst II, Opportunity Network

Rachel Malloy-Good, Special Education Program Specialist

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

YES Philly 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 the Summit Learning platform. 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
- Each class period is comprised of teacher-led instruction and utilization of the Summit Learning platform for the majority of courses offered to students as part of the master schedule

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 collaboratively review data during professional development days

Intervention
- The team reported that intervention and differentiation is available to students using the Summit Learning platform resources

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 working with a consultant as part of the professional development plan

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
- There is data available in the Summit Learning platform
- MAP data is reviewed and was presented to the instructional walkthrough team

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- There is a consistent welcoming environment across the program where teachers display interest in their students and the attempt to engage them.
- The program emphasizes a connection to integrating technology to support student learning.
- 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.
- Teachers make attempts to make the curriculum relevant for students in most classrooms.
- There were attempts to demonstrate interdisciplinary connections made for students in many classrooms.
- Teachers incorporated a blended learning model in the daily lessons in many classrooms.

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	9	20	45
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	10	28	36
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	15	28	54
TOTAL	34	76	45

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)
1. The program is welcoming and inviting.				X	
2. School - wide rules and procedures operating effectively. *There are posters that reference school-wide expectations, but these were not being followed by large numbers of students. Attempts to redirect students in the hallways and classrooms were unsuccessful. The cell phone policy was not reinforced and was regularly violated by large numbers of students in all classrooms. There were late arrivals to class by large numbers of students.*		X			
3. Classroom rules and procedures are operating effectively. *In some classrooms, teachers were not consistently or successfully reinforcing the expectations for student behavior that were established by the program. There were disruptions to the instruction and large numbers of students not following the classroom routines or following the procedures. There were large numbers of students, who were not compliantly engaged and multiple interruptions to instructional time were observed in many classrooms.*		X			
4. Acknowledgement of students who are/are not following rules and procedures is evident in classroom/school-wide. *Teachers made attempts to redirect behavior in some classrooms. Some attempts were less successful in redirecting the disruptive behavior.*		X			
5. Teachers display awareness of conditions.				X	

Summary: The program has posted school-wide expectations that have been not been consistently effective in maintaining a safe and orderly environment at the program level. The instructional staff made attempts to reinforce the expectations at the classroom level with limited success. Program staff monitor the climate and respond to student needs. Staff and student relationships were highlighted during the student interviews as a positive aspect of the program. Some classrooms were not as aligned to the school-wide expectations for behavior or there were attempts that were unsuccessful to reinforce these expectations.

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.
2. **Ensure classroom expectations are in place and aligned to the school-wide expectations.** Create opportunities for teachers and students to understand the expectations for appropriate behavior and offer support in having them develop aligned classroom management plans.
3. **Provide ongoing professional development to staff on effective classroom management to increase their ability to address inappropriate behavior and prevent disruption to the learning environment.**

DOMAIN II: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

Components of Effective Instruction	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
1. Teachers model the thinking and learning process. *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 did not consistently model the thinking and learning process or provide support for students before requiring independent thinking. In some classrooms, the teacher did most of the thinking without offering students the opportunity to respond to or practice what they were learning.*			X		
2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.				X	
3. Lessons are rigorous. *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.*		X			
4. Students are working harder than their teachers. *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. Students were not required to demonstrate learning in most classrooms, and some elected to not participate in the instruction.*		X			
5. Evidence of data is visible. *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.*		X			

Components of Effective Instruction	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency. *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. Some classrooms did have opportunities for students to complete something, but large numbers of students opted out.*		X			
7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. *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.*		X			

Summary:

The program requires teachers to incorporate the blended learning model. This was observed in some classrooms where direct instruction was followed by the use of the online program or some response with technology. A common lesson plan format was not evident in the plans reviewed and some lesson plans were incomplete with sections that were left blank. The master schedule indicated that multiple courses were simultaneously scheduled in the same room, with the same teacher and at the same time. There was no evidence of attempts to cover all of the diverse content that would be associated to these courses and this was addressed as needing immediate correction.

Opportunities for Growth:
1. **Ensure that students are appropriately rostered.** Teachers cannot be assigned to teach multiple courses simultaneously.
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.
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.

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. *Teachers did not address many students that were not engaged at any time during the lesson. At times, students in these classrooms were redirected unsuccessfully. There were large percentages of students in each classroom not adhering to expectations and the cellphone policy was not consistently reinforced causing disruption to the instruction where students listened to music and watched videos sometimes without headphones.*		X			
2. Teachers use a variety of engagement strategies. *Students in some classrooms were not engaged in the lesson. The students did not sit in seats that facilitated higher levels of engagement having been permitted to select seats that did not allow for closer proximity to the teacher and the visual materials. There were limited attempts in some classrooms to facilitate student engagement or offer interactive activities with the content or other students.*		X			
3. Students appear to be engaged in the lesson. *Each classroom had several students who were not actively engaged in the lesson. Many activities did not require students to be actively engaged or offer challenge to the students.*		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. *This varied across classrooms. Some attempts to address inappropriate behavior resulted in argumentative behavior from the student.*			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 posters throughout the building. Intentional efforts have been made to share the norms as described and some teachers made efforts to reinforce these particularly with incorporating intermittent redirections regarding the cell phone policy. Staff and students, who were interviewed, stated that they feel respected and valued. There was consistent articulation of the program's goals and areas of focus during the interviews. While intentional efforts have been made to describe the desired learning conditions, there was inconsistent reinforcement and limited intentional efforts to engage students that varied across classrooms. Student engagement appeared to be impacted by inappropriate behavior and lack of adherence to the school-wide expectations particularly as it relates to the enforcement of the cell phone policy.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. **Assist staff with utilizing a variety of engagement strategies to promote appropriate interaction with one another while engaging in discourse about the content.** Consider professional development opportunities that might increase the teachers' knowledge of instructional strategies for increasing compliant and cognitive engagement.
2. **Provide professional development that assists teachers with ensuring adequate learning conditions.** Assist teachers with teaching and reinforcing behavioral expectations and the competencies that are developed through intentional social and emotional learning.