



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. *NOTE: Due to the COVID pandemic, availability of some academic data was affected. Academic data may be available in part, whole or not at all.* 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.

**During the 2020-21 school year, due to Covid related health restrictions meant that instruction was being conducted remotely. All Instructional Walkthroughs were conducted virtually as well, including meetings with leadership, class video conference observations, interviews with staff and students, and review of documentation. Initial feedback from the walkthrough was also given at the end of the visit to the program.*

GENERAL INFORMATION

Walkthrough Date: March 25, 2021

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

1142 E. Erie Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19124

Phone: 215-744-6000

Webpage: <http://www.onebrihtraycommunity.org/>

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

The One Bright Ray model is a project-based learning model to provide students with the opportunity to complete work that culminates in a final project that extends their learning of the content in a relevant application.

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Marcus A. Delgado, Chief Executive Officer

Anna Duvivier, Chief Operating Officer

Joycet Velasquez, Chief Academic Officer

Kara Fisher, Director of Curriculum and Instruction

Marta Lasiy, Principal

Thaddeus Falana, Dean of Academics

WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director Opportunity Network

Daniel Turner, Director of Instructional Resource

Tiana Wilson, Assistant Director, Operations

Kia Woods, Instructional Special Education Advisor

Jennifer Szwec, Special Education Case Manager

Benaline Baloyut, Manager Multilingual Programs

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Daily Structure – this year students have the option of synchronous remote, hybrid, or asynchronous remote instruction. For those receiving synchronous or hybrid instruction, the daily routine consists of-

- A daily advisory period
- Synchronous classes for a total of 75min, 45 are teacher led and 30 focus more on student independent practice
- Friday is an asynchronous day, where students complete work independently as well as Naviance tasks (these assignments are posted to google classroom), teacher support is available as needed

Teacher Feedback

- Support and feedback are provided to teachers on their unit plans as well as their lesson plans
- Teachers are observed formally and informally, receiving both written feedback as well as meeting 1:1 to discuss feedback and provide individual coaching
- Focus in feedback and coaching has been on utilizing technology as effectively as possible

Use of Data

- The program has been focused on attendance and engagement while engaged in online instruction
- Surveys of staff, students, and families have been utilized to gather qualitative data for planning and adjusting programming
- Shifted from TABE to the STAR Assessment as a universal screener and tool to measure student growth in Math and Reading

Intervention

- MTSS system in place, with different interventions and bi-weekly data meetings
- Teacher support is provided through office hours each day after instruction has finished
- Added a review and re-teach week to the calendar, where teachers schedule students to review missing work, failed quizzes or other missing assignments
- The school has created an engagement team to manage the SAIP process and coordinate outreach to students to support with improved attendance

Professional Development –

- Teachers receive development on Friday's during the asynchronous work time, this is done on a network wide level by the OBR team, as well as in campus specific PD led by the Dean of Academics, Mr. Falana
- Topics of focus this year have been improving MTSS supports and in improving the Rigor in classrooms

Parent Communication –

- The school has established an engagement team to help coordinate the daily outreach to families around attendance- utilizing a variety of tools: phone, email, text messages, power school, social media, and others.
- Individual meetings/conversations were held to start Modules 2 and 3 to determine the most beneficial way for a student to attend school (synchronous/hybrid/asynchronous)
- School has shifted to having meeting with families via google meets or Zoom when necessary
- Teachers have also utilized the suite google communication tools to keep families informed

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- Several different tools were being leveraged to drive student engagement, such as jam boards, Nearpod, shared google docs etc.
- Clear efforts were made to make the content relevant to students
- Academic vocabulary was present in almost all classrooms observed
- Consistent and effective use of google classroom to manage instructional resources for students
- School wide focus on interesting and engaging lessons as well as teacher development with tech tools was evident
- Consistent class structures helped to create a sense of routine across classrooms
- Program was welcoming and inviting to students, evidence of strong staff student relationships

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY OF ALL DOMAINS

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 2020-2021 Instructional Walkthrough.

DOMAINS	PROGRAM PERFORMANCE	TOTAL POSSIBLE	PERCENTAGE
Domain I: Overall Management	16	20	
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	19	28	
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	21	28	
TOTAL	56	76	

** Percentages were not calculated due to COVID and full-time virtual teaching and learning, this structural change does not support comparison of the report for the 2020-21SY to previous or future school years.*

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.					X
3. Classroom rules and procedures are operating effectively.				X	
4. Acknowledgement of students who are/are not following rules and procedures is evident in classroom/school-wide.				X	
5. Teachers display awareness of conditions.				X	

Summary:

The program has made several adjustments to maintain their school culture while shifting to the remote environment. Staff consistently worked to create a welcoming environment, establish clear expectations, and monitored student engagement. Students and staff expressed that they feel respected and valued during the interviews. There were consistent structures in place from classroom to classroom, and all teachers were able to navigate tech tools and routines in a way that student experience was smooth and interesting.

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.				X	
2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.					X
3. Lessons are rigorous. In all classrooms observed, there was strong academic vocabulary being used. However, the tasks and the checks for understanding asked by the teachers were not matching the rigor of the grade level or course. At times teachers had planned a challenging question or task, but in execution would have students do a simpler and less rigorous task.			X		
4. Students are working harder than their teachers. During the lessons observed, students were often answering low level questions- yes/no or comprehension of shared information. The teacher would then provide answers to the more rigorous questions or not allow students the opportunity to attempt those questions. There were many different engagement opportunities and methods for students to participate in class, however, increasing the rigor or thinking work required of those tasks would push students to work at standard level expectations.			X		
5. Evidence of data is visible.				X	
6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency.				X	
7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. During each lesson there were opportunities for students to attempt tasks and answer questions related to the content. However, these questions were largely low depth of knowledge questions that could be answered with short phrases, and then they were not pushed to explain or defend their answers. Frequently, the teacher and not the student would explain the rationale or reasoning behind an answer.			X		

Summary:

In the classrooms observed, there was clearly an effort being made by all teachers to make the daily lessons and larger unit projects relevant for students. In addition, teachers were also very consistent in their modeling and in the clarity of expectations they have set for students about where to find materials and what was expected in the assignments. There was evidence that teachers were using evidence from prior classes to guide their instructional choices, which was also evident in their lesson plans. There was a consistent effort made to have all students engage in the lesson- by calling on everyone, using cold calling, or offering participation moments where all students could weigh in. With this level of engagement and strong teacher tools, the next area of focus should be on the rigor and balance of student to teacher thinking, where students should own more of the thinking load on rigorous tasks and questions.

DOMAIN II: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY- Continued

Opportunities for Growth:

1. Provide teachers with support in the design of their lesson materials and the choice of activities to encourage more rigorous tasks. Consider supporting teachers with the design of their slide deck, jam board, or nearpod so that the rigorous questions scripted in their lesson plans are also made visible to students.
2. Provide teachers with coaching and feedback/support on how to facilitate with more rigor- in particular, how to follow up on student responses to checks for understanding. Teachers have scripted higher level questions in their lesson plans- but these were not always utilized during the lesson. In addition, teachers need support on how to respond when a student answers a question, and they need to push their thinking further. Consider utilizing real time coaching or video reflections to help support this work.
3. Support teachers with concrete strategies or professional development on how to support the strong execution of wait time and scaffolding. At times, teachers were not giving enough space for students to think and answer questions- instead they would jump in a provide the explanation. Providing concrete strategies for wait time and to support thinking so that they can arrive at the answer with support from teacher prompting or resources will make the lessons more impactful for students.

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. During the visit, there were limited student to student interactions observed. While no interactions between students were concerning, there was little space given to respond to a peers answer or to provide feedback or improve an answer.			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:

Teachers and staff at OBR Simpson were utilizing a variety of low tech and high tech tools to gauge and monitor engagement, from calling on everyone in the classroom to share to monitoring avatars in a jam board they were effective at keeping an awareness of students in the classroom and how engaged they were with the lesson. Teachers utilized many strategies, and there was strong engagement between the teacher and students during the class. The area for growth is expanding that engagement, from just teacher to student, but also student to student. This type of engagement will help support building a stronger community, deeper levels of the thinking, and more relevant engagement for students.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. Support teachers in planning tasks and activities in the lesson that would facilitate and encourage student to student conversations. This may include planning activities where students work with a partner or small group in breakout rooms to complete a task, or where they are giving another student feedback on their work. It may also be class discussions where students are support or challenging a peer’s point of view or answer on a prompt.