THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

OPPORTUNITY NETWORK
INSTRUCTIONAL WALKTHROUGH 2020-2021
Program Name: OIC Workforce Academy
Provider: Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc. d/b/a/ Philadelphia OIC

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 16, 2021

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

1231 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122

Phone: 215-842-5451

Webpage: http://philaoic.org/workforce-academy/

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

The OIC Workforce Program offers students direct instruction four days weekly with a focus on workforce development on Fridays to offer students vocational experiences.

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Dr. Parthenia Moore, Vice President of Education

Aisha Dennis, Chief Operating Officer & Vice President of Human Resources

Marquis Butler, Dean of Academics

Priscilla Duncan, Workforce Coordinator

WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, Opportunity Network

Majeedah Scott, Director, Office of Multiple Pathways to Graduation

Daniel Turner, Director, Instructional Resource

Seth Morones, Strategy Analyst II, Opportunity Network

Tanya Bradley-Watson, Special Education Director

Nefertiti White, Special Education Director

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Philadelphia OIC Workforce Academy is an Opportunity Network contracted program that offers students the opportunity to participate in an accelerated high school program to increase students' opportunities to gain high school credit and ultimately graduate from high school. The program is designed to provide students job readiness skills on Fridays that enhance their opportunity to access and demonstrate mastery of college and career readiness skills outlined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Daily Structure -
The week for students at Philadelphia OIC Workforce consists of four days of academic course work, while on Wednesdays they are engaged in workforce development tasks. The academic school day begins with a 30min advisory, four 70min long academic periods, and a 30min lunch period. Each day teachers also hold office hours where they are encouraged to provide students with 1:1 supports, small group instruction, or other supports as called for in a student's IEP.

Teacher Feedback
- Weekly instructional walkthroughs are conducted by the leadership team
- Teachers are observed informally twice each week, with a follow up coaching conversation
- Lesson plans are submitted on Mondays, feedback is then provided the next day

Intervention
- There is a weekly "Student Roundtable" meeting where student data and the aligned interventions are discussed
- Teacher lesson plans should reflect interventions being provided
- There are office hour supports offered daily by teachers (including the special education staff)
- Students with IEPs are supported with in class push-in support and then the use of breakout rooms during independent work time

Professional Development –
The instructional staff have received feedback on the following topics:
- Student Engagement and Participation Strategies
- Lesson Planning
- Trauma Informed Practices
- Creating spaces for Social Emotional Learning
- Providing Special Education Accommodations
- Engaging community and families
- Developing Anti-Racist practices (Culturally Responsive Teaching, seminars from Dr. Bettina Love, and others)

Parent Communication –
Parents receive information from the program staff as needed and during regularly scheduled times for sharing progress - this year the program was using phone calls, emails, text messaging, and the remind app as part of their outreach. They have shifted to holding typically in person meetings to using the Zoom or Teams platforms.

Use of Data –
There is a weekly "Student Roundtable" conversation, involving all staff where they discuss student academic and attendance data and determine MTSS supports. The program uses the STAR assessment and teacher created assessments each week during class to gauge students' academic progress.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- There was a welcoming environment and staff were generally warm and some displayed a genuine interest in their students.
- There was a focus shared by the leadership team of focusing on equity and a data driven approach to supporting students' academic and emotional needs.
- There are consistent points of communication between leadership and staff (including a daily meeting to begin the day.)
- There were almost no disruptive or inappropriate student behaviors observed.
- Students were respectful of and responsive to teacher requests.
- Students shared an appreciation for the support and attention they have received, and for the opportunity to engage in the workforce readiness programming.

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	12	20	
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	10	28	
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	11	28	
TOTAL	33	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. In multiple classrooms observed, attendance was very low and in some cases no students were present. Teachers were generally welcoming to students, however, there was no outreach to students not in class by teachers or school leadership observed in either walkthrough. Most outreach efforts seem to be coming from counseling staff, and are primarily done via messaging- either text or other systems.		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. Teachers did attempt to interact with students that were present and in class, however, little effort was made to confirm they were able to access materials, comprehend the material, or complete required tasks. Increased ability for teachers to observe student work and more frequent checks of student engagement and understanding are needed.			X		

Summary: There were attempts made to welcome and engage with students who were attending class. Attendance was very low, some classes had no students and most hand just 1-3 students. There was no visible outreach to improve attendance during the walkthrough. There were virtually no disruptive behaviors observed, however, teachers did not seem to have a clear understanding of what students were or were not engaging, and if they were not engaging what the barriers were.

1. Establish clear concrete systems to improve student attendance. This was described as a key area of focus by the leadership team, but there were no systems of in the moment outreach observed during the observation. These systems were not mentioned by teachers or student in interview, and there was no other evidence of such a system. Assign key staff and points where this outreach would take place and develop systems to track the results of that outreach. Develop incentives and recognition for attendance and engagement, as well as supports to overcome barriers as they are identified.

2. Provide professional development for teachers on how to both monitor and engage students while they are in class, and or to help troubleshoot issues that may arise and prevent students from engaging. Continue to provide development for teachers on ways they can use technology to monitor student engagement. Additionally, provide clear support channels for students to access their academic courses (simple tech troubleshooting techniques for teachers, and more in depth supports - from Philadelphia OIC Workforce or from district partners to help remove access barriers for students.) Consider identifying a clear point person, an OIC Workforce tech expert that can manage these systems and provide this development for teachers.

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. There was very little modeling and or guidance on the instructional process observed during the observation. This was most evident in math where there was no modeling of the problem solving process, and very few visual supports. When modeling was present, it was largely driven by videos from Ck-12 or other online resources.			X		
2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students. Efforts to make the curriculum more relevant are inconsistent among classrooms. Teachers in some areas are designing activities that push students to reflect and find meaning relevant to their own experience (crafting your own code of honor for example). Some students shared this feeling of finding the curriculum relevant in their interviews. In other classrooms however, there was no observed adjustment of the curricular materials to make it more reflective of the students' lives and experiences.			X		
3. Lessons are rigorous. During the observations, lessons were passive and there were very limited opportunities to engage with the work. Questions asked were low rigor, and not aligned to the level of the standard. The most common task was to observe a lecture or video, with no task given and no task assigned to check for comprehension and understanding.		X			
4. Students are working harder than their teachers. There were only minimal student activities assigned during our visit, most commonly taking notes or answering multiple choice questions. There was a significant imbalance between student and teacher voice, where teachers dominated the vast majority of the lesson.		X			
5. Evidence of data is visible. There was no mention of student data in the classrooms observed. There were no modifications or adjustments made in relation to a student's IEP or MTSS data in the lesson materials reviewed.		X			
6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency. Teacher questioning was very limited, and often times when questions were posed there was little wait time provided. Student engagement was difficult to gauge, and there was an uneven expectation set- some students participated, but no expectation set that all students would share and contribute.			X		
7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity.		X			

Components of Effective Instruction	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
The questions observed, were primarily low-level questions to confirm that a student was in the right place. There were few high level questions asked, and very few opportunities to explain their thinking or defend a position. Frequently the checks for understanding were yes or no responses, or simply asking students- "Do you have any questions?" Written tasks given to students were assigned and included higher level questions and tasks, however, there was no feedback given actively in classes observed on student written work.					

DOMAIN II: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY, *continued*

Summary:

There was evidence that teachers are relying on third party software to do much of the modeling and instruction during remote instruction. When this was the case, there were very few checks for understanding and teachers did not seem to have strong responses when those checks for understanding demonstrated student gaps or misunderstandings. While the collaboration between SPED and EL teachers and content teachers was highlighted as a strength by the leadership team, there was very limited evidence of those accommodations in the lesson plans or in the observed instruction. In general, students were very passive in their classes, and there were few activities that required active student participation- classes instead were much more focused on teacher presentations.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. Provide teachers with a clear expectation or an instruction period, including the key components- modeling, checks for understanding, rigorous engaging tasks, and differentiation. Creating exemplar lessons, and providing professional development on how to create similar materials would support a normed vision for strong instruction on your staff. Consider clarifying or defining for staff what you expect and what it should look like to have a rigorous, relevant, and engaging instructional period for students.
2. Provide coaching and support for teachers who are not providing rigorous or relevant instruction. Consider adopting a real time coaching model or one that allows for intensive teacher supports to quickly improve their performance- and to meet the instructional expectations established by your program.
3. Provide planning tools and guidance on how to adapt school district pacing guides and other instructional resources to be used in an accelerated setting. When utilizing district created resources be mindful that those resources are designed to be used in courses that are offered across a full school year and with traditional pacing. Consider supporting the teachers planning process by setting clear expectations on how to adapt these materials. These tools/expectations should assist in the documentation of these adaptations (creation of unit plans etc.), while also ensuring alignment to the state standards and your instructional model.
4. Provide lesson planning feedback around lessons tasks, differentiation, and checks for understanding. Focus lesson planning feedback on the rigor and quality of tasks that teachers are assigning, as well as how they are modifying or differentiating those tasks for their students, and the level of questioning. These components were present in the lessons plans reviewed, but did not meet instructional expectations.
5. Provide teacher development on techniques and strategies for Checks for Understanding. Consider focusing the development on crafting and then facilitating checks for understanding that both involve all students, as well as ask them to support or explain their answers. There is a need for stronger systems to assess all students in the moment and their understanding of the task/concept, as well as the ability to probe further if the initial answer is too short or doesn't provide the teacher with enough insight into the students thinking.

6. Adjust the lesson planning and office hours planning tools so that the differentiation and accommodations being made are more apparent. While utilizing data was named as a priority and practice, the evidence of this was difficult to find. Consider adjusting the planning documents to more readily identify the adjustments made to meet the needs of students with IEPs or those with MTSS interventions. In addition, consider requiring some sort of planning document for office hours to reflect the targeted individual and small group interventions a teacher plans to lead each afternoon.

7. Provide clarity around the expectations for staff to utilize the PD provided around making content relevant for students, and then support staff in making those adjustments. While leadership shared that professional development has been conducted around making content more culturally relevant for students, these adjustments were not evident. Consider revisiting this topic, with an emphasis on what the observable changes should be when these adjustments are made effectively.

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. During the walkthrough, some teachers were observed going to great lengths to ensure that students were able to access the lesson materials (providing tech support, alternative access options, etc.) However, most lessons were not driven by student input or participation, but were a more lecture or video-based format. There were infrequent checks to make sure students were following along or completing tasks.			X		
2. Teachers use a variety of engagement strategies. There were limited strategies being used to engage students- the most common was to contribute with their voice in the video conference, or to complete their work independently in google classroom or Ck-12. Rarely did students utilize the chat, and there were no collaborative work spaces observed. Teachers at times were unsure of if or how students were engaging with the work.		X			
3. Students appear to be engaged in the lesson. Student contributions to the lessons observed were minimal, and only one shared written work by reading it aloud. Some lessons observed the teacher was engaged in conversation with the student as they reviewed previous lesson topics. At times teachers were unclear if students were engaged or not.		X			
4. Students are interacting appropriately with other students. No students were interacting with one another during the lessons observed, and no activities directed students to do so.		X			
5. Teachers show interest in their students. There was a diversity in how much teachers were able or attempting to connect with their students. In some classrooms, it was clear there was a strong relationship between the teachers and students. In others, there was no evidence of community building or relationship building.			X		
6. Students are appropriately responsive to teacher interactions.				X	
7. There is evidence of the school-wide focus in the classrooms. There was not a consistent format or level of preparation from classroom to classroom. Routines and formatting varied from room to room, and it was difficult to determine the school wide focus as an observable aspect of the classes observed.		X			

Summary:

The program has developed staff in lesson planning and student engagement strategies- there was not a consistent structure or approach to the courses observed. There was little or no evidence of tasks that informed teachers about the level of student engagement and or comprehension. Additionally, there was little evidence of community building, instead- teachers were more often lecturing students in a very passive format.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. Establish a clear vision for what an instructional block should look like, and then support and develop teachers to implement that vision. Consider creating exemplar lessons and or quick checklists to ensure that there are consistent lesson components in place in all classrooms.
2. Support teachers in implementing engagement strategies that are interesting and fun for students, but also inform the teacher on students' engagement and understanding. Consider using digital tools that would allow students to respond or contribute in writing but without having their work displayed publicly (completing a google doc visible to the student and teacher, but not to everyone else the way a chat would be.)
3. Support teachers with providing more student collaboration opportunities to increase the amount of student to student conversation. Consider providing professional development or sharing some strategies to either have students authentically collaborate to complete assignments or to provide feedback or responses to another student's work/solution to problem.
4. Ensure that each class period includes some form of community building and or relationship building oriented activity. Building a strong community and caring relationships is key to student success, and should be a part of each lesson. Consider sharing with teachers the Healing Together resources from the school district on how to create this environment with the Community Meeting strategy, which can take place briefly each day/period in the high school setting.
5. Create an area or areas of school wide focus, and determine some observable actions that demonstrate that focus. Once this has been established, support teachers with implementing that focus on a daily basis. Consider choosing a high impact area of growth and one where teachers have already had some development, and then monitor to make sure that structure/technique has been implemented with fidelity across classrooms and times of day.