



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 21, 2022

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Continuation (Grades 6-8)

CONTACT INFORMATION

4300 Westminster Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19104

Phone: 215-436-0307

Webpage: <https://sesischools.com/locations/excel-middle-years-academy/>

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

Students participate in this program to provide them with the opportunity to successfully transition into a high-school setting of their choice as a result of an intense focus on academic and behavioral goals.

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Milton Alexander, Deputy Superintendent

Scott Cruttenden, Regional Director

Sadiqa Lucas, Executive Director

Cassie Oshinsky, Principal/Instructional Specialist

Melita Johnson, Director of Special Education

Samuel Johnson, Director of Operations

Jaleeca Jacobs, Director of Student Services

Andelain Gingalewski, ESL Teacher

WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, Opportunity Network

Daniel Turner, Director of Instructional Resources

Marcus De Vose, Assistant Director of Transition and Continuation

Tiana Wilson, Assistant Director of the Re-Engagement Center

Nefertiti White, Instructional Support Director

Marlon Riddick, Student Transition Liaison

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Here is a brief description of different aspects of the program, these descriptions were shared by the program and observed as part of the Instructional Walkthrough.

Daily Structure – The student’s day begins with a meet-and-greet followed by a Morning Townhall and GGI. Throughout the day, they are also supported with mental health check-ins and one on one counseling as needed. The school environment is also supported with other structures like monthly spirit weeks, afternoon townhalls, team meetings, and a student of the month recognition.

Teacher Development and Feedback – Lesson plans are submitted weekly to leadership and feedback is provided directly to the teacher, with corrections being made and resubmitted. This is further supported by ongoing professional development (whole school and individual/one-on-one) on specific lesson plan needs. The program also has weekly instructional & operational walkthroughs that occur for each teacher, with feedback provided on the teaching and learning occurring. Operational and leadership staff are all trained in walkthrough protocol and lesson planning. There are also quarterly formal observations that follow the Danielson model occur for all teaching staff. Finally, the program has a structure called “Rounds Observations,” which occur monthly and involve teachers observing one another and providing feedback and support in regards to internally developed Student Learning Questions.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports – MTSS information is discussed and changes to students’ intervention/MTSS supports are made during team meetings, resource meetings, and designated MTSS meetings. Students receive academic interventions in Math & English by using iReady’s adaptive instruction. The program also plans for small group instruction intervention to provide further instruction to students in needed areas. In addition to those supports, LiveSchool is a system used to implement a program-wide PBIS for students. Operational staff tracks student behavior throughout the school day to gain points in a system that can be utilized for student rewards and incentives, as well as parent communication of positive and undesired behaviors. Lastly, Student Attendance Improvement Plans (SAIP) are utilized to track and monitor attendance for students displaying attendance issues. For ongoing interventions, the program prides itself on their parent communication and community involvement to keep student attendance a priority and an on-going strength.

Professional Development – Staff receive professional development weekly on Wednesdays during Common Planning Time (CPT), as well as on scheduled full- and half-day PDs. PD topics include: Lesson Planning and Curriculum Development, Opening Routines, Measurable Objectives, Reading and Literacy Across Content Areas, Social Emotional Learning, as well as Data Analysis and Review. Some staff also participate in the Instructional Residency which is an in-depth professional development focused on the skills needed most by new teachers.

Parent and Family Engagement – The program communicates with parents through many means, including: regular social media posts on multiple platforms, interim reports, red flag meetings whenever there is a concern, report card conferences, and MTSS meetings. In addition, the program hosts Village Thursdays twice a month via zoom or in-person to brainstorm collectively to better service students and families. The program also hosts High School Selection Workshops, and Parental Consultation Meetings, which are supportive meetings to help families address concerns they have.

Use of Data – The program utilizes data in many ways, first- student STAR scores are collected, monitored, and compared three times throughout the school year in Reading and Math. Student course grades are also monitored on an ongoing basis and analyzed quarterly to determine student & staff supports needed in specific content areas or classrooms, and to determine success rates program wide. Daily attendance and participation are also tracked in all classrooms. iReady is utilized weekly in Math & English classes, and students follow individual “My Path” support to receive instruction in specific needs areas. In addition, student growth on this platform is monitored weekly during MTSS meetings. iReady diagnostic and instructional data is analyzed and compared to student grades & STAR scores to determine skill gaps throughout the program and to address further interventions and classroom support needed. When necessary, the program uses the EMYA Force Field (a comprehensive support plan) utilized during team meeting to further support students.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- The program has established a welcoming and supportive student culture with a positive and musical start to the day in Townhouse, warm greetings for students, and many other interactions throughout the day.
- Classrooms observed were active and engaging, and students reacted positively and were excited participants in most activities.
- There was clear evidence of strong adult and student relationships, such as students having nicknames, or body language that they felt pride when receiving praise.
- The program demonstrated a high level of student voice. In many classrooms, students were answering questions and working with partners and in small groups in a positive and productive way.
- The program has created genuine opportunities for student leadership, including not only opportunities for interactions with visitors, but within the classes and among their peers as well.
- Upon review of materials, it was clear teachers planned thoughtfully and looked for engaging resources. To that end, one student interviewed shared it, "feels like teachers here teach."

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 2021-2022 Instructional Walkthrough.

| DOMAINS | PROGRAM PERFORMANCE | TOTAL POSSIBLE | AVERAGE RATING | CATEGORY |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Domain I: Overall Management | 15 | 20 | 3 | Expectations Met |
| Domain II: Instructional Delivery | 17 | 28 | 2.4 | Nearing Expectations |
| Domain III: Conditions for Learning | 21 | 28 | 3 | Expectations Met |
| TOTAL | 53 | 76 | Overall Percentage: 70% | |

DOMAIN 1: OVERALL MANAGEMENT

| Management for a Safe and Educationally Supportive 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. <i>In some instances, such as scavenger hunt in Computer Science, gym exercises in PE/Health, silent hands in Social Studies, students needed multiple redirects, or the teacher was not redirecting students; in PE/Health students were trying to avoid being fully on task and completing all of the exercises; in Computer Science the scavenger hunt became a disruption to the learning environment and students were called out more than once for speaking inappropriately to each other; and in Social Studies, students needed three redirects for using "silent hands". Teachers should stop and reframe the rationale or procedure for following the rules.</i> | | | X | | |
| 5. Teachers display awareness of conditions. | | | | X | |

Summary:

The program has a very warm and welcoming environment, created and driven by strong staff and student relationships as well as several opportunities for student leadership. Rules and many procedures were well established and students were aware of these expectations both program wide and on the classroom level. There were also strong systems in place to redirect student behaviors to keep them focused, or to reinforce positive student behaviors throughout the day in most classrooms. At times however, the structure of specific activities or student participation levels called for more redirection and or a reframing of a procedure, which was not always done or done effectively.

Opportunities for Growth:

- (Standard 4) **The program should provide some professional development and coaching on redirection strategies and modification techniques to support students when they become off-task during complicated or more independent activities (eg, scavenger hunts, exercises in gym, etc.)** Consider focusing on how to redirect behaviors in a more invasive way, while minimizing the negative response from students. For example, focus on strategies that restate the directions, highlight those who are meeting expectations, etc.

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>1. Teachers model the thinking and learning process. <i>Modeling was not consistent from classroom to classroom. At times, there was strong modeling (eg, different exercises in PE/Health, and the reading of a short passage in History). However, more modeling in some other courses would have benefited students in engaging with the task (eg, the film strip activity in ELA and the Venn diagram in Science.)</i></p> | | | X | | |
| <p>2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.</p> | | | | X | |
| <p>3. Lessons are rigorous. <i>There were several examples of students engaging in a high-level task, but the content being taught was not always aligned to the expectation for that course or grade level. In addition, in some courses, there was little academic content, with a much greater focus on skills. For example, in Science where students were learning about the structure of the brain, the lesson was the same for all grades (6-8), which, content-wise, was also not reflected on any of the SDP scope and sequences for 6, 7, or 8th grade.</i></p> | | | X | | |
| <p>4. Students are working harder than their teachers.</p> | | | | X | |
| <p>5. Evidence of data is visible. <i>While there is a data culture in the building, it is primarily focused on participation and behavior rather than student learning and gauging progress or understanding in the moment. Classrooms had excellent student work posted and there was evidence of other data tracking systems. During the observation, there were few activities where teachers could scan student work for trends and then adjust instruction, and when these opportunities did present themselves, rarely was feedback given based on observed trends. Feedback tended to be related to behavior or participation instead of the strength student of responses.</i></p> | | | X | | |
| <p>6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency.</p> | | | | X | |
| <p>7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. <i>During the observations, some questions asked of students were higher level and asked them to explain or defend their thinking, however, the majority of questions were lower level recall type questions. In some cases, students questioning of the teachers was more probing and higher level than the questions teachers posed to the class.</i></p> | | | X | | |

Summary:

The school has a strong culture of making sure that all students are included and engaged in the lesson, asking everyone questions and designing lessons so that students will find the content relevant to their lives. While there was modeling and many of the tasks

were high-level, they were not always aligned to content standards and was often more of how to complete a task than the modeling of a skill or thinking process. Additionally, there was evidence of a data-driven culture, but this was focused primarily on behaviors and celebrating academic success rather than adjusting instruction and increasing the level of student performance. Students were engaged and working hard in all classrooms observed. Teachers designed activities that were fun and interesting for students. Student questioning did not always reach the highest levels, and instead frequently focused on lower level recall responses instead of application and synthesis.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. (Standard 1) **The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on how to plan and execute strong modeling of the skill or thinking process named in their daily lesson objective.** While teachers modeled the task and how to complete the assignment, they did not always provide a strong model of the thinking process or how to implement the skill of the lesson. Consider not only professional development on this approach, but also how you could modify the lesson planning documents and the observation feedback to further support growth in this area.
2. (Standard 3) **The program should provide more curriculum guidance, support, and accountability to ensure that staff are planning lessons and units aligned to the state standards (especially those teachers who may span multiple grade levels.)** Consider your planning process and if there are adjustments that could be made (eg, more feedback on unit plans, etc.) so teachers are focused on content that is aligned to State Standards, and the School District's scope and sequence.
3. (Standard 5) **The program should provide more professional development and coaching on how to collect and respond to data during the lesson to improve student's objective mastery.** Identifying 2-3 strategies for whole group checks for understanding and having teachers have a repertoire of ways to respond to the feedback they see in the lesson would dramatically improve teacher's ability to respond in the moment to student needs and support stronger understanding. Look for ways to apply some of the data driven approach that the program takes with behavior supports and apply them to academic goals as well.
4. (Standard 7) **The program should coach and support teachers with asking all students high-level questions.** While all students were engaged and active during the lesson, many times this was engagement at a low level of academic rigor. Support teachers in crafting, posing, and supporting students to answer high-level questions aligned to the lesson objectives each day.

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. <i>There was inconsistency with the implementation of the program-wide focus areas presented by the leadership team. Overall, classes had opening routines and measurable objectives, and teachers utilized a variety of engagement strategies. However, the use of the gradual release model, exit tickets, and the focus on reading across the classrooms was varied.</i> | | | X | | |

Summary:

The program has a strong teacher presence in all classrooms, with the adults circulating and engaging with students, and redirecting them when necessary. Classes were very engaging with a wide variety of different activities and tools being utilized to keep lessons fresh and interesting. Student-to-student interactions were very frequent and positive, with several opportunities for students to display leadership (assisting visitors, supporting their peers, etc.). There were some successful focus areas as mentioned by the leadership team (eg, opening routines, measurable objectives, and engagement strategies), however, others were not being implemented consistently (eg, gradual release model and reading across content areas.)

Opportunities for Growth:

- (Standard 7) **The program should clarify and better monitor the implementation of their program-wide focus areas.** Consider potentially narrowing the program-wide focus areas, at least until implementation has been established. Consider how focus areas are shared with the staff and students, and how you can better monitor implementation. There are lessons to be learned from the successful implementation of the opening routines, and the measurable objectives to help with the implementation of future program-wide focus areas.

ADDENDUM: SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL LEARNING

SEL Foundation and Execution

As a part of program contract requirements, Transition and Continuation Programs provide explicit Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) instruction by which students can acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. The SEL observations provide a focus on foundations and execution that promote SEL through a modified SAFE (Structured/Sequential, Active/Engaging, Focused, and Explicit/Evaluative) model for effective SEL.

| SAFE MODEL COMPONENTS | N/A | Did Not Meet Expectations (1) | Nearing Expectations (2) | Expectations Met (3) | Exceeding Expectations (4) |
|---|-----|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Structured and Sequential - SEL <i>standards/goals</i> are embedded into lessons; Curriculum/Lesson is <i>connected</i> to students' needs and/or reasons for referral. Lessons are <i>constructed</i> to introduce new concepts or <i>build upon</i> previously learned ones. Session has Opening, Sharing, Activity and Closing. | | | | X | |
| 2. Active - Use <i>active tasks and activities</i> that allow students to <i>practice</i> skills and apply knowledge. Teaching strategies should include discussion with higher-order questioning, role-playing situations with takeaways, peer-teachings, gamified activities, interviews, pauses and reflections, incorporation of the arts/writing, and visuals. | | | | X | |
| 3. Focus - Facilitators can specifically address how a given skill <i>applies</i> in daily life and break down <i>strategies</i> and skills into smaller, more manageable components. Students <i>make connections</i> between SEL and what they're learning and initiate reflection, discussion and practice. The session was more than discussion/talking. Facilitator used a prompt and questioning but did not connect it to a life skill. Students shared and discuss, however, key takeaways or skills was unclear. | | | X | | |
| 4. Explicit and Evaluative - <i>Track/Chart</i> students' SEL progress over time, providing insight into students' skill development and student reviews. <i>Use tools</i> such as exit tickets, grades, rubric/ratings to provide frequent feedback for positive behaviors and identify growth areas as it relates to SEL and assess students' skills acquisition. Facilitator provided questioning during session, however, a main concept or check for understanding was not observed. | | | X | | |

Summary:

The day started with an energetic townhouse and morning ritual. In the session observed, the facilitator led a session with a prompt and reflections. Student voice was present as they discussed a scenario. The session moved quickly and was not supported by a key concept, skill, or takeaway. That being said, students were highly engaged in the circle.

Opportunities for Growth:

- 1) **(Standard 3) The program should ensure sessions are focused on an SEL concept or skill and help student make connections with what they're reflecting on, discussing, and practicing.** Facilitators can infuse SEL competencies in interactive activities and age/culturally relevant examples to assist students with SEL skills application.
- 2) **(Standard 4) The program should ensure intentional connection of topic/session to SEL and check for students' understanding or application.** This could include a round robin, post-it note activity, cold calling or share out of what they learned or how they can use the main idea, concept or skill of the session.