THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

OPPORTUNITY NETWORK
INSTRUCTIONAL WALKTHROUGH 2021-2022
Program Name: Gateway to College
Provider: Community College of Philadelphia

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 20, 2022

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Dual Enrollment (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

1700 Spring Garden Street, Winnet Building, S3-15A, Philadelphia, PA 19130

Phone: 215-751-8425

Webpage: https://www.ccp.edu/academic-offerings/high-school-student-programs/gateway-college

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

Students complete courses at the local college that permit them to gain high school credits for graduation as well as obtain college credits prior to graduation.

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Dr. David E. Thomas, Associate Vice President, Strategic Initiatives; Dean, Division of Access & Community Engagement; Executive Director, Institute for Community Engagement & Civic Leadership

Monifa Young, Director, Gateway to College

Thomas Stubbs, Assistant Director, Gateway to College

Jim Alexander, Special Education Coordinator, Gateway to College

WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, Opportunity Network

Daniel Turner, Director of Instructional Resources

Seth Morones, Strategy Analyst II

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Gateway to College program, located at the Community College of Philadelphia (CCP), is an Opportunity Network contracted program offering students the opportunity to participate in a dual enrollment and allows students to gain high school credits while participating in college courses. 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 – Students attend their academic courses based on their individual schedule; these courses are taught by CCP instructors. In addition to those courses, students have a weekly one-to-one meeting with their Academic Coordinator. Students also participate in daily advisory meeting, as well as workshops, some courses (eg, Hip-Hop and Ethics, Senior Seminar, and Achievement Lab).

Teacher Development and Feedback – It is important to note that the college faculty are evaluated and supported by their department deans. The Gateway staff, the Hip-Hop and Ethics as well as Senior Seminar teachers, are observed by the program coordinator through unannounced observations; feedback is shared afterward. There are also weekly meetings to discuss student data and how it can inform the work of the academic coordinators during Achievement Lab and one-to-one check-ins with students

Multi-Tiered System of Supports – Gateway offers a variety of student supports. The program begins gathering data about students' strengths and growth areas starting with their info sessions and continuing through their placement testing and the supports provided during Bootcamp (a content area remedial support initiative for reading and math). The program continues to collect data from the students' professors as they implement student supports. Student supports include individualized scheduling, 1:1 meetings with the academic coordinator and other staff members, and the supports and resources provided by CCP and the Center of Disability.

Professional Development – Instructional staff received professional development from CCP in a series entitled, "Stronger Together: Pedagogy, Integrity, and Community." They also received development on trauma informed care, leadership development, and effective student support.

Parent and Family Engagement – Parents are contacted via text messages, phone calls, letters home about student progress, and other key announcements. There are also bi-weekly emails sent to the students and parents entitled "Shout-out and Update." In addition, there are also parent facing workshops are held in partnership with CCP.

Use of Data – The program collects and uses the following data to determine student supports:
- Starfish early warning alerts from professors
- Bi-weekly SAT notes
- Edgenuity progress reports
- Canvas grades
- STAR assessment scores/other progress monitoring tools
- Midterm/end of semester grades
- Other information from Academic Coordinator weekly meetings and daily check-ins (student self-reported progress)

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- The program has established a welcoming environment for students, and strong relationships, including providing flexibility wherever possible to support students' unique schedules.
- There were very strong conversations and discussion about complex topics in the Hip-Hop and Ethics course despite attendance challenges, such as several students arriving late to class.
- There were a number of opportunities where staff celebrated student successes and accomplishments, although at times this was limited to a small number of students.
- The staff utilizes a variety of engagement strategies and modalities such as leveraging student leadership to encourage more student engagement with the program.
- Classroom procedures were well established and students participated fully in whatever way staff asked.

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	14	20	2.8	Expectations Met
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	12	20	2.4	Nearing Expectations
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	18	28	2.6	Expectations Met
TOTAL	44	76	Overall Percentage: 65%	

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.				X	
5. Teachers display awareness of conditions. *There was not a robust structured check-in and monitoring system for the students who participated virtually. For in-person, staff were talking and engaging with students, and had an awareness of how they were spending their time. However, for those participating virtually, this awareness was not observed. Consider ways to adjust the delivery of your supports, be that advisory or in Achievement Lab, to better suit the environment and attendance levels.*			X		

Summary:

The program has created a warm and welcoming environment, and the teaching staff were all energetic and excited to see students. Students in attendance all seemed familiar with the rules and procedures for the Achievement Lab and other structures, and there were no behavior concerns or disruptions. Positive praise was offered to students who were participating both in person and virtually, although this praise was reserved for a small group, and a more inclusive approach to the praise will likely better support engagement. There were some attempts to engage students during their virtual check-in, but staff did not seem to have a clear sense of how students were spending time if they were participating virtually.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. (Standard 5) **The program should develop stronger systems to monitor students and ensure that they are engaging with the programs academic supports, especially when those students are engaging virtually.** This could be a stronger and more intentional check-in where the staff member has prepared for the support block by reviewing student data (Edgenuity progress, current course grades, etc.) and having an awareness of what they should prioritize for the support period. Utilize technology resources (eg, a second computer, breakout rooms etc. so productive 1:1 conversations can take place even in the hybrid 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.				X	
2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.	X				
3. Lessons are rigorous.	X				
4. Students are working harder than their teachers. *There were inconsistent levels of students working harder than their teachers observed. For example, in Achievement Lab, work was done independently so students were owning the cognitive load, however, in Advisory and Senior Seminar, the structure was direct lecture and students had little opportunity to own the learning. However, Hip-Hop and Ethics did offer opportunities for students to engage with lesson and express their thoughts/opinions.*			X		
5. Evidence of data is visible. *The program utilizes several data sources (eg, attendance, Starfish, STAR, Accuplacer) and has systems in place to review this as a team. However, it was unclear how in practice this data then impacts the supports and interventions students are receiving and how, for example, students not progressing (ie, not logging into Edgenuity, not attending classes) are being supported in real time.*			X		
6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency.				X	
7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. *During several of the observations, all students present were being questioned and participating, though the level of questioning was lower-level, meaning there were very few comparing/judging/analyzing prompts with the exception of the Hip-Hop and Ethics class where all students were engaged in higher-level questions, which was not consistent in the other supports for students.*			X		

DOMAIN II: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY, *continued*

Summary:

In general, the program had an inconsistent implementation with different components of instructional delivery. This divide was clearest when comparing the Achievement Lab, Advisory, and Senior Seminar with the Hip-Hop and Ethics class. In most instances, the different components were strong in the Hip-Hop and Ethics course, but much less apparent (or not observed at all) in other courses. For example, Hip-Hop and Ethics included modeling, higher-order questioning of all students, and had students working harder than their teachers. The direct lecture-style of Advisory and Senior Seminar led to less questioning and students not owning the cognitive load.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. (Standard 4) **The program should clarify their vision and then coach and support staff in leading the Senior Seminar and Achievement Lab so students are owning the thinking and more cognitively engaged in the work of those structures.** While not traditional academic courses, these classes too should have a lesson plan and goals established for students each day. Consider how best to support and implement these structures to meet the instructional needs of the students.

2. (Standard 5) **The program should strategically identify the most impactful data points to inform the work of the different components of their program, and then adjust those structures to impact those data points.** Consider for example, the daily advisory structure is likely tied to attendance or other school culture metrics, and how the advisory structure then be adjusted to help improve those metrics. For examples, advisors could reach out in the moment when students are not in class, or utilize more community-building activities to encourage students to feel more connected to school. Another example is staff using academic data points to drive their conversations and goal setting with students during Achievement Lab. Consider having interactive trackers for each student that the student has access to so they understand where they are in terms of tasks to complete, assignments to submit, and progress made. Being more data driven will improve the effectiveness of these structures.

3. (Standard 7) **The program should provide professional development and coaching for the leaders of the Achievement Lab, Advisory, and Senior Seminar structures on how to more effectively question students at a high level.** While not traditional academic courses, there is certainly room for higher-level thinking and discussions within these structures. Consider development and coaching on how staff can plan for and incorporate this type of questioning into those lesson structures so they are 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. *Teachers were checking in with students and making efforts to see if they had a focus for the day, however, in Achievement Lab, staff were not frequently circulating/checking on student screens etc. (especially those participating virtually) to make sure they were engaged or on task.*			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. *There were multiple, positive student-to-student interactions observed, however, there were no collaborative student activities observed, such as an ice breaker, think/pair/share, etc.*			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. *While there were some examples of outreach to boost student attendance shared in the leadership presentation, and teachers had an awareness of who should/or likely would not be attending class, there were not visible efforts to improve student attendance (eg, text messages, phone calls, tracking logs, etc.) observed during the walkthrough.*			X		

Summary:

The program has strong engagement from those students who attended class, and there was clear evidence of caring teacher/student relationships. This was further supported by the students' willingness to participate and engage in a variety of activities, either in person or virtually (primarily via the chat). Additionally, the program had a variety of structures for engaging with students, through in-person and virtually engagement, campus culture events, phone calls, emails, home visits, and more. These efforts also include a student group—Gateway Leadership Council—to help coordinate some of the outreach and engagement events. However, within classroom structures, there were few opportunities for students to work together, and at times there was not strong monitoring of student engagement. Lastly, the program-wide focus on improving attendance was only observed as a an understanding of the data instead of active outreach efforts to improve attendance.

Opportunities for Growth:
1. (Standard 1) **The program should provide professional development and coaching on how to effectively monitor students during independent work time, particularly for virtual/hybrid students.** This includes creating new structures or routines, and or adjusting expectations for students during achievement lab and other instances of independent work time. Additionally, this includes establishing a norm of cameras on, more frequent check-ins by staff, etc. Consider how to include student voice here as to which methods they find most supportive.

2. (Standard 4) **The program should provide professional development and planning support to staff on how to incorporate more interactive activities into their lessons.** Consider utilizing common planning time (CPT) as a structure where this work can take place, as it aligns well to the collaborative approach of that structure.
3. (Standard 7) **The program should develop clear methods and actions to take place routinely as part of their focus areas.** Having a clear action or practice reflecting the focus area will connect the daily practices of staff to the goal they are hoping to reach, for example, making daily outreach efforts would align to an attendance goal.