

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 1, 2022

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

2820 North 4th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19133

Phone: 215-423-1776

Webpage: <http://www.onebrightraycommunity.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 Delgado, Chief Executive Officer

Anna Duvivier, Chief Operating Officer

Joycet Velasquez, Chief Academic Officer

Emily Trunfio, Principal

Rachel Turanski, Academic Dean

Dominique Haynes, Dean of Students

WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

Daniel Turner, Director of Instructional Resources

Majeedah Scott, Director of the Office of Multiple Pathways to Graduation

Amy McCourt, Office of Multilingual Services Manager

Nefertiti White, Instructional Support Director

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 – Students are rostered into a cohort based on their individual needs and personal circumstances (with varying start and end times). Students’ rosters consist of three classes, including a Community Building class and a lunch period. Community Building classes include workshops for students on self-development, problem solving, and emotional coping strategies. Students that wish to earn additional credits are also able to add an additional class with another cohort. Academic support is available to students daily either before school or after.

Teacher Development and Feedback – Teachers are provided standards-aligned planning resources for each unit and receive feedback on their unit plans and daily lesson plans from the Dean of Academics. Teachers are observed formally and informally, receiving both written feedback as well as meeting 1:1 to discuss feedback aligned to the Danielson Framework. These observations are used to inform differentiated support for teachers based on their individual needs and student outcomes. Additionally, data collected from these observations is used to plan for common planning time.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports – MTSS meetings are held weekly. The program has an MTSS tracker that is updated with current grades and staff are asked to add comments for the week on current social, emotional, and academic progress. They also note strategies that work to best support students listed. At the end of the meeting, program staff discuss next steps for each student and any follow-up support needed, and make notes to inform future meetings. For students with attendance concerns, the program utilizes phone calls home and the Student Attendance Improvement Plan (SAIP) process. Home visits are scheduled certain students to see how the program can re-engage and/or assist in removing any barriers that are preventing the student from coming to school and being successful. In the program’s Emotional Support Department (EST), a youth engagement advocate assesses students’ reluctance to come to school on a consistent basis and provide additional support. When a student arrives excessively late, they meet with a member of EST to discuss barriers and the impact their lateness has on their success.

Professional Development – Professional development is provided bi-monthly, grouping all OBR teachers by campus or by content area. Content teams are given the opportunity to review curriculum and share supportive content and specific strategies, while campus groups can review campus specific data and share strategies specific to their own school community. Every Wednesday, teachers participate in common planning sessions that focus on program-wide goals and initiatives to increase engagement, build in more opportunities for student thinking during the lesson, and support a more equitable framework around instruction overall.

Parent and Family Engagement – An outreach is made daily to any student who is absent from school. The program strives to always involve parents and guardians in school programming changes and orientate new students and their support systems into the program and culture. Parents are encouraged to sign up to receive the school newsletter, and are able to request login information for PowerSchool to view their child’s grades and attendance. Communication is also sent via email, as well as by phone and text using the PowerSchool platform. At the end of each module, report cards are mailed and emailed to students.

Use of Data – Data is reviewed daily to monitor student performance. Teachers assess students’ work daily through completion of classroom activities, and checks for understanding and closures. Common planning is utilized throughout the year to implement effective strategies to discuss student work and improve instructional outcomes using the Last Protocol strategy, as well as campus specific PDs to engage and break through academic barriers with students. This data is used to inform instructional next steps for the class. The STAR test is used as a screener and tool to measure student growth in Math and Reading.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- The program has a warm welcoming environment, with a clean and well-maintained building and warm staff greetings for everyone.
- There was evidence of strong relationships between students and staff; clearly, students are aware of one another and have built rapport.
- Technology was strongly integrated and improved learning, allowing teachers to give feedback very efficiently and effectively throughout the lesson.
- Student engagement was strong across classrooms, and was achieved through a wide variety of engagement strategies.
- Lesson planning was rigorous and aligned to state standards.
- Teachers were observed using data in the moment, scanning student work (both physical papers and looking at digital documents in the google classroom), and providing helpful feedback in the moment.
- Students were taking risks and taking ownership of their learning as they asked questions and responded to challenging questions.

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	18	20	3.6	Exceeds Expectations
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	17	28	2.4	Nearing Expectations
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	21	28	3	Expectations Met
TOTAL	56	76	Overall Percentage: 74%	

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.				X	

Summary:

The program has a warm and welcoming environment, that began with a very clean and well-maintained facility, but continued through strong systems and procedures, acknowledgement of students by all staff, and even creative use of their courtyard for basketball. The strong systems established program- wide were all present in the classrooms where Google Classroom was used seamlessly by both students and teachers to support instruction. There was no evidence of students not following the rules during the walkthrough, and teachers were observed acknowledging those on task and working hard. Teachers were able to do this by being aware of the classroom conditions and scanning and circulating frequently to provide feedback and support to students as needed.

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. <i>While students were engaged and finding connections to their work, it was not clear if teachers had considered building relevancy for students into their lessons. Consider provide more opportunities for student choice and trying to find topics or materials relevant to your students.</i>			X		
3. Lessons are rigorous.				X	
4. Students are working harder than their teachers. <i>In several of the classrooms, teachers seemed to get stuck in the "I Do" section of the gradual release model, and students were not expected to carry the cognitive load until much later in the lesson. Consider working to develop more opportunities for students to carry the cognitive load earlier in the lesson, with checks for understanding etc.</i>			X		
5. Evidence of data is visible.				X	
6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency. <i>While some teachers (namely in History and Biology in particular) focused on making sure all students were engaged in the lesson and answering questions. However, there were many teachers who relied on volunteers and only questioned the group as a whole instead of calling on individuals.</i>			X		
7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. <i>Most questions observed were lower-level DOK questions, with some exceptions. Moreover, these questions were often answered by a select few students, and not everyone was pushed to answer the higher-level questions.</i>			X		

Summary:

The program has an established instructional model where teachers create standards-aligned lesson plans and include modeling of the skill or concept. While some students were able to find relevance in the content, it did not appear teachers were purposefully planning for their students to find the materials and activities relevant. In addition, there is room to use text more to drive instruction, and to rely less heavily on videos and lecture to deliver content. When considering the gradual release model, some teachers held the thinking load longer than was necessary. Pushing the cognitive load onto students allows them to internalize even more of the content. There was strong evidence of teachers using technology to help monitor student responses and use information to adjust their instruction. Making sure all students were engaged in the lesson and responding to questions was inconsistent, meaning some teachers were more focused on this than others. In addition, only in limited classrooms were all students responding to higher-level questioning, where more frequently it was evident among a small group of students.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. (Standard 2) **The program should provide professional development and adjust their planning process to better support teachers in purposefully choosing relevant lesson materials and activities.** Consider utilizing common planning time to give teachers space to collaboratively work through choosing relevant activities and content for students. This may be further strengthened by reviewing the lesson planning process/template and looking for ways to ensure that relevancy is considered more in the planning process.
2. (Standard 4) **The program should provide more coaching for teachers on how and when to move the cognitive load onto students earlier in the gradual release model.** This is a more nuanced skill and will likely require real-time coaching as teachers need (based on student feedback and responses) to shift the cognitive load at an earlier point in the lesson. Consider connecting with the School District for resources and support with this type of coaching.
3. (Standard 6) **The program should provide professional development on techniques or systems that teachers can use to ensure all students are being questioned.** Consider using resources like the books, *Teach Like a Champion* or *Total Participation Techniques*, to identify and share some of these strategies/techniques.
4. (Standard 7) **The program should provide coaching for teachers to ensure all students are being asked questions at the highest level of complexity.** Consider how your classroom observations and teacher coaching can be leveraged to make sure everyone has equitable access to these questions, either through adjusting teacher techniques, developing systems to ensure all students are called on, or real-time coaching when the leader notices an opportunity to include more 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.				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:

The program utilizes a wide variety of engagement strategies to ensure all students are involved in the lesson. This, when used alongside their technology tools to monitor student work, led to minimal off task or disengaged students. In the student interviews it was noted that teachers often offer extra help, and that students feel very respected by the staff. This was shown in the students' willingness to comply with teacher directions and answer questions even when the teacher was cold calling. There was strong student-to-student interactions observed, however, there is an opportunity to provide more space for group work and student-to-student collaboration (this was most present in Art and Chemistry). The program executed well on their program-wide focus areas, including gradual release, using Google Classroom, engagement strategies, and data-based decision making.