



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 7, 2022

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

3133 Ridge Avenue, Philadelphia PA 19132

Phone: 215-999-3110

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 A. Delgado, Chief Executive Officer

Anna Duvivier, Chief Operating Officer

Joycet Velasquez, Chief Academic Officer

Thaddeus Falana, Principal

Kellen Massie, Dean of Students

WALKTHROUGH REVIEW TEAM

DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, Opportunity Network

Daniel Turner, Director of Instructional Resources

Tiana Wilson, Assistant Director, Re-Engagement Center

Brett Botwinis-Zaba, Special Education Advisor

Nefertiti White, Director of Special Education

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 – There are many flexibilities built into the program’s schedule. Generally, students take up to three credits each term and have 75-minute classes daily. Students are also scheduled in an advisory and a community building course to support their college and career planning and social and emotional learning needs. There are “review and revise” periods built into the calendar to provide students with academic support, as well as daily supports provided by teachers after school three days each week.

Teacher Development and Feedback – Teachers submit lesson plans weekly, which can be written in collaboration with other teachers in the same subject area at other One Bright Ray sites. Feedback is given in writing via google docs or in one-on-one meetings with the principal. The principal performs walkthroughs frequently for informal feedback and provides formal feedback at varying levels based on teacher experience and performance. All teachers receive personalized coaching, although this support is differentiated based on performance and alignment to the programs’s priorities.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports – The school has a referral system where teachers submit a student’s name for discussion and the creation of a support plan. School-wide, all staff MTSS meetings are held monthly to craft these plans with input from as many stakeholders as possible and incorporate a wide range of both academic and non-academic data sources. Plans are reviewed and adjustments are made every four weeks.

Professional Development – The Mansion team participates in weekly Common Planning Time where the principal can provide support on program specific development areas as well as allow for collaborative planning. In addition, the One Bright Ray team provides regular network-wide PDs, which include topics such as lesson structure, engagement strategies, and writing in all content areas.

Parent and Family Engagement – There are a variety of reasons for family engagement, and methods to do so. When there are concerns, the Dean of Students will arrange parent meetings (either in person or via google meets) to address them and develop a plan for improvement. In addition, the program utilizes different team members, and a variety of methods, to share other information about grades, college and career planning, and more. This is often determined on an individual level, as the program serves many older students with diverse family dynamics. Such outreach includes phone calls home, emails, text messages, and other social media postings.

Use of Data – The program uses data in several different ways, such as determining student success, identifying the need for intervention, and determining future programming for the program. There are some reports created by the Director of School Improvement which guide some academic supports, while attendance reports often guide the work of the program’s “Engagement Team.” When students do not make academic progress in their courses, teachers connect with families to provide additional support. All of this is also incorporated into the schools MTSS system.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- There was evidence of rapport between staff and students, and a warm culture in the building.
- There was consistent use of technology and engagement strategies
- There was a high level of writing observed during the walkthrough, and many tasks for students to complete in varying formats.
- There was evidence of consistent implementation of engaging openings across classrooms.
- The program has a support system in place of colored cards (supportive tips) on a ring, which was present in all classrooms.
- The program has strong alignment between program goals, teacher PD, and feedback/support.
- Lessons reviewed were generally aligned to the objective, as well as unit goals

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	18	28	2.6	Expectations Met
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	19	28	2.7	Expectations Met
TOTAL	52	76	Overall Percentage: 68%	

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 staff greeted students warmly and created a welcoming environment. The rules and norms are well established, and there were very few disruptions observed during the visit. Classrooms were focused, and on task behaviors were acknowledged and re-enforced effectively. Teachers were actively monitoring their classrooms and providing support as needed, as well as working to keep everyone focused on the task at hand. Consider adjusting your seating arrangements to be more welcoming and to encourage more student-to-student interactions, as some classrooms had students spread very far apart.

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>There were some strong examples of modeling with a think-aloud, particularly in art history, however, this wasn't consistent across classrooms. While modeling was mentioned in lesson plans, which included graphic organizers as a differentiation strategy), these were not modeled effectively.</i></p>			X		
<p>2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.</p>				X	
<p>3. Lessons are rigorous. <i>There were rigorous tasks, especially when students were asked to write. However, this was not supported in the execution of the content objectives. For example, students often went directly into revisions or writing without spending time discussing the concept/content named in the objective. Another missed opportunity was in Community Building where the viewing guide only asked comprehension questions (eg, "What happened in the movie?") instead of analysis or application questions.</i></p>			X		
<p>4. Students are working harder than their teachers.</p>				X	
<p>5. Evidence of data is visible. <i>English teacher used data from student writing and then addresses one frequent area of misunderstanding in her opening activities the next week. There were examples when teachers were given feedback to students based on their writing. Making these data-based decisions even more evident for students may be useful, creating a culture of constant improvement and growth. Consider adding or connecting these moments for teachers to share to the aligned sections of their lesson plans.</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.</p>				X	

Summary:

The program has created an environment where students are engaged and working on a variety of tasks and can often times find relevancy and connect to the content being taught. In addition, although class sizes are small, all students are being questioned and are pushed to respond to high-level questions. There was inconsistent modeling among classrooms, with some classrooms having a strong model to follow (eg, art history), while others either did not model, or did not execute the modeling described in their lesson plans to fidelity. Students were not always engaging in the rigorous work described in the lesson objective, but would sometimes seem to get stuck in answering questions that were recall and not application or analysis. Finally, there was a lack of consistency in the use of data from the lesson to drive instructional decisions. If teachers are making adjustments based on data, this should be done with more transparency for students and the supports provided should connect more clearly to the MTSS support plans.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. (Standard 1) **The program should provide more development and coaching on effective modeling strategies.** Support should focus on the execution of modeling to be effective in building student understanding, as staff are already including modeling in their plans, but it is not be implemented as designed.
2. (Standard 3) **The program should provide more professional development and coaching support in creating rigorous content objectives.** Focus on not just continuing to have students write, but giving them text to reference or first providing an opportunity to discuss a concept before moving to writing about the concept. This will allow for more consideration of the idea/concept and allow students to develop a deeper understanding of the material.
3. (Standard 5) **The program should identify some high-leverage data points, and support teachers with development and coaching on making lesson adjustments based on that data.** The program has some staff who are making data-based adjustments, so consider utilizing some common planning time or other collaboration time to further develop teacher capacity in this area.

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. <i>A variety of student activities were observed (eg, create a presentation, use jam board, card game, watch video, etc), but there were some missed opportunities for students to own the learning, for example, have students come up to smartboard rather than remain at their desks, using student pair share, etc. No class during the walkthrough had more than five students, but all teachers used a traditional lecture style seating. Rather than lecture-style seating, instead suggest circles or discussion format pods in class to bring students and teachers closer together. Another example was in the editing warm up in English 1; there were no visual revisions taking place, instead it was all just described by the teacher. Consider more engaging techniques.</i>			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>Program-wide focus areas examined were: engaging openings, strong outcomes, utilizing space to support instruction, use of technology, reading and writing throughout the curriculum, and higher order thinking prompts. The walkthrough team saw extensive use of technology and when class openings were observed, they were engaging, although they could be more inclusive. There was mixed evidence of reading and writing throughout the curriculum, with more emphasis on writing. This caused missed opportunities for student voice and student read aloud. Higher-order thinking prompts were mixed and use of classroom space could have been better to encourage student participation and reduce the impact of lower student attendance. Did not observe strong outcomes.</i>			X		

Summary:

The program had high levels of student engagement, and when asked to interact with one another, students had productive conversations. At times, these conversations would have been more productive and involved more students if they had been seated more closely together. In addition, students knew the school norms and were appropriately responsive to staff directions. Teachers seemed to be aware and knew how to redirect when students were off task. While there were a variety of engagement strategies

observed, though teachers seem hesitant or unwilling to adjust some things for small class and instead delivered the lesson with structures more appropriate for a much larger class. Some program-wide focus areas were successful, but this was not consistent across all focus areas.

Opportunities for Growth:

1. (Standard 2) **The program should provide professional development on different class structures that would best serve small class sizes and maximize engagement.** Consider ways to help teachers be creative with seating and different lesson elements to maximize student engagement and provide strong visual supports.
2. (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 their implementation has been established. Consider how the focus areas are shared with the staff and the students, and how you can better monitor their implementation. There are lessons that can be learned from the successful implementation of the opening routines and the integration of technology to help with the implementation of future program- wide focus areas.