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 15, 2022

Contract Term: FY 2018 - FY 2022

Program Type: Accelerated (Grades 9-12)

CONTACT INFORMATION

444 N. 3rd Street, 4th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107

Phone: 215-567-2410

Webpage: https://www.oicofamerica.org/

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

OIC CADI's program was designed to offer accelerated classes in traditional settings with direct instruction being supplemented by integrated technology.

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

C. Benjamin Lattimore, Director, National Literacy Programs

Dana Rapoport, Principal

Yvonne Knowles, Career Counselor and Case Manager

Lester Lowery, SEL Counselor and Case Manager

N'Kenge Feagin, Special Programs Coordinator

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, Instructional Support Special Education Advisor

Jazz Council, Relationships First Coach

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 take at least five classes, and each period is 50-minutes long. Outside of their classes, students also have an advisory period three days a week, focusing on SEL supports, community building, and academic advising. The other two days a week during the advisory time, there are academic supports where students can get extra support in math or reading, meet with teachers for one-on-one conferences, or complete any missing assignments. Students are also encouraged to take advantage of staff office hours, offered after school three days a week.

Teacher Development and Feedback – Teachers were given support over the summer to craft course units, aligned to standards, and build from the SDP frameworks. Teachers are also given lesson plan feedback via email each week. Informal visits take place weekly and are aligned to a look-fors document as well as the individual teacher coaching goals. The program has a weekly Common Planning Time (CPT) meeting where teachers collaboratively work on planning.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports – Most supports are provided during the advisory program, which is designed to meet students' social emotional as well as academic needs. Students also meet weekly with their counselor to discuss and work at eliminating barriers to their success. There are also MTSS meetings twice each week, where teachers and school staff discuss supports and adjust as necessary.

Professional Development – The instructional staff have received feedback on the following topics:
- Nurtured Heart Training (positive approaches, de-escalation training)
- Threat Assessment (training on handling a crisis)
- Inclusive Openings
- Restorative Justice and Advisory (led by Relationships First team)
- Alma Training (program's new in-house student information system)
- Achieve3000 (literacy and math computer adaptive support programs)

Parent and Family Engagement – The program leadership described the following tools for parent and family outreach:
- Weekly & ongoing calls to students and families
- Utilizing social media platform
- Creating flyers to electronically send out to students through Remind App (Updating students and families on special school events, school schedule, and school updates)
- Pop-ups on the program's website
- Family meetings
- Report Card conferences

Use of Data – The program leadership shared the instructional staff use the following to monitor student performance:
- STAR testing is done at the time of enrollment, as well as the beginning of each quarter. The data is then reviewed by staff and used to determine appropriate groupings and student needs for support.
- Attendance data is monitored using the Alma system, ScholarChip, and Infinite Campus.
- Advisors have weekly one-on-one check-ins with students to review their grades and attendance and to set weekly goals.
- The staff reviews data on attendance and academics twice weekly in their MTSS meetings.
- Teachers review student grades on content specific assessments and use this to adjust plans and reteach as necessary.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM AREAS OF STRENGTH

- There were strong staff student relationships and warm interactions observed.
- Improvement in the instructional environment (such as the posting of objectives, arrangement of furniture, and presentation of instruction) by teachers was noted in alignment to the leadership team's walkthrough overview when compared to prior visits.
- There was a strong response to student data observed in the lead teacher's classroom. The teacher had a great response to a lack of student understanding, providing extra examples and assistance before beginning the independent task.
- Special Education teacher was observed being very active and impactful in supporting students, in multiple content areas and of students who both have and do not have an IEP.
- Students were aware of expectations and were observed generally meeting those expectations, and most were engaged in the lessons.

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	13	20	2.6	Expectations Met
Domain II: Instructional Delivery	11	28	1.6	Nearing Expectations
Domain III: Conditions for Learning	15	28	2.1	Nearing Expectations
TOTAL	39	76	Overall Percentage: 51%	

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. *There were only a few students who did not follow the school or classroom level rules, and redirection for these students was limited Students who could not respond to questions because they were disengaged or students doing something other than the lesson were not redirected.*			X		
5. Teachers display awareness of conditions. *One teacher (English) noted that students were not yet ready to move on in the lesson and pivoted to insert another class-wide activity to reinforce the lesson. The additional activity was also more relevant to students (a favorite movie versus the play* A Raisin in the Sun*). Some teachers circulated amongst students or intentionally popcorned to ensure all students were being engaged. But this standard had mixed evidence. For example, in some classes, the teacher lectured on and was not concerned with lack of engagement, or one student voice dominating the discussion, or students off-track. Also, teachers did not generally go deeper with checks for understanding and therefore it is unclear if the teacher was aware if students were engaged, following the lesson, or mastering the content.*			X		

Summary: In general, students were following the school rules and procedures, and redirections were minimal. However, there were not consistent expectations from room to room, particularly in student redirecting, and there were questions as to what the expectations were for students both engaging in the lesson. The program was welcoming and inviting to students, shown by being greeted as they entered the classroom and positive interactions with most staff.

Opportunities for Growth:
1. (Standard 4) **The program should provide more professional development and coaching support for teachers on effective redirection strategies.** This will support teachers in establishing consistent expectations for students, and for addressing students when they are not meeting expectations in a way that gets the student re-engaged with the lesson and does not escalate the situation to be more disruptive. As part of this professional development and coaching, ensure there is a consistent and clear set of expectations for students across all classrooms.
2. (Standard 5) **The program should provide professional development as well as coaching and more frequent accountability for teachers on how to monitor students and their understanding of the lesson material.** This would need to include both classroom management monitoring (eg, scanning to make sure students are on task) as well as more instructional monitoring such as asking whole group checks for understanding. Teachers should have an increased awareness of who is and is not engaged in the lesson as well as comprehending the content and then making the necessary adjustments.

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 inconsistent modeling observed across classrooms, and where it was present it most often was a model of how to complete a task or access a resource rather than how to think through a skill or concept. The exception to this was observed in the English 3 classroom where the teacher did model identifying and explaining symbolism both in the text as well as in a familiar movie.*			X		
2. Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students. *Some attempts to make the curriculum relevant for students were observed, but the majority of this was done by in-the-moment teacher attempts and or providing choices for students. It was not evident that there was prior planning to create relevance or selection of materials that would be relevant for students. For example, Math problems were not given in context when they could have been presented that way. Additionally, in some instances, relevant connections were attempted but not successful (eg, connecting the US Civil War to the war in Ukraine.)*			X		
3. Lessons are rigorous. *The lesson topics and informational content observed were largely grade level appropriate (eg, causes of civil war, heterotrophs, and autotrophs, etc.)- but there was very little students were asked to do and few examples of students engaging in rigorous tasks. Instead, students were primarily listening to lecture-style instruction or activities that were more creative in nature (eg, poster making, cut and paste) instead of writing or practice activities.*			X		
4. Students are working harder than their teachers. *Most lessons observed were passive and students were not very active or engaged. There were some exceptions, however, the lecture-style lesson structure was common and often did not include an aligned student activity. There was not strong evidence of the program-wide priority of student-to-student interactions or questioning that led to students explaining their thinking.*		X			
5. Evidence of data is visible. *There were not examples of teachers scanning or looking over student work to identify trends or gaps, and there was no mention of prior student performance informing the instruction. Postings of exemplar student work were not observed nor were there any displays to celebrate progress etc. in the classrooms visited.*		X			
6. Teachers question all students with the same frequency. *Some teachers worked to engage all students, however, it was inconsistent across the program. Often, students were able to disengage from the lesson and the teacher would not engage them with questions.*			X		

Components of Effective Instruction	N/A	Did Not Meet Expectations (1)	Nearing Expectations (2)	Expectations Met (3)	Exceeding Expectations (4)
7. Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. *While there was some evidence of higher-order tasks in the lesson plans, most of the questions observed during classroom observations were lower-level recall questions. There was little evidence of students engaging with high-order comprehension or analysis questions in writing in the classes observed today.*		X			

Summary: In general, the instruction observed was mixed but overall nearing expectations, and there were some aspects of some classrooms where teachers were connecting with students and making strategic instructional decisions. The lesson plans reviewed were aligned to grade level standards, however, they can be designed for students to see more relevance in the lesson tasks and materials. The execution of these plans needs to be more consistent. In several cases the activities/questions observed in the class did not align to the plans that were written, and were not of the appropriate rigor. Students need to be more engaged and own more of the thinking, as well as interacting with their peers more frequently.

Opportunities for Growth:
1) (Standard 1) **The program should provide professional development and coaching on how to model a concept or thinking process for students aligned to the standard.** This involves crafting a more consistent vision for strong instruction, which should be rooted in the School District of Philadelphia framework, the gradual release model, or another research backed method, which may also depend on the best practices for each content area. Consider how this topic could be included weekly CPT, and leverage those already modeling effectively.
2) (Standard 2) **The program should adjust their lesson planning template and provide more accountability (as well as training and support as needed) for teachers to plan activities and select materials relevant for their students.** Having relevant activities and materials is a well understood approach to improving engagement, and one that is likely needed in an accelerated learning environment. Consider ways to adjust current systems to make sure lesson plans require teachers to consider how their content and delivery helps students to find relevance.
3) (Standard 3) **The program should provide more accountability and coaching for teachers to deliver lessons as designed (or to adjust in the moment) so that lessons are rigorous and grade level appropriate.** This could be more frequent classroom observations, peer-to-peer observations, more coaching, or other accountability tools. The goal is lessons are delivered as planned, or when adjustments are made, the level of rigor is maintained.
4) (Standard 4) **The program should provide professional development and coaching to support teachers in adopting a stronger understanding of the instructional model, and an active/engaging approach to lesson design.** Teachers need support in moving from a lecture model to a more interactive model, and one in which students are owning the thinking and the teacher acts as less of a lecturer and more of a facilitator of learning. Consider revisiting the expectations for teachers to have student-to-student interactions as one key component of this shift/vision—CPT is an excellent place to reinforce this vision/expectation.
5) (Standard 5) **The program should provide professional development and coaching on how to collect and respond to student data during the class period, as well as in a longer term.** This could be adopting a small number of program-wide check for understanding strategies (like Everybody Writes from Teach Like a Champion for example) allowing teachers to gather data on the understanding of all students, and then respond in a strategic way to improve the groups' comprehension of the topic or skill. This can also be professional development in supporting teachers with using assessment data to adjust and differentiate the instruction to meet individual student needs.
6) (Standard 6) **The program should provide more coaching and accountability for teachers to consistently question all students.** This could also mean adopting a few strategies that support teachers in making sure they question all students (such as tools to assist with cold calling, tracking tools, etc.). It may also be useful to establish this as a clear norm and something that is expected and should be observed during observations, including informal visits.

7) (Standard 7) **The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on higher-order questioning strategies and Webb's Depth of Knowledge (or another tool) so that they may engage all students with higher-order thinking opportunities.** There was evidence of these questions in lesson plans, however, they were not being asked during classroom observations. Support teachers with opportunities to develop the skill of asking higher level questions, and how to support students as they are challenged with these questions and may need more support in the moment. Consider this as a topic for CPT where teachers can work collaboratively to craft these questions.

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. *While in some classrooms observed the teacher demonstrated strong awareness, in others students were engaged in other videos on their laptops while the teacher was instructing the class. Students had their heads down on the desk and headphones/earbuds playing music during the instruction. Consider more directly and clearly communicating when students should or should not be on their computers.*			X		
2. Teachers use a variety of engagement strategies. *A lecture-style of teaching was observed in several classrooms. Students were taking notes, and or completing assignments independently. Consider more group work, think/pair/shares or turn-and-talks to increase engagement and student participation. There were few engagement strategies from prior PDs and community building activities from advisory observed during the visit.*		X			
3. Students appear to be engaged in the lesson.				X	
4. Students are interacting appropriately with other students. *There were minimal opportunities for students to interact with one another during the observations.. It is critical for overall student success that they are presented with more of these opportunities to interact in an academic setting. Complete more turn-and-talks, think/pair/shares, or group work during the lesson to allow students to work and interact with one another.*		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. *During the walkthrough, there were some attempts at the program-wide focus areas as mentioned in the leadership presentation. There was little focus on allowing students to explain their thinking and pushing them to build upon their answers. In addition, there was inconsistent pacing. Consider providing more think time as opposed to having students shout out answers, thereby allowing other students a chance to answer. Another possible solution is allowing students to write answers on a piece of paper or white board until all students have answered the check for understanding. Most (but not all) classrooms had their daily objectives or an agenda posted.*				X	

Summary: The program has established strong relationships between staff and students, which was was visible in their interactions and in the safe and trusting environment many teachers have created in their classrooms. In addition, most students followed adult directions quickly and were comfortable asking clarifying questions when they did not understand. There were, however, students distracted and not engaging in the lesson by watching videos or listening to music. Teachers who were utilizing the lecture-style of teaching often ignored this behavior or did not address it effectively. There were few opportunities for student-to-student interaction and a low number of engagement strategies were used to encourage participation and higher-level thinking.

Opportunities for Growth:
1) (Standard 1) **The program should provide professional development and coaching support to teachers on effective classroom management strategies (eg, circulating, positive narration, less invasive redirections, etc.).** This type of professional development will help teachers and other staff consistently maintain the program-wide expectations for engagement and support them in refocusing students who are off-task and/or distracted. Consider working with a proven resource (eg, the School District's new teacher PD sessions on these topics) or the Relationships First team to help support this work.
2) (Standard 2) **The program should provide more coaching and accountability for teachers to utilize the student engagement strategies previously shared in other professional developments.** Consider ways to adjust informal visits, lesson plan review process, formal evaluations, coaching meetings, and other structures to ensure teachers are all utilizing the techniques that were reviewed during professional development and adopted by the program.
3) (Standard 4) **The program should clarify its expectations and provide more coaching for teachers on the frequency of opportunities for students to speak with one another during the instructional period.** Consider looking for ways to make student-to-student conversations present in all classrooms everyday so students can more deeply engage in the lesson and build relationships with their peers. Consider choosing one or two structures (eg, think pair share, turn and talk, or others) all teachers can utilize and begin to build as routines with students to use during the lesson, working collaboratively to prepare and practice these in Common Planning Time.
4) (Standard 7) **The program should develop stronger accountability tools and feedback systems to ensure program-wide focus areas are consistently implemented in all classrooms.** Consider how you are both maintaining staff and student awareness of the focus areas, and how you are addressing and celebrating when they are and are not being implemented with fidelity. Develop strong systems to make sure the vision for the focus area is clear to the entire school team and teachers are aware of their progress in implementing the program vision. Lastly, consider how to use existing structures like the MTSS meetings to help align the data analysis to the focus area.