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Instructional Walkthrough Overview

Instructional Walkthroughs for all Opportunity Network contract programs focused on the instructional design and implementation of this design with consistency and fidelity at the classroom level required to deliver high quality instruction to all 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.
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Program Overview

The following is a brief description and summary of different aspects of the Opportunity Network program. These descriptions were shared by the programs prior to the walkthrough and informed by observations as part of the formal Instructional Walkthroughs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Structure</th>
<th>Student Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Program Snapshot** | ✓ Achieve 3000 Literacy  
Enrollment: 154 (as of April '23) | Intervention Period  
✓ Achieve 3000 Math  
✓ Small Group Instruction  
✓ Co-Teaching/Push-In Support  
✓ Community/External Partners (ex: ELECT, etc.) |
| **Instructional Model** | Direct Instruction |

**Daily Student Schedule**

- **Full Day**: 8:30 am – 2:42 pm

**Course Frequency**

- **Core Courses**: 5 times a week

**Class Duration**

- **Full Days**: 55 minutes

**Number of Classes**

- **Number of Courses Students Can Take**: 4 – 6 (maximum if taking Edgenuity courses for credit recovery)

**School Culture**

- There is a student council, and monthly Town hall.

**Core Curriculum Resources**

- **Math**: Ck12
- **English**: Norton Anthology of African Amer. Lit. and Novels  
 SDP Curriculum
- **Science**: SDP Curriculum  
  Ck12
- **History**: Ck12

**Additional Supports**:

- The program also has an after-school grant-funded academic support program for students, three days a week from 2:45 – 4:00 pm.

**College & Career Readiness**

- **Service Learning Opportunities**
- **Internship Program**
- **1-on-1 Counseling**

**Certifications Offered**

- OSHA 10  
- CPR/First Aide  
- Mandatory Reporter (Act 31)

**Additional/Other Certification Opportunities**:

- The program has also established a Coding Club.

**Culture of Academic Success**

- **Honor Roll**
- **Public Recognition**
- **Restorative Practices**

**Additional/Other Academic Success**

- There is a daily 25min Keystone Prep structure offered for students, as well as monthly incentive celebrations.
Summary of Program Areas of Strength

Below are short descriptions of areas where the program has shown sustained strength, as informed by the school visit, student and staff interviews, and a review of the provided artifacts.

- **Supportive Environment**
  During interviews, students shared that they felt more supported and successful at OIC CADI than they had been in prior schools. Specifically, students shared that they felt well supported by their guidance counselors (and we found this to be aligned to their SEL and graduation supports - like Act 158).

- **Student Choice**
  In the science class as well as Senior Capstone, student choice was a key aspect of the student project and led to increased student investment.

- **Relationship Building**
  There were some examples of teachers having strong interactions with students and evidence of established relationships, especially when providing one on one personal support during student work times.

Performance Summary - All Domains

The table below summarizes the number of standards by category that met expectations consistent with contract requirements during the 2022-2023 Instructional Walkthrough. Information regarding how standards in each domain are measured can be found in the Performance Framework for Opportunity Network contract programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Program Performance</th>
<th>Total Possible</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain I: Overall Management (Page 4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain II: Instructional Delivery (Page 6)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain III: Conditions for Learning (Page 9)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Percentage: 47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Domain 1: Overall Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management for a Safe and Educationally Supportive Environment</th>
<th>Observation Notes (notes are provided for standards rated Nearing or Did Not Meet Expectations)</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Environment</td>
<td>Maintain a school environment where students feel welcome and invited.</td>
<td>Expectations Met (SY2021-2022: Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School-wide Rules and Procedures</td>
<td>The program ensures school-wide rules and procedures are operating effectively.</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Expectations (SY2021-2022:▼ Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classroom Rules and Procedures</td>
<td>The program ensures classroom rules and procedures are operating effectively.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022:▼ Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acknowledgement of Students</td>
<td>The program’s acknowledgement of students who are not following school-wide and classroom procedures is evident.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Awareness of Conditions</td>
<td>Teachers display an awareness of conditions.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation Notes
- **School-wide Rules and Procedures**: School-wide structures were not being consistently followed across classrooms. For example, there was confusion about the school’s hall pass system, they were not used in all classrooms and a student responded when a teacher asked them to get a pass by saying, “Why do I need to present a pass? Where would I get one?". Students also noted frustration at being locked out or turned away if they arrive to the building after 9:30am, a practice not in alignment with District policies or best practice. Students were however aware of and compliant with the cell phone policy as no phones were observed.

- **Classroom Rules and Procedures**: Classroom expectations were not always clear or consistent. Several classrooms did not have rules posted, and the expectations for completing daily work were not clear to students. For example, there were questions around accountability for daily work—was this a daily grade for attendance, a grade for participating in class, or for completing an assignment. Another example was that in several classrooms the teacher had not established a clear expectation for going to the bathroom or leaving the room for other reasons (students left for long periods of time without interacting with the teacher, taking a pass, or signing out etc.).

- **Acknowledgement of Students**: In multiple interactions observed between staff and students, it was unclear if staff knew how to effectively respond to students who were off task and/or disruptive. Often times students who were disengaged were ignored and there were few redirections provided or little acknowledgment/encouragement of those that were on task.

- **Awareness of Conditions**: Teachers often did not acknowledge students coming to class late. In addition, teachers almost always addressed misunderstandings one on one with a student and did not utilize checks for understanding with the whole group. Some teachers were not always aware or responsive when students made inappropriate or offensive comments to one another or visitors (for example, slurs relating to sexuality), and so these behaviors were not effectively addressed.
Observation Summary

The program has attempted to create a warm and welcoming environment for students, with classrooms that although cluttered with furniture and unused materials, were also bright and decorated with materials aligned to the content area. There were not clear school-wide systems or norms in place for some key aspects of the day, such as student movement during class. This lack of systems led to some disruptions and lost learning time for students. There was also a lack of classroom rules and procedures- including clarity about how to earn credit for the day’s class, where to sit, and what the rules were for behavior in class. Teachers ignored several off-task and at times disruptive behaviors, seemingly unsure of how to address them in a productive way. There were multiple classrooms where foundationally the classroom culture needed improvement, especially for when students say negative things to one another or create an emotionally unsafe environment. There is also an opportunity for more positive acknowledgment of those students that are meeting expectations and productively participating in class. Finally, some teachers seemed somewhat unaware of what was happening in their classrooms- be that student understanding of the lesson or students arriving late to class.

Opportunities for Growth

1. **Standard 2: School-wide rules and procedures operating effectively.**

   The program should develop some school-wide systems in collaboration with students for student transitions. The program shall also revise their morning entry procedures so late students are able to attend school. The systems need to be clear and consistently implemented with the support of teachers, school leaders, and all staff members. To encourage buy-in from students, students should be surveyed for their input and student leaders engaged in co-design of new or revised systems. Also consider collaborating with other programs in Opportunity Network to learn about their transition procedures and supports. The policy for late student arrivals shall be brought into alignment with School District policies as produced and supported by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

2. **Standard 3: Classroom rules and procedures are operating effectively.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on establishing supportive classroom systems aligned to their classroom rules and norms. These rules and norms should be posted, and grading policies should be clear, consistent, and aligned to the supports students need to be successful. Grading policies shall also be aligned with contract requirements and should follow School District Marking Guidelines as established for Opportunity Network. Consider how policies and expectations can be normed school wide so that teachers can better support their students as they move between classrooms and courses. Professional Learning Community meetings (PLCs) may be a useful place to develop these systems as it based on collaboration.

3. **Standard 4: Acknowledgement of students who are/are not following rules and procedures is evident in classroom/school-wide.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching for school-based staff on how to effectively give directions, reinforce those directions, and address students who are off task or disruptive. The professional development series, #teachPHL offered by the School District touches on several of these topics and may be a helpful resource. The strategies and supports should also be inclusive of all school-based staff so that students have consistent expectations and a uniformly safe and supportive learning environment.

4. **Standard 5: Teachers display awareness of conditions.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on how to monitor student work times and to check for understanding during the lesson. This professional development should be designed to support teachers in circulating and monitoring student work, or in designing activities that allow the teacher to engage all students. The book, “Total Participation Techniques” is one resource that may be helpful. School leaders should include this in their “look fors” during informal classroom observations so that teachers can receive real-time feedback and coaching to further develop their instructional practice.
## Domain 2: Instructional Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Observation Notes (notes are provided for standards rated Nearing or Did Not Meet Expectations)</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional Modeling</td>
<td>Teachers model the thinking and learning process. The modeling observed across classrooms was inconsistent, some classrooms had no modeling and others only had modeling of the procedure or task. There were very few examples of academic modeling (of the thinking or concept) observed.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Relevance</td>
<td>Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students. There were few attempts made to make the curriculum relevant for students. The attempts observed included a text in English that is culturally relevant to many students and engaged them in a conversation about gender stereotypes, as well as some space for student choice in Senior Capstone and Science classes. There were no observed attempts at relevance in other classes where there were also high levels of disengagement.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum Rigor</td>
<td>The program ensures all lessons are rigorous. Very few of the tasks asked of students today were matching grade level rigor or standards-aligned (creating a poster without clear expectations for content/quality, completing a word find, etc.). The text chosen for English 2 and the writing expectations for the Senior Capstone project were grade level appropriate, however. There was little evidence of lesson planning or use of the program’s chosen curriculum in the core content classrooms.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Effort</td>
<td>Courses are developed and implemented to ensure students are working harder than their teachers. Students were given few opportunities to experience the full thinking load and to attempt the objective independently (with the exception of Senior Capstone where they did experience full release). However, when students were given the opportunity to attempt the objective—if they were incorrect, they were typically supported and corrected by the teacher.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classroom and Instructional Data</td>
<td>Evidence of data is visible. Exemplar student work was posted in almost all classrooms and in the hallways. There was also an observed instructional shift in science, where the teacher gave feedback to the whole class based on a trend they were seeing in student work. However, similar feedback based on data trends was not observed in the other classrooms, and instead feedback was almost always given one on one, and not based on group trends.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Did Not Meet Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Questioning</td>
<td>Teachers question all students with the same frequency. There were few instances of whole group questioning observed and these were almost always responded to by volunteers (instead of cold calling etc.). In most classes, the teacher did make an effort to speak with everyone, but this was done with one-on-one conversations primarily.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Did Not Meet Expectations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Components of Effective Instruction | Observation Notes | Performance Rating
--- | --- | ---
7. Cognitive Complexity  Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity. | The majority of questions asked of students were lower-level and teacher supported, very few pushed students to explain their thinking. There were several missed opportunities, where a student would provide an answer, and then the teacher would provide the rationale or reasoning instead of first prompting the student to share. In addition, most questions aligned to procedural understanding and not the skill being taught. The highest-level questions asked were all done in one-on-one settings, and not for the benefit of the whole group. | Did Not Meet Expectations (SY2021–2022: ▼ Nearing Expectations)

Observation Summary

The program had some examples of effective instructional delivery, but there are several areas for improvement in this domain. There was little consistency from classroom to classroom with modeling, rigor, engagement, effort, and questioning. Often the lessons being taught and activities given were not relevant for students, did not align with grade level standards, and so much teacher support was given that students didn’t have the opportunity to fully own the thinking load. There was little observed evidence of release, gradual or otherwise. There was very little evidence of lesson planning and fidelity to the program’s chosen curriculum, which contributed to a lack of quality instructional activities and alignment to grade-level standards. Some courses, such as Senior Capstone, Science, and English had some aspect of the lesson that was strong- but this wasn’t consistent throughout the lesson or across classrooms.

Opportunities for Growth

1. **Standard 1: Teachers model the thinking and learning process.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching on effective modeling strategies for both skills and procedures.

   Identify two or three core strategies/techniques that teachers can adopt for modeling the concepts or the procedure for a complicated task in class. These models provide critical support for students to access grade-level content and should consider the student needs and academic supports that are required.

2. **Standard 2: Teachers make the curriculum relevant for their students.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching on how to identify and provide relevance in the lesson for their students.

   This may include building choice into activities, having students build connections between the lesson topic and their own lives, or connecting smaller daily tasks to a larger long-term goal that they are invested in (such as a unit project, a career path, etc.). Suggest providing time for review of student activities and prompts in PLCs so that teachers are sharing what they know of student interests and lived experience collectively and can improve relevance across classrooms as a group. Review for relevance and student connections should also become standard in regular lesson plan review and feedback from the school leader.

3. **Standard 3: Lessons are rigorous.**

   The program should provide professional development as well as lesson plan feedback and coaching around utilizing their curriculum resources and meeting the rigor of the standards and grade level experiences.

   Lesson plan quality and alignment should be a focus of leadership support, so that teachers are aware and supported in aligning to grade level standards. Consider supports that teachers will need to utilize the curriculum resources chosen by the program. Consider seeking professional development from curriculum providers so staff can familiarize themselves with shifts necessary to align to PA Core and academic standards.
4. **Standard 4: Students are working harder than their teachers.**

   The program should establish an expectation for the structure of lessons, including how often students should engage in activities where they can own the thinking load and practice the objective skill or concept. Opportunities to practice the skill and experience the full thinking load are critical for students to internalize the concepts. The book, "Total Participation Techniques" along with the activities in the curriculum resources chosen by the program should be considered when establishing and supporting this expectation.

5. **Standard 5: Evidence of data is visible.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on ways to collect formative student data during the lesson, and possible adjustments to make in response to the data. This data can be collected in many different ways (questioning students verbally, scanning written responses, using technology such as padlet/jamboard, etc.), but choosing a small number of strategies to collect the data, and some high impact responses (re-teach, error analysis, etc.) will likely support more consistent implementation.

6. **Standard 6: Teachers question all students with the same frequency.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching to teachers on questioning techniques that allow the teacher to question all students. Two strategies commonly used for questioning, which allow the teacher to be strategic and inclusive, are cold calling and/or utilizing a tool (like names on popsicle sticks) to choose the students to participate at random while ensuring that all students have the possibility of being selected. This can also increase student engagement with content during the lesson as students will be aware that they can be called at any time.

7. **Standard 7: Teachers ask all students questions at different levels of cognitive complexity.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching to teachers on how to ask higher-order questions of their students, especially those asking students to explain their thinking or support their answers. These questions can be scripted into lesson plans, or if more flexibility is needed, there are some frequent follow up questions that teachers can ask to help push students to give more complex responses (for example, Explain what you mean? Where did you see that in the text? Can you build on their response?). Questions and follow-up prompts can be reviewed in the PLCs so that teachers are collectively building their questioning skill and learn from each other as to what has worked well or did not work in practice.
### Domain 3: Conditions for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishing Conditions Necessary for Learning</th>
<th>Observation Notes (notes are provided for standards rated Nearing or Did Not Meet Expectations)</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-Engagement Teachers are aware of non-engagement in their classrooms.</td>
<td>There were many students observed off task or disengaged, at times this was done quietly (head down, watching YouTube with headphones) and other times it was more disruptive (walking in and out of the classroom, talking with a peer during instruction, etc.). Teachers often did not address students, and it was unclear what the school-wide policy or expectation was for addressing those students.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engagement Strategies Teachers use a variety of engagement strategies.</td>
<td>The use of engagement strategies was not consistent across classrooms. In some instances, teachers had one task for the class to do for long periods of time, in others there were a variety of tasks (but these were not always learning objective aligned). Classes did not consistently begin with an opening routine, and there was not a universal agenda in use across classrooms.</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Expectations (SY2021-2022: Did Not Meet Expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Engagement Students appear to be engaged in the lesson.</td>
<td>There were often students disengaged in the classrooms that were observed, and the level of engagement rarely was above 80%. During independent work the level of student engagement was lowest, and teachers often missed opportunities to increase engagement by having students present or share whole group at checkpoints during larger independent activities.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: ▼ Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peer Interactions Students are interacting appropriately with other students.</td>
<td>Students were generally physically interacting appropriately with each other but at times their individual actions (talking off-topic, talking on a personal Facetime call, listening to music out loud, etc.) were disruptive to the learning environment. Some students were observed speaking to each other using disrespectful language and in one instance discriminatorily against trans persons- these actions were not effectively addressed by the teacher.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: ▼ Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Interest Teachers demonstrate a clear interest in their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations Met (SY2021-2022: Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student Responsiveness Students are appropriately responsive to teacher interactions.</td>
<td>Some teacher directions were met with compliance, however, this was not consistently the case. In some instances, students would respond negatively to teacher directions or questions. For example, when asking a student for their hall pass- the student responded negatively, saying “they don’t need to follow the rules” and leaving the room without a pass. In another example, when a student was asked why they weren’t working, they said, “I don’t know, and I don’t want to know!” the teacher then walked away.</td>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: ▼ Expectations Met)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Establishing Conditions Necessary for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Notes</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the stated focus areas, there lacked consistency across classrooms. First, an objective was generally posted in each classroom, but rarely was this referenced or were there clear connections made to the objective during the lesson. Second, lesson plans did not provide evidence of consistent teacher planning, and did not lead to students working harder than their teachers. In general, the lesson plans were high-level and not actionable—there was no evidence of expected outcomes, means of assessment, or of differentiation. Lastly, although there was a reasonable balance of student and teacher voice, this was not consistent from class to class and students were not owning the learning or tasked with higher-order thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearing Expectations (SY2021-2022: Nearing Expectations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation Summary

The program’s staff are attempting to build relationships with students and have an interest in who they are and how they are doing, but this was not enough to create the conditions necessary for learning. The level of engagement was too low, this was impacted by a lack of variety in the activities and the quality of planning, as well as the negative response that some students had to teacher directions as well as interactions with their peers. Lastly, the school-wide focus areas of objective-driven lessons, stronger lesson planning, and increased student voice were not implemented with fidelity and likely resulted in the observed lack of evidence of impactful change.

Opportunities for Growth

1. **Standard 1: Teachers are aware of non-engagement.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching so teachers have a more normed level of expectation for student engagement, and one which is shared by both the staff and students. The program first needs to establish a common language and understanding of what it looks and sounds like when students are engaged and work to set this as the goal for all classrooms in the school (likely through professional development activities during the PLC time.) This work should then be supported by real-time coaching so that teachers are leaders about the level of engagement. Real-time coaching has the added benefit of also communicating to students this shared expectation.

2. **Standard 2: Teachers use a variety of engagement strategies.**

   Provide professional development and coaching for teachers on how to structure lessons to include more engaging activities. This may include breaking larger tasks into smaller components that can be more quickly accomplished, using more models/visuals to help students understand the task, or implementing new tools or activities that are more engaging. Consider how setting an expectation for the number of engaging activities in each lesson may support teachers in meeting this expectation. A common set of activity structures can be used across content areas and the impact on engagement of these strategies can be reviewed during PLCs.
3. **Standard 3: Students appear to be engaged in the lesson.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on how to give clear directions and to build in accountability for lesson activities. This professional development should focus on making sure that teachers are clearly communicating to students what and how to do the lesson activity, as well as the why- how will they be accountable for engaging in the work and completing the task, which may be credit/grade accountability or more social accountability (like sharing with the class etc.). Clear directions and engagement strategies are both part of the #teachPHL PD series from the school district, which is available to teachers in the Opportunity Network.

4. **Standard 4: Students are interacting appropriately with other students.**

   The program should provide professional development for teachers and programming for students on the type of school culture the program wants to establish, and provide ongoing opportunities for SEL lessons that will help to support more positive and productive student-to-student and student to staff interactions. Consider how to make sure that teachers and staff are normed on what appropriate student interactions look like, how these expectations will be communicated to students, and how to respond when those expectations are not being met. Ensure that students are exposed to School District monthly counseling topics and also receive annual orientation and/or assemblies to review bullying, harassment and discrimination. Resources are available on the School District website for students (and staff) and families.

5. **Standard 6: Students are appropriately responsive to teacher interactions.**

   The program should provide professional development and coaching for teachers on effective directions and redirection strategies. This PD should focus on supporting teachers with the techniques and delivery of both clear directions and redirections so that they have confidence to keep students focused and on task. Consider using resources such as the school district's #teachPHL PD series, in particular the sessions titled “Clear Directions” and “Redirecting Unproductive Behaviors”, or books that provide classroom management guidance like the “Teach like a Champion” series.

6. **Standard 7: There is evidence of the school-wide focus in the classrooms.**

   The program should develop some key student outcomes which incorporate growth in several teacher actions for their next focus. Consider how you will message this focus (such as student engagement, or on task behaviors) to the larger community, and how you will continue to share progress toward the goal. By clearly aligning teacher and staff PD to this focus area goal, you are more likely to have positive outcomes and increased buy-in to the goal. Students and families should also be involved both in planning for the focus and in communications regarding progress towards meeting program goals.