

PSC School: Flournoy Elementary School

**PSC 4.0 Evaluation Rubric
Superintendent’s Review Panel**

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments <i>What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?</i>	Follow Up Questions
A. Vision and Instructional Philosophy	<p>The vision statement communicates the school’s fundamental beliefs about student learning and high expectations/rigorous standards for both students and adults. The vision statement and explanation of the vision provides a clear statement of values that will lead to the success of the school’s future graduates. The key priorities of the school are meaningful, measurable, ambitious yet attainable, and appropriate for the target student population, as are the instructional strategies.</p>	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan takes into account elements from the Performance Meter. <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeared to have 6 visions for matriculating students, but the noted beliefs only support 5 of them—“Retaining knowledge to maintain a healthy lifestyle” did not connect to one of the 6 beliefs. • There are many quotes listed, but it is not obvious how they are incorporated into the school’s vision. Overall, this seems to be a plan to do what every school should be doing. It reads as a general plan with randomly placed quotes. • The plan is written in generalities and lacks specificity to the Flournoy context (especially pg. 5). The vision is not ambitious nor does it hold a sense of urgency. The vision was not aligned to the target population. The student population was not mentioned in the vision. The tables they reference are not strategies on page 5. The plan vision is not clear and is not personalized to the Flournoy context. 	
B. School Data Profile/ Analysis	<p>A wide range of data is used to conduct a thorough, in-depth analysis—at a minimum the review must discuss (a) areas of strengths and concerns; (b) areas of improvement over recent years; (c) both positive and negative trends over the past few years; and (d) underlying root causes of persistent trends.</p> <p>The data analysis conveys a highly complex and profound understanding of the school community and whole student, including physical, emotional, social, and academic needs. The application focuses in on three to five critical issues that are highly relevant to the school and will have far-reaching impacts when improved upon. The issues identified cover instructional, behavioral, and operational needs, rather than focusing solely on one area.</p>	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This reads as though the team reviewed the data included in the plan. • They understand the root causes for the decline in performance. They articulate the trends in metrics. • Growth in parents demonstrating that they feel comfortable at the school. <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is significant data missing in the data tables for the 2011-2012 school year. E.g., CST data and staff attendance are not included in the table. • A wide range of data, as you would expect to compare trends. • Student data indicates significant academic needs for students. The plan does not offer innovative, Flournoy-specific ideas to support the students. • The plan only addresses the instructional needs of the school. • A hypothesis to explain student academic and social needs is not included. The data analyzed was information that you can find in the CDE website. The plan does not break down the strands of data or present a comprehensive review of the data. They include basic API and AYP data, which is basic. On page 11, they use 2009 and 2010 data. Why didn’t the team consider the 2011 and 2012 data? 2012 data are missing in the plan. 	
C. School Turnaround	<p>Overall, the strategies, practices, programs, and policies identified in this section are linked to the vision statement of the school and the results of the</p>	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan includes a comprehensive school wide behavior plan. • The school plan describes partnering teachers with mentor teachers. 	

PSC School: Flournoy Elementary School

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments <i>What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?</i>	Follow Up Questions
	<p>team's data analysis—it is clear that when the strategies are fully, effectively implemented, the priority area will be addressed. The plan is clear, concise, and provides evidence that the school will accelerate student achievement fairly quickly, over the next few years.</p> <p>Evidence is provided to show that the strategies for turning around the school culture, into one that promotes the intellectual and social development of all students, are effective as well as realistic given the context of the school. Systems and structures will be established to support the transition to a culture/climate that supports the vision of the school and success of each future graduate.</p> <p>The plan demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the current school community and its stakeholders, including staff, students, parents and community members. This knowledge was used to develop thoughtful, tailored strategies to share, communicate and generate interest and create excitement for the school turnaround plan. The plan recognizes the need for a differentiated approach in order to fully engage each of the various stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan states that the school has a resistant staff. It is not ideal to bring ideas that are already in place expecting the team to transform the school. • The plan must build culture by building repetitive practices. • How will the team generate excitement if the staff is resistant? • How will you train stakeholders to be data savvy? • The plan did not split up the special education population? They state building a positive environment for all, especially for those that are special needs. The specific disabilities of the student population are not broke down. • The “hows” are not discussed. The plan does not give evidence on how teachers will be supported. • On page 15-16, why did they copy and paste the college and career readiness anchor standards? What is the purpose of having these in the plan? • On page 22, it appears that they are explaining what a professional learning community is, as opposed to stating how they will use this strategy to turnaround the school. • The responses make the plan unclear. They define what the strategies are but they do not describe how they will implement the strategies in the classroom. The benefits of using the strategies are discussed but no mention of the specific use of the strategies at the school are provided. • A clear professional development plan is not presented. • The ideas in the plan are philosophies but they are not personalized to Flournoy. • The plan does not answer how they will differentiate instruction for all of the key stakeholder groups. • There does not exist a clear idea of what the turnaround plan is to meet the needs of Flournoy students. 	
D. Implementa- tion	<p>The benchmarks for determining progress are clearly articulated and will provide an accurate measure of whether or not the strategies, practices, programs, policies are having the intended impact. The timeline and process for measuring progress will be frequent and regular, enough to ensure that the team can spot trouble areas immediately and make mid-course corrections as necessary.</p> <p>There is a clear understanding of the realistic challenges that the school may face in turning around the school. The ideas for for counteracting these challenges are thoughtful, applicable, creative, and within reason.</p>	<p>Strengths: None noted.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific strategies to turnaround the school are not included. • When discussing the 5 factors to turnaround the school and the magnet, the plan simply provides 5 definitions. • The plan does not have criteria for measuring success. No benchmarks are noted in the plan. This will impede their ability to spot trouble areas. • They see staff resistance but they do not identify how they will overcome and grow from this resistance. The characteristics of an articulate response are not found in the plan. • The ideas for counteracting the challenges, such as the building the coaching with fidelity, are not convincing. They have no timeline for implementing their learning framework with teachers. The culture piece is not included. 	

PSC School: Flournoy Elementary School

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments <i>What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?</i>	Follow Up Questions
E. Alternative Governance Models & Autonomies	<p>The plan presents a clear rationale for the chosen alternative governance model as well as any requested autonomies and how these elements fully support the school's vision and instructional philosophy. A thorough explanation is provided for how the selected model will allow for high levels of academic achievement among the target population of students. Plan provides a thoughtful, comprehensive rationale for why each requested autonomy is necessary to support student achievement at the school. The plan explains what steps the school will take to ensure that a culture of shared leadership and decision-making focused on high student performance is in place to effectively implement the governance model and requested autonomies. Where applicable, evidence of staff input from UTLA members (e.g., petition, vote tally) is attached to the plan.</p> <p><i>Governing School Council (pilot schools only):</i> Composition of the Governing School Council is in compliance with state regulations. Membership selection process is fair, equitable and also in compliance with state regulations. Roles and responsibilities of governing council is clearly articulated and broader than School Leadership Council. A draft of the Elect to Work agreement is attached. <i>NOTE: All pilot school applications will also be reviewed by the Pilot School Steering Committee.</i></p>	<p>Strengths: None noted.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many philosophies are included in the plan, but none are personalized to Flournoy. • PD waivers, curriculum waivers that might have supported an innovative vision and plan are not requested. 	
F. School Planning Team	<p>Members of the school planning team were identified by a fair, equitable, transparent process; the team is diverse and representative of the entire school community, including faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members. All members, including the leader, fully participated and actively contributed to the plan development/writing process. Member contribution is noticeable and extended beyond those typically attributed to them (e.g., parents contributed in more ways than in discussions solely related to parent engagement).</p>	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing team was made up of volunteers. <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders are not included in the plan. There is heavy responsibility on the staff, without involvement of parents or engagement of other community members. • Planning team leader was not identified. • The plan identifies how the parents were informed and updated, but not clear how and whether they participated in the actual writing of the plan. 	

PSC School: Flournoy Elementary School

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments <i>What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?</i>	Follow Up Questions
	Parents and students were specifically engaged as plan writing/developing members and as leaders in the process. The process of developing the plan included equitable delegation of work and responsibilities, a comprehensive communication strategy to ensure all members are fully informed of decisions, and a conscious effort to regularly update the school's community-at-large (beyond the members of the school planning team).		

School Visits

Did your Review Team conduct a School Visit? (circle one) YES / NO

Planning Team Interviews

Did your Review Team conduct a Planning Team Interview? (circle one) YES / NO

Final Recommendation to the Superintendent

Overall Rating: (circle one) Beginning Developing Well-Developed Exemplary

Overall Comments: Flournoy's plan is in the beginning phase. Flournoy has been a Program Improvement school for 8 years. Surprisingly, the applicant team's vision statement fails to provide a complete picture of the community and how it will better serve their needs. This plan is unambitious and does not provide a sense of urgency and commitment to facilitate large scale transformation. In fact, this plan appears to be one of "doing what we should have been doing all along," rather than a plan of change. The team utilizes several types of data to profile the school, making it fairly comprehensive. However, a large portion of the current data (i.e. 2011-2012 CELDT scores) is missing. Similarly, the plan discusses the use of data to drive instruction, but it is unclear how this will be implemented.

The plan identifies strategies, practices, programs and policies to be used, but only provides a general definition of that strategy rather than how it will be utilized as part of Flournoy's plan. The behavior and attendance sections of the turnaround plan are clear and explicit and include all stakeholders, but are lacking in acknowledgement of the specific culture of the school.

The team clearly identifies the root causes for their decline, but the issues they focus on are solely instructional. The foreseen challenges are site specific and detailed; yet, the ideas presented to counteract these challenges are neither thoughtful nor creative. For example, the turnaround plan asserts that Flournoy will continue to use the current curriculum in both reading and mathematics. The applicant team fails to request a waiver for supplemental materials to differentiate instruction to meet student needs.

The plan does not include benchmarks or a timeline to measure effectiveness. This makes it difficult to understand how the school will know if they are on the right track or if their plan needs to be amended. We question how the enactment of this plan will quickly accelerate student achievement in the years to come.