

**PSC School: Coliseum 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
<b>A. Vision and Instructional Philosophy</b>	<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><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan concentrates on two philosophies, including Vygotsky, Dewey and progressivism.</li> <li>• It is grounded in research with a clear vision with meaningful and ambitious goals. It has both short term and long-term goals and is realistic about what students need to be able to do before going to college.</li> <li>• The instructional philosophy supports the vision.</li> <li>• The plan mentions scaffolding the learning for the children.</li> <li>• It includes a discussion of the whole child- including second step and classroom management</li> <li>• Philosophy is to analyze their student data every two weeks.</li> <li>• Flexible grouping, universal access strategies, etc. are highlighted. It appears that teachers are already using them so they may need PD or observation to help them gain those skills.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redesignating all ELL students is not realistic.</li> <li>• The plan does not talk about how other stakeholders would be included in this. There is just one brief sentence about how parents would be in partnership with school staff.</li> <li>• There is discussion of a need for parent engagement on page 3 but it doesn't explain how or what they are going to do to pursue it.</li> <li>• The plan talks about parent engagement but they appear to be quoting research rather than talking about the needs of their school.</li> </ul>	
<b>B. School Data Profile/ Analysis</b>	<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</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The critical issues are clearly identified– CST proficiency, EL redesignation, and instructional days lost due to suspensions</li> <li>• Quantitative data described areas of concern and strengths and notes both positive and negative trends.</li> <li>• There is a clear idea of the student strengths and areas of need in the school.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of data in narrative was difficult to follow; tables could have helped.</li> <li>• There is not much qualitative data. Seems to suggest a lack of involvement with families. Plan states that parents reviewed the plan but they don't appear to be active participants.</li> <li>• No formal data on number of students in foster care; however, that data is available in SIS and it seems that, given the small school size, there should be a better grasp of students' family situations.</li> <li>• Why don't parents submit their meal applications? This should be explored further.</li> </ul>	

## PSC School: Coliseum Elementary School

	<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One root cause noted was parent’s “permissive attitude” – can this be said in a less hostile or accusatory manner? Also, what evidence leads them to say this? There is no reference to what this is based on. They note there is a lack of parent engagement, but don’t really explain where this is coming from.</li> <li>• There is a nonspecific statement about the sense of community having an impact on student engagement and tardiness. But plan also states that parents say students are late because they have to take older children to middle, high school--this does not mean that parents have a permissive attitude or don’t care.</li> <li>• Lacking in analysis of the school community and relations with stakeholders.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>C. School Turnaround</b></p>	<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 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><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifically addresses the areas that they identified as key priorities. It was easy to track this alignment.</li> <li>• Specific strategies are mentioned (i.e., scaffolding, use of workstations with tiered instruction)</li> <li>• Use of boxes to explain the information clearly delineate the roles of each group.</li> <li>• Research based strategies are discussed including activities used by high performing schools.</li> <li>• There are proactive approaches for discipline, including an RTI format and reflection room.</li> <li>• They mention using webinars for PD.</li> <li>• The plan includes a personal commitment by the students and noted a need to increase awareness of staff of various strategies.</li> <li>• Parent training will be made available on early education and special education.</li> <li>• Teachers will be looking at assessments regularly (page 11).</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan mentions SDAIE and EL strategies but these are mandated already—why aren’t they being implemented already?</li> <li>• Page 10 states that students will not feel anxious. Why are students nervous about participating? EL strategies should already help mitigate this.</li> <li>• Purpose of the Reflection Room is not clear.</li> <li>• Given there are trust issues with the parents, how likely is it that parents will sit on the discipline review team?</li> <li>• Explanation of school culture and climate seems limited.</li> <li>• They discuss what they will do for parents (provide information, speakers, etc.) and how they will give them information but they don’t explain how they will bring parents into the culture of the school. The reviewers recognize this is a challenging task given the level of trust between school and parents, but hoped to see some creative ideas or bridging that gap.</li> <li>• A lot of strategies don’t seem different from what teachers are already mandated to do (SDAIE, cooperative learning, inquiry learning, etc.). How is this different from what they are expected to do now? Are they doing those now?</li> <li>• The parent engagement piece also seems to list items that are already mandated, such as Back to School Night, conferences, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Is there a specific goal for tiered instruction?</p> <p>Is there a measureable goal for when you move on?</p> <p>Will teachers get training for all the strategies mentioned?</p> <p>How will you support students, given there are no out of classroom teachers, other than the reflection room teacher?</p> <p>Reflection Room: Social skills lessons or core class work in this room? What happens Tuesdays and Thursdays? How will students not lose instructional time if they are</p>

**PSC School: Coliseum Elementary School**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not much beyond the scope of what they are already expected to do.</li> </ul>	working on social skills lessons?
<b>D. Implementation</b>	<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 counteracting these challenges are thoughtful, applicable, creative, and within reason.</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses all areas of concern and how they will build teacher capacity to do better.</li> <li>• Uses data to monitor all areas of concern and data is used to drive planning</li> <li>• Specific goals set for suspension and attendance.</li> <li>• Discussion of sharing the campus with a charter and the challenges involved.</li> <li>• Discussion about using district resources, such as MyData, CORE data, attendance figures, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It appears they started to change some practices last year. This is discussed instead of barriers.</li> <li>• They note they will monitor progress but could be more specific about how. It isn't clear what benchmarks will be in place to monitor changes in instruction.</li> <li>• Reflection Room teacher seems to have a lot of responsibilities, including monitoring plans, teaching, attending DRT meetings. Is this realistic?</li> <li>• Community agency referrals are mentioned but why aren't they happening now? They should note if they are reaching out to new community resources.</li> <li>• There is more discussion of upper grades than lower grade issues.</li> <li>• Need to address potentially challenges regarding staff support.</li> <li>• They mention using technology in regards to the math program but don't discuss how they will provide for this. Is this in place or is it a need?</li> <li>• Parent communication methods do not seem particularly impactful.</li> </ul>	It is a good idea to have staff mentors, but how many people do they have on their staff? How many tier 2 students are there? Is this realistic?
<b>E. Alternative Governance Models &amp; Autonomies</b>	<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.</p> <p>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</p>	N/A	Why did they not ask for any waivers/autonomies?

**PSC School: Coliseum Elementary School**

	<p>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><b>F. School Planning Team</b></p>	<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). Parents and students were specifically engaged as plan writing/developing members and as leaders in the process.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b> None noted.</p> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan does not identify who the team members are other than certificated staff, so it is difficult to know how representative it is.</li> <li>• The team does not seem to have parent or community representatives. They do note that parents had an opportunity to review the plan, but they were not part of the development. The parents solicited for input seem to be the parents from their SSC, who already participate in school planning.</li> <li>• No parents were writers of the plan.</li> </ul>	<p>How did you identify writers and what efforts were made to find non-certificated members of the team?</p>

**PSC School: Coliseum Elementary School**

**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:** The plan is very well written with many specific strategies to improve and it is easy to track the alignment from section to section. However, it is lacking in participation from all stakeholders and seems to primarily offer strategies that are currently mandated by the district.

*\*Please note that the rating and comments above reflect the review of the Superintendent's Review Panel members. While the the Superintendent agreed with many of the areas of strength and weaknesses noted by the reviewers, given the numerous and serious concerns he identified, his final decision was to rate the plan **Beginning**.*