

**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 |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>A. Vision and Instructional Philosophy</p> | <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"> • Students will be taught to gain mastery in content areas, participate in elective courses of choice for becoming career ready, be self-aware yet have a role in community and world at-large. • Understanding that there should be short, intermediate and long term goals. • Vision includes creating 4 Master Schedules (for each SLC)–difficult to achieve with unity, but not impossible if coordinated properly. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed 3 efforts for students: mastering core content, participation in electives of choice, and self-awareness, then list 4 skills: work collaboratively, communicate effectively, think critically and creatively and become responsible members of society. • Stated work with community organizations without identifying which ones and why those would be of assistance to school community. • There is a mention of “innovative teaching methodologies” but it is not articulated with details as to how they would be reflected in classes. • The vision is very common, and one that has been adopted in most high school. It includes a lot about what the teachers must do to meet this vision, not what they believe about student learning. Vision lacks detail of how student achievement will improve and a description of opportunities for an innovative school experience. • Vision uses words like; teachers <i>must</i>, our staff <i>will be</i>, and require the <i>full commitment</i> of all teachers. • Vision states “...teachers who want to teach at the New Sylmar High School must agree to training...” • Vision does not include measureable priorities to determine student success. • Plan creates 3 new SLCs. What happens to the students in the 4 SLCs they already have? What about seniors? • There is not a clear connection between their 4 stated student skills and how <i>Linked Learning &/or Humanitas</i> will help students achieve school's 4 student skills that is part of their 3 goals. • There is no evidence that QEIA funding has moved them towards the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop mastery in core content areas; participate in elective courses of choice-- what will be available? Will there be a sequence? • What are the “innovative teaching methodologies and how will teachers learn them? How do these all fit together? • How and why these particular SLCs? Were there interest surveys completed by parents and students? Did they find out about job opportunities for entry positions in these fields? • What if teachers do not meet this vision for the school/staff? What if they do not agree to the training? Will there be a high turnover of staff since there is no indication in the vision that teachers are committed to this vision? • What guarantees are there that additional funding will do so? How will the vision be affected if no additional funding other than the QEIA is obtained? • What will each of the three funding sources provide that is unique and enhances the vision? • How can they implement program if <i>Race to the Top</i> grant is not |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>goals set in their vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different funding options mentioned. | <p>received? Is it possible to make this vision come true with current funding? How will they use funds differently?</p> |
| <p>B. School Data Profile/ Analysis</p> | <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"> • Classroom observations were used as a reflective tool to assess strengths and concerns. Identified that some of their teachers don't use teaching strategies that address the needs of many of the students. • Staff to develop common assessments. • Identified another need for teachers to be trained. • Magnet Program is identified as strength so they will model their SLCs after the Magnet Program with greater classroom purity, greater autonomy over each Master Schedule and collaboration amongst teachers. • CTE courses have greater student engagement in present SLC model so they will replicate in designing their new SLCs. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of quantitative data analysis. Overall, data analysis section is very weak; no real data provided. Data is alluded to in their analysis. • Team lists their current SLCs as a strength, yet in explaining how it is a strength, the team says, "...current SLCs exist only in name." • Current SLCs have been in operation for four years, yet now they are creating 3 totally new SLCs. • Common Assessments/Essential Learnings (ELs) have been listed as a strength, yet they go on to say "...the use of ELs as a leading indicator has not transpired into desired results." They do cite that they "...need to change the types of ELs that are established and tested." • Areas of Concern cite that "...the majority of teachers do not utilize teaching strategies that address the needs of many of our students." But it does not explain what type of training these teachers have received. • Plan states "...83% of our LEP students are LTELs." EL Master Plan program will be used to change this statistic, yet there is no plan for teacher training or support in learning this program. • Plan states, "...All students would benefit from teachers engaging in differentiated instruction and assessment practices." But again, no mention of the need for teacher training or support. • Classroom observations show that ELA and Math teachers have not been fully trained in using the additional period allotted for intervention. • Analysis of parent communication is honest on the surface, but does | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why create new SLCs? What are the teachers committed to doing different from what they've been doing for the past four years? • Is it lack of training and follow through or unwillingness of trained teachers to implement their training? • Parent data was collected but what will they do with this information? |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>not really look deeply at why the problem exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges listed that are really goals they wish to achieve through this plan. The real challenge seems to be in creating a change of culture and belief system among the stakeholders. There does not seem to be a commitment to changing the status quo, other than from the writers of this plan. • Additional challenges include: 4 Master Schedules, classroom purity, teacher collaboration, full utilization of money and time provided, training and follow-up support and accountability. | |
| <p>C. School Turnaround</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>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Humanitas, Linked Learning (LL) and Project Based Learning (PBL) all have research cited. These practices have been successful when implemented with fidelity and commitment by teachers. Overall, good research analysis of Linked Learning and the Humanitas models. • Math instruction identified as a concern – the noted strategy has been implemented for Algebra I. Plan to improve Algebra II and Geometry is a good start because the common planning done by some in the Math Dept has shown gains in Algebra I. (Although quantitative data would make this a stronger strategy). <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not seem to be a clear understanding of linked learning as it really encompasses the elements of PBL and Humanitas • <i>“In addition to implementing an innovative curricular program, the staff at Sylmar High must revisit some fundamental concerns as related to ‘first instruction.’”</i> There are too many methods named that will help in this—Access to Core, First Instruction, EL Master Plan, Teaching and Learning Framework—but without a clear plan as to how this will all be done • Math is identified as an area of concern yet none of the previously mentioned methods will be utilized to address this. • Opportunities for internships and jobs but there is no evidence of desired or possible partnerships. • There are many areas that are identified as needing work, yet the plan is not clearly defined or detailed • Plan states “Sylmar is committed to ...”, yet there is no written evidence of staff commitment to anything • Plan provides program definitions of <i>Linked Learning, Humanitas, and Project Based Learning</i> but there is no connection to their SLCs or school vision. • A strategy is improvement of first instruction, but there is not enough | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected <i>Access to Core</i> but if this is presently improving academic achievement, how will revisiting this make it better? • Who will identify, secure and coordinate internship and job opportunities for students? • Plan depends heavily on technology. What is current and proposed computer/student ratio? How do they plan to increase the use of technology among students, teachers and parents? • Changes in Math Instruction – Clear plan. Question – How will stopping and re-teaching for mastery affect Pacing Plan? • School-To-Home Communication – How will parents be reached that have no access or knowledge of technology? |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>detail. District mandates are mentioned but what will be innovative about their teaching and how will they increase student engagement and achievement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving parent communication strategies are limited and do not account for families that may not have access to technology. Plan states that “English and Math Intervention courses will be imbedded in the school day and teachers will use this time to ...” Earlier, plan stated this was not happening now, and it does not say how or why the status quo will change. It does list that peers will observe and admin will monitor, but does not mention support. A lot of responsibility is being given to “each (stakeholder) group to share & generate interest ... to ensure...fidelity.” “Professional development opportunities” implies choice in whether to take advantage of the training or not. Does not show evidence that school has done anything different after their first PSC application submitted last year. | |
| <p>D. Implementation</p> | <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>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They will ensure SLC classes are pure. Autonomy of SLCs to create own Master schedule and map out professional development allows for schools to plan according to the over-arching school theme. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sylmar was once considered by the district for the Race to the Top Grant, but since now that is no longer happening, will any of the pathways apply to be Linked Learning? Vision section clearly stated that they need short, intermediate, and long-term goals, yet this is not evident in their turnaround planning and when certain strategies will be instituted. One day training for clerical and out of the classroom staff to improve customer service is not sufficient to build a school culture. Accountability for monitoring SLC is the responsibility of the Administrator, how will teachers take ownership and have buy in of their school? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the one-week time frame for planning and attending trainings sufficient time to change and improve teacher practice? Is collection of a customer service survey from parents convenient for parents while attending to school business? How will data collected be used to continue to work with staff to improve customer service? Who will facilitate the SLCs discussion and creation of a Master Schedule? How will the 4 separate Master Schedules be synthesized into one unified Master Schedule that addresses the needs of all students? Will depts develop their common formative assessments? |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>E. Alternative Governance Models & Autonomies</p> | <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"> • No evidence of how the autonomies will support student achievement. • No clear rationale for the autonomies selected other than to stop future administrative teams from dismantling the plan. • The use of their autonomies is vague and lacks purpose and details. • Mutual Consent Requirements: Teacher Commitment Letter & Teacher assignments: Based on SLC need, not seniority – Is Union on board with this? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why were these autonomies chosen? • What happens to teachers who do not sign the contract? |
| <p>F. School Planning Team</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. 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>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty was invited to join the planning team, as were parents, LAEP staff, and the PSC Office. • All teachers were given the opportunity to participate in the development of the plan. <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 13 has data but no where in the plan is there an analysis of this data or a plan to address areas of highest need. • It is not clear how many faculty members volunteered to participate • It appears that some students and parents were actively involved in plan development, more so than teachers. A couple of students had the opportunity to give their perspective. • Contributions to the plan are limited and once the team was selected, they did not go back request feedback from other school community members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much of this plan has teachers seen and approved? |

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:

Sylmar HS presently has Small Learning Communities but this plan does not give a clear description of how implementing the curriculum chosen and the selected autonomies would provide different results in student achievement. The plan defines *Linked Learning, Humanitas and Project Based Learning* without providing a professional development plan, timeline or goals to show growth in student achievement. The school has already implemented common assessments; these *Essential Learnings (ELs)* were developed and administered by teachers to measure student performance levels. The ELs results did not show an increase in student performance level. There is no evidence of the connection between ELs and curriculum planning. The data analysis section is very weak. Data is alluded to through their analysis without any quantitative data provided or explanation of how the analysis of this data will address areas of highest need. Parent data collected indicates that parents feel disconnected to the school, staff and their child’s education. Using communication technology the District already provides for schools and providing a one day training for clerical and out of the classroom staff does not demonstrate an engaging or innovative plan to increase parent involvement or participation. They also do not address how they will communicate with parents that may not have access or knowledge of technology. Requesting that parents fill out a “quick” survey when visiting the school does not seem an appropriate manner to improve customer service or make the environment more welcoming. There are many areas that are identified as needing work, yet the plan is not clearly defined or detailed to show that they will be able to increase student achievement. It is not clear how many faculty members volunteered to participate. It appears that some students and parents were actively involved in plan development, more so than teachers. Contributions to the plan are limited and once the team was selected they did not go back request feedback from other school community members.