

**PSC School: 153<sup>rd</sup> St. 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><u>Strengths</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team finds it positive that the school’s vision to matriculate students to be college ready is in accordance with the Superintendent’s vision for every LAUSD student. In order to achieve the vision, the plan enumerates expectations from and responsibilities of each stakeholder. It is also important that the plan includes thinking critically to resolve problems. Critical thinking is a vital component of the Common Core Standards, and it is the plan’s strength to include this in its vision statement.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Concerns</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team did not see this as a plan to step outside of the box of what all LAUSD schools are required to do. It is a restatement of mandates and requirements that are uniform for every school in the district. From the vision there was no follow up on the strategies or sources referenced. The Instructional Philosophy mentions Madeline Hunter, as well as other references, and yet they were not brought up again in the succeeding paragraph or sections. The instructional program design (namely Prioritizing Student Achievement, Implementing a Coherent, Standards-Based Curriculum, among others) is fairly basic. Instructional Strategies such as Access to Core, SDAIE, Reciprocal Teaching, and Writing Across the Curriculum are things that are generic to LAUSD elementary schools. The connection between the vision and the instructional philosophy is just not explicit and clear. Lack of clarity and focus in terms of the foundational pieces to tie the vision to the instructional philosophy will make it challenging to implement this plan.</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 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><b><u>Strengths</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team recognizes it as strength that the school collects multiple sources of data, identifies and reflects on their strengths, and highlights areas of improvement. While the school has increased its API score over the years, its percentage of proficient and advanced students across content areas continues to be less than half of the student population tested.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Concerns</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team found that this section of the plan does not provide a narrative of the school and student trends. The plan fell short of personalizing the data to provide a glimpse of the school. While the chart and figures depict the current performance, it was difficult to understand what is going on in the school on a day to day basis because this section failed to provide a descriptive context for teaching and learning on campus. There was no accurate depiction of the diverse learners/subgroups and their performance in academics, attitude, and attendance. For adult goals, there was not data on teaching staff, credentialing, and number of teachers at the school. It appears that there is a disconnect between the reality of the school’s performance and what needs to be prioritized. Specifically, science scores declined rapidly, but is not considered a priority. The</li> </ul>	

## PSC School: 153<sup>rd</sup> St. 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
		School Experience Survey names poor leadership as cause of low morale, but this also was not considered a priority. Instead, the plan relies on implementing superficial strategies such as changing the school name or wearing uniforms to build school morale. Similarly, suspension of African-American students and SWDs was also indicated as a problem, but there were no action steps or resolution to highlight how this issue will be addressed. The school data shows the school's areas of needs, but the plan failed to connect those needs to actions and strategies to improve the situation.	
<b>C. School Turnaround</b>	<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>The team has identified strategies, programs and backed it up with some research. The plan also enlists a strong partnership with city and community agencies to provide services to the school community such as professional development in science, motivational speakers, financial literacy, sports and music. These partnerships are further strengthened by letters of commitment signed by the agencies, as found in the appendix.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the plan has identified various strategies, programs, and services to turn the school around, they were not clear and specific as to how these will increase student achievement. This is because the ideas that drive the strategies identified are mostly leaning towards issues of low morale and poor leadership. The plan cites peer observation as an essential component in building collaboration among the faculty and staff, but how is this beneficial if it becomes evaluative, as the plan suggests it should towards the summative observation? The plan cites in the previous section that the staff does not collaborate and does not trust each other, and yet, they aim to implement data chats, grade level collaboration, peer observation, lesson studies, and other strategies that involve trust and collaboration. Without focusing on the underlying issues of low morale and mistrust, it is difficult to engage the staff in the identified strategies and programs. The plan must first focus on strategies that build morale as a team. In terms of the school's partnerships with outside agencies to provide programs, there is no connection of these partnerships to support the broader ideas in the plan. Lastly, there are multiple ideas and strategies but no context as to how they will implement this work. The plan in general uses buzzwords such as RTI2, reciprocal teaching, weekend intervention, etc., but it does not highlight how they will be implemented in the everyday instructional context of the school. Strategies such as differentiated instruction takes place throughout the day, and should not be misconstrued as a pull-out program in conjunction with the learning lab.</li> </ul>	
<b>D. Implementa-tion</b>	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	<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Review Team has not come up with any strength for this particular section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In terms of implementation, the plan suggests that the administrators must begin to prioritize. This in itself is a broader, more important issue. If this and poor leadership is raised, why is this not a</li> </ul>	

## PSC School: 153<sup>rd</sup> St. 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>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>priority of the plan? In fact, the plan states the following: "The most significant barriers that we foresee is not having 100% support of our plan from all stakeholders...We will weed out teachers who feel as though they do not like the way our school is headed." This strategy alone will not get this plan moving. If this approach is the solution to identified problems, there is no wonder why morale is low. The responses to this section of the plan seem like the true issue is not being confronted and addressed by the school.</p>	
<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 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>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team has not come up with any strength for this particular section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team believes that the autonomies requested appear to be the problem because the autonomies might exacerbate the morale issues. How will morale be built if the idea of weeding out teachers is in the plan? The autonomies do not connect to the real needs of the school. The plan asks for autonomy in terms of teacher assignment, but does not put in place systems or structures to measure staff and student compatibility. These autonomies and ideas are not anything considered innovative and outside of the school structures of LAUSD.</li> </ul>	
<b>F. School Planning Team</b>	<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</p>	<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team has not come up with any strength for this particular section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Review Team does not consider this plan to be a product of a collaborative team. There were</li> </ul>	

## PSC School: 153<sup>rd</sup> St. 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>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>no specific people identified as members of the Writing Team. Instead, administrative and teacher positions were named as members of the planning and writing team. This does not give us an insight as to how interested these individuals are in turning the school around. Their number of years in the school, teaching experience, and other descriptive details would have given us context as to how and why they write the plan the way it came out to be.</p>	

### 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 Review Team rates this plan as Beginning. The plan is unclear, unaligned, incomplete, lacking in depth and focus, and missing crucial details that would have seamlessly and cohesively connected the vision, to the instructional philosophy and strategies, to the implementation stage to turn the school around. It does not appear to be on the right track mainly because the core problems at the school are not fully addressed. The first two sections sound good theoretically, but fell apart in the succeeding sections due to disconnect to the real instructional and morale context of the school.