

**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>Strength:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have a very specific focus on what they want their students to do. They are very clear about where they are going.</li> <li>• The Academy focuses are specific to the community.</li> <li>• Plan is articulate, team seems to understand exactly what they want.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not very clear about how they will do their Advisories—they can purchase College Knowledge, but 4 years is a long time to use that. This takes students out of class time so how will they ensure they use it well?</li> <li>• They were going to develop local standards for courses that do not have standards—but what does this mean? It should be tied to something beyond the local standards, especially if have a certification process</li> <li>• The plan is only for a portion of the Banning HS population—understand that this is intentional but where does this leave the rest of the students?</li> </ul>	<p>Will there be a certification for all the Academies/ fields of choice?</p> <p>How are they going to offer all this in the Master Schedule?</p> <p>How were the SLCs selected? Were they existing or created?</p>
<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>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis is great, clearly stated.</li> <li>• Overall, the plan is easy to read.</li> <li>• Did a good job identifying their barriers.</li> <li>• Good that they were honest about having identified the low expectations.</li> <li>• If they are talking about the culture of low expectations, it seems odd they have focused so heavily on ELA, even though that one area has the highest proficiency.</li> <li>• They did not provide reclassification data in the data section, although they say on page 7 that it is an urgent need. Need is not addressed well enough for it to be a central urgent issue.</li> <li>• Question their EL data—reclassification does not mean students are proficient. They state that their reclassified students have contributed to their increase in ELA, but this seems like an assumption.</li> <li>• Should be clearer how college preparedness relates to ELA.</li> <li>• Instead of focusing on instruction, the root causes they cite the school’s decline are SLCs not working, the 9<sup>th</sup> grade houses not working, and counselor misplacement.</li> <li>• Analysis is heavily focused on academic achievement and doesn’t delve into physical, social, emotional needs to students.</li> <li>• Identified their most critical issue as low expectations—which seems a bit</li> </ul>	

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>simplistic, because this implies that they just need to raise expectations to raise student achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Credit deficiency is an early indicator...” this seems a bit simplistic and too vague.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b> None noted.</p>	
<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>• Four pillars were clearly articulated in their vision, and are the focus of the school turnaround plan.</li> <li>• They have many strategies for Career Readiness. They have recognized the realities of where they live.</li> <li>• The use of the e-portfolios and on-line instruction and learning indicates a focus on 21st-century skills.</li> <li>• Strategies are research based and proven to increase academic achievement.</li> <li>• Blend of technology integration and project based learning</li> <li>• Culture of compassion suggests they are concerned with emotional, social, psychological needs of students, even though their focus is almost entirely academic.</li> <li>• Relationships among all stakeholders are cited as a priority, showing a culture of respect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not expand on principles of RtI2, which was mentioned in the data section—why isn’t it in the strategies section?</li> <li>• “Results” section is not helpful and seems a bit gradiose—some of the statements seem too broad, and they take big leaps.</li> <li>• Seems strange to say students cannot drop AP classes because they are too difficult—is this absolute? What are the details of this statement?</li> <li>• A big question is about how they will incorporate parent involvement? They mention that their parents are not active and do not participate, but they don’t have much a parent engagement plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Do they have enough resources to get each student a computer/laptop?</p> <p>Dual enrollment (p.13)—will it be feasible with all the cuts?</p>
<p><b>D. Implementation</b></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><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A system of monitoring each facet of implementation is clearly explained.</li> <li>• Presumably, since this plan would set up a new school, all systems would have to be instituted immediately.</li> <li>• Realistic about the challenges of dividing the Banning school and they promise flexibility in sharing the space. But the realities of sharing the space may be more of an impediment than they even realize...</li> <li>• They anticipate the need for PD, especially online PD.</li> </ul>	<p>Are they a PLTW school?</p> <p>If the people on the Personnel Team leave, will they be able to continue this?</p> <p>What does it mean when</p>

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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Friday Folder is a unique idea for teachers, although we don't know if it will be successful.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They have some significant barriers.</li> <li>Project Lead the Way (PLTW) classes that are not pre-approved by LAUSD cannot be used by any school.</li> <li>Benchmarks are not documented on a timeline, but this may be because they have to set up something new, so that all facets of the plan will be in place at the outset.</li> <li>It is unclear how they are going to monitor their progress. Especially around online PD—how will they know that teachers are getting the support that they need through the PD.</li> </ul>	<p>they say that students will have the option to extend their semester? How will they do this?</p> <p>Need some clarity regarding their Elect to Work Agreement and when/how they will write it.</p>
<p><b>E. Alternative Governance Models &amp; Autonomies</b></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><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requested autonomies generally support the vision.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They don't have a governance model selected (not sure if they are going to be SBM, SDM, etc.)... concern is If they want a magnet school and all these things that will require decision making, if they do not have a building council, who will make these sorts of decisions for them? They need to start talking about this now. It will likely be the planning team, but it is a missing piece that they should write about.</li> <li>Assessment autonomy—they want to use locally developed assessments, but they don't talk about this much in the plan aside from Moodle. Why did they request this autonomy if they don't necessarily have anything they're planning for? Plan should have mentioned their rationale for this autonomy if they are going to request it.</li> </ul>	
<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</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diverse, representative group of the school community and they all live in the community.</li> </ul>	

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
	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).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They came together because of the similarities in their ideas—desire to collaborate rather than compete.</li> <li>• Strong focus of the plan demonstrates commitment and shared sense of purpose of the team, which bodes well for success.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not have a community member or parent on the planning team, which would have been good to have.</li> <li>• Could have included some more information about how parents provided input into the plan—a little bit more detail would have been helpful.</li> </ul>	

### 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 thorough, but concise, with a focus on effective instruction and consistently high expectations for student achievement. The strategies and ideas around instructional philosophy are clear and it demonstrates what a student in their school would be able to do. In particular, the four pillars make it very clear. A strong sense of commitment is evident in the plan, which gives confidence that the Planning Team could successfully implement their plan despite the significant challenges of breaking apart an existing school.

However, the Planning Team does not already have a governing board or body, which is concerning because they have no one to ensure implementation of the plan, or that their work will continue regardless of who is the leader at the school. This decision-making group is very critical because they will need to be involved in all the big decisions that need to be made. The team will also need to clarify how they will track their school's progress, because this information was lacking. Otherwise, the plan was well-developed in every regard, except the lack of a clear plan for governance.