

**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"> • Targeted, recognized industry in their community • Clearly planned the SLCs they want, and they are in the growing industries, including a catch-all humanities. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems to use the “kitchen sink” approach, throwing in every buzz word, but didn’t know if they have any of this in place already. Are they ready to implement? Will they do it all of a sudden, all at once? • Feel there should be more about academics, especially given data that we see in Section B. 	
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"> • It is an honest depiction of their current situation. • Cite that their data came from a variety of sources. • Thorough in defining their trends and articulating the causal factors. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not see a connection between their central issues that were outlined in B2 and their vision for their school. For example, community was noted as a key piece in their vision, but it wasn’t included in B2. • They talk a lot about loss of QEIA – is their plan realistic without these funds? • Plan states that community support for the plan is strong but their parent attendance is low, which seems contradictory. • They cite low staff morale and lack of communication between staff and students, which calls into question how they will make significant improvements in these particular key areas. 	<p>Is it realistic that they will be able to do all the things they will ask for with loss of QEIA?</p> <p>Especially for the 2x8 block schedule, will they have enough funds? Will they have enough staff for all they propose?</p>
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 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</p>	<p>Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school has built the infrastructure necessary to implement their plan, in terms of technology. <p>Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On page 21, plan states that “teacher buy in should not hinder success of the school-wide plan.” This is a troubling statement. • Technology is part of the vision but it is not mentioned for the 9th grade house. • The ties to the vision are inconsistent and there is a big question of how they will bring all 	<p>Is the vision really being thread through their school?</p> <p>Is it really the vision that they want?</p> <p>Groups of people mentioned, but how</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>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>this to fruition. They may lose their vision in the midst of trying to implement the all things they've listed, e.g., 2x8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They discuss trips to the museum, etc., but how does this get back to their key vision of connecting to the community? There are lots of arts opportunities in the Wilmington community and Long Beach but why are they talking more about a UCLA program, outside their immediate community? • Port Academy and LA Harbor SLCs may be the most connected to the vision; however, the Art SLC may be a bit disconnected. • Not clear how they will thematically connect the Freshman Academy to the vision. They also do not call out why they are going to have the Freshman Academy—they do not make a case for it. • They have no program for their Advisory classes. They can use the AVID strategies, but those are not a curriculum—does not feel concrete enough. • Data Team (pg. 11)—Reviewers fear the school would not have enough money to pull all those people together. Would rather they had noted all positions the school needs and really focus in on their top priorities, limiting to those essential, useful positions. Plus, these people are not connected to a specific group of kids, they are school-wide... so how will they have more focused data conversations? • One of their issues is low morale; however, they have also said they would meet every Monday for PLCs and use the Critical Friends protocol. The protocol is great, but meeting together doesn't necessarily build the trust/morale that is apparently missing. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a plan for doing anything different with these PLC meetings. • How will they now ensure sustainability? It is unclear what might happens if the principal leaves again, and what their plans are for their PLC meetings, for example, aside from the Critical Friends protocol. • It seems that the only explicit plan to change the culture is organizing more meeting time. • Lack of specificity in terms of what would take place in meetings. Critical Friends protocol is great for looking at student work and lesson study, but how will these Monday meetings build staff relationships, trust, etc.? • Non-academic portion of the culture is not included. If they have that many LTELS, how are they going to be connected to the community? • The plan recognizes that teachers will need to be trained on PBL and the block schedule, but it might be too much at once. Right now, it looks like they will train teachers on all of these things—do they have a plan for implementing over time? How will they manage all this? 	<p>guarantee, for example, the SLC leads are not good? Have they all been well-trained?</p> <p>Are there realistic resources for all of these things?</p> <p>There are a lot of plans for teachers to meet, but will they have the resources/funds to do all that?</p> <p>How will teachers learn to teach to the block, alongside Common Core training?</p> <p>Advisory – what curriculum do they intend to use.</p>
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</p>	<p>Strengths: None noted. Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this plan to be successful, they would need money to pay the teachers for the PD time. 	<p>Much of the PD will have to happen over the summer--will they be able to pay?</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>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>Especially difficult if trying to train all staff in AVID, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good job of detailing what they need, but the plan doesn't seem realistic about how they are going to accomplish all the things in their plan—especially with all the training and the switch to another block scheduling. • Seem like they've included everything in the first year. • Plan seems to assume that teachers will have one training on the various strategies, but no plan is evident for ongoing PD to ensure teachers have the knowledge and skills they need. • Will need a very skilled APSCS for pure SLC classes, intervention, enrichment, small classes, 2x8. This is too difficult for an AP because this is a job in itself. • Lost QEIA last year so their class sizes are already high. Moving to a 2x8 block will cause their classes to get even higher. • It appears that they are not doing any of the strategies now and the reason it fell apart was due to loss of QEIA; then, the plan states they used to have these programs, but they will suddenly redo all of it next year. Reviewers questioned how this sudden implementation would work. • Plan blames the school's decline on the previous principal, for not keeping the programs going. However, reviewers wondered, if these programs were operating successfully, why they were not self-sustaining, and how they might avoid this sustainability issue in the future if/when administration changes again. • Reviewers felt that the team does not fully understand some of the realities of their current situation. • They say that "Teacher buy-in should not hinder..." This is a troublesome statement. If teacher buy-in is not an essential element, why have they selected the ESBMM model? It seems there is a core group in support of the school plan, but there are others who are against that flow. If staff are the barrier to improvement, what will they do to overcome it? • No tracking or benchmarking system was mentioned, in terms of identifying whether they are actually doing what they need to do—there was no mention of a system to assess and make tweaks as necessary. How will they know that they are going in the right direction? • API goals over four years is only 5%, which seems very modest. • Most of their performance indicators are focused on test scores, with very little on the other aspects of the school. 	<p>Will teachers be willing to give up their summer without pay?</p> <p>Who will be doing their Master Schedule?</p> <p>What is the plan if both plans are approved for the school, given the number of SLCs?</p>
<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</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESBMM seems to be a reasonable expansion of their current shared decision making model. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewers had a major question about the Learning Lab. High numbers of ELs, but they want to use Learning Lab (which is technically for Special Ed) instead of the Master Plan. 	<p>They mention the loss of QEIA so many times, how are they going to replace it? And what will they do if they can't?</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>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>But they have a huge percentage of Special Ed and the concern is especially that there is no accountability for Learning Lab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are requesting curriculum autonomy but it does not seem necessary given what they have proposed. • Also unclear how altering their pacing plans is going to strengthen their SLCs • Their autonomies are not clearly connected to their vision. 	
<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: None noted.</p> <p>Concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have a lot of strength in their personnel, but they don't discuss this much in the body of the plan. • It is odd that they designate all their lead teachers for SLCs that don't yet exist. This may indicate commitment, but the reviewers caution that this could be seen as the team being exclusive. 	

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 reviewers rated this plan Developing. The vision is clear and targeted to their community, but the body of the plan is not always true to the vision. Many details are provided about what the team plans to do, but a lot of traditional structures are still in the plan without a clear explanation of how they are going to ensure that they are more effective within these traditional structures. What will they do differently, and how will they track for their success? Support letters provided in the appendix make clear that the school has partners, but it is not explicitly, fully stated in the plan how the partners will support the school. Furthermore, the plan proposed a schedule change, adding personnel and increasing PD, but it is unclear how the school will find the resources to do these things, especially given that they discuss their loss of QEIA funds extensively, and how this has negatively impacted the school. Overall, the plan felt like a long, exhaustive list of priorities and the major concern of the reviewers is that claims of low morale and stated disregard for teacher buy-in (noted in the plan itself) may hinder their ability to successfully bring about change and improvement.

Please note that the rating and comments above reflect the review of the Superintendent's Review Panel members. While 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.*