

SCHOOL *DISTRICT*

Targeted Site Visit Report

(Report 2 of 2)

July 2022



201 Jones Road
Waltham, Massachusetts
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499
www.air.org

18595_07/22

Contents





- About the Targeted Site Visit Process..... 1
 - Targeted Site Visit Implementation Rubric..... 2
- Organization of the Report 3
 - School Overview 3
 - Instructional Staff Survey Interpretation 3
- Findings 5
 - Ratings for Turnaround Indicators 5
 - Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration..... 6
 - Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction 16
 - Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students..... 29
 - Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture 40
- Appendix A: Instructional Staff Survey Report 50
- Appendix B: Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report 61

About the Targeted Site Visit Process

The Targeted Site Visit is designed to provide formative feedback regarding school progress in implementing continuous improvement efforts in four key turnaround practice areas.

Research regarding Massachusetts schools that have successfully achieved dramatic academic and nonacademic improvements has identified four key turnaround practices that contribute to rapid improvements in student outcomes. These turnaround practices, listed in Table 1, provide the framework for driving sustainable school improvement efforts in Massachusetts.

Table 1. Key Turnaround Practices

Key Turnaround Practices	
	1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration
	2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction
	3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students
	4. School Climate and Culture

The Targeted Site Visits conducted by the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) use data from multiple sources—including a principal interview and questionnaire, an instructional staff survey, and schoolwide instructional observations—to identify strengths and areas for growth according to 25 indicators of school practice, within the four key turnaround practice areas. The Targeted Site Visit results in two documents: (1) the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* (also in Appendix B), based on schoolwide instructional observation data, and (2) this *Targeted Site Visit Report*, which is the final report that documents the team’s findings across all data sources.

Ratings on the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* are based on the nationally normed Classroom Assessment Scoring System developed by Teachstone. In the *Targeted Site Visit Report*, ratings in each turnaround practice indicator provide formative feedback to the school. When used in tandem with the practice guides from the *Turnaround Practices in Action* document,¹ the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* and *Targeted Site Visit Report* will help school teams assess areas of strength and areas for improvement to inform continuous school improvement efforts.

¹ See Lane, B., Unger, C., & Souvanna, P. (2014). *Turnaround practices in action: A three-year analysis of school and district practices, systems, policies, and use of resources contributing to successful turnaround efforts in Massachusetts’ Level 4 schools*. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. <https://www.doe.mass.edu/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>

Targeted Site Visit Implementation Rubric

Based on information gathered from the Targeted Site Visit, schools are rated for each indicator on a 3-point implementation rubric: *limited/partial*, *emergent*, or *coherent* (see Table 2 for definitions of the ratings). The process for assigning the ratings is as follows: (1) Code data and analyze implementation for each indicator; (2) for relevant indicators, consider ratings from schoolwide instructional observations, responses from the principal questionnaire, and results from the instructional staff survey; and (3) assign ratings for each indicator.

Table 2. Targeted Site Visit Implementation Rubric

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
Evidence suggests that necessary organizational practices, structures, or processes are nonexistent or are not yet fully effective.	Evidence suggests that some necessary organizational practices, structures, or processes are in place and are implemented effectively. However, key systems are not yet implemented schoolwide for all relevant teachers and students.	Evidence suggests that necessary organizational practices, structures, or processes are in place and are implemented effectively for all or nearly all relevant teachers and students.

Organization of the Report

This report begins with a broad school overview, including key demographic information as well as a summary of focus areas for the 2021–22 school year. The remainder of the report focuses on the indicators in each turnaround practice area.

School Overview

SCHOOL (hereafter, SCHOOL) is located in DISTRICT. During the 2021–22 school year, the school had approximately 45 teaching staff and 644 students in Grades 5–8; 20.7 percent of students have identified disabilities, 33.7 percent of students are English learners (ELs), and 76.6 percent of students are considered economically disadvantaged.² In the 2020–21 school year, SCHOOL was designated a school in need of focused or targeted support.

The current principal is in his first year at SCHOOL and is supported by an assistant principal. According to the current school improvement plan, SCHOOL's priorities for this year include high-leverage goals aligned with each of the turnaround practice areas, such as the following:

- Shared leadership and effective collaborative structures support SCHOOL as a professional learning community focused on continuous improvement [Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration].
- Educators develop the knowledge and efficacy to implement well-planned lessons that are designed to be culturally relevant and are accessible and challenging to grow each student's academic, social, and emotional skills [Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction].
- Based on an MTSS model, educators provide accessible and challenging interventions to optimize, challenge, and promote growth, which is built on student assets, matches student needs, and is monitored so that it is highly effective [Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students].
- The SCHOOL community works together to develop trusting relationships that support a safe, orderly, and positive environment focused on improvement and achievement [Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture].

SCHOOL receives professional development and instructional supports from its district office, as well as from its regional liaison. Specific district supports are highlighted in the relevant indicators in the following sections.

The Findings section identifies strengths and areas for improvement in the school's structures and systems in place to achieve these priorities and, in general, to pursue whole-school improvement.

Instructional Staff Survey Interpretation

The instructional staff survey is designed to align to key components of the turnaround practices and indicators. Most of the ratings are based on a group of survey questions that are more reliable measurements of a school's progress toward an indicator than the individual items. Data relating to individual items are not intended to inform decision making and are included for reference only. Survey data from items with a response rate of 50 percent or more are used to inform the Targeted Site Visit ratings. In some cases, response rates might be below 50 percent for items that ask about specialized student populations (e.g., ELs) and are therefore relevant to only a subset of staff who

² Based on 2021–22 data available on the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website.

work with students in these subgroups. In this case, we may use survey data despite a low item response rate. If applicable, in the report, we have indicated instances in which we include survey data for questions that had a response rate less than 50 percent. At SCHOOL, 50 of 61 total instructional staff members completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 82 percent.

Findings

Ratings for Turnaround Indicators

Ratings for each indicator across the four turnaround practice areas for SCHOOL are included in Table 3. More details about the findings for the indicators follow.

Table 3. Ratings for Turnaround Indicators

Turnaround Practice Indicator	Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration			
1.1 Use of Autonomy			X
1.2 High Expectations		X	
1.3 Support for School's Sustainable Improvement Process		X	
1.4 Trusting Relationships		X	
1.5 Use of Time for Collaboration		X	
1.6 Communication With Staff		X	
1.7 Teacher Leadership		X	
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction			
2.1 Instructional Expectations		X	
2.2 Instructional Schedule		X	
2.3 Classroom Observation Data Use		X	
2.4 Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)		X	
2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)		X	
2.6 Structures for Instructional Improvement		X	
2.7 College and Career Preparation	X		
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students			
3.1 Academic Interventions		X	
3.2 Academic Enrichments	X		
3.3 Teacher Training to Implement Student Interventions (academic and nonacademic)		X	
3.4 Multitiered System of Support (nonacademic)		X	
3.5 Academic Supports for English Language Learners		X	
3.6 Academic Supports for Students With Disabilities		X	
4. School Climate and Culture			
4.1 Schoolwide Conduct Expectations	X		
4.2 Adult-Student Relationships	X		
4.3 Expanded Learning		X	
4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners		X	
4.5 Family and Community Engagement		X	

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator ratings were developed based on review of the principal interview, questionnaire, and relevant extant documents (e.g., the school improvement plan), as well as results from the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* and an anonymous survey of all instructional staff. For each indicator, AIR staff reviewed collected data and compared responses to the standards of *limited/partial*, *emergent*, and *coherent* as defined in the Targeted Site Visit rubric for each indicator. Given the data sources available for this review, the ratings that follow can offer a snapshot of the school’s improvement effort to inform ongoing improvement strategies. The ratings are not intended to be a definitive account of the quality or success of the school improvement effort.

Table 4. Ratings for Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration

Indicator	Limited/ Partial	Emergent	Coherent
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration			
1.1 Use of Autonomy			X
1.2 High Expectations		X	
1.3 Support for School’s Sustainable Improvement Process		X	
1.4 Trusting Relationships		X	
1.5 Use of Time for Collaboration		X	
1.6 Communication With Staff		X	
1.7 Teacher Leadership		X	

The sections that follow highlight ratings for each indicator, as defined in the rubric. For each indicator, we include information from relevant data sources that contributed to the rating.

Indicator 1.1 Use of Autonomy

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating: Limited/Partial Emergent **Coherent**

Findings

- At SCHOOL, school leaders have the autonomy to make decisions about staffing, the school schedule, and professional development, and school leaders regularly use this autonomy to make changes in the school.
- The principal reported that the school has autonomy over scheduling. He explained that the school has the autonomy to modify the instructional schedule based on students’ needs.
- The principal reported that staffing is based on the school budget that is provided by the district. This year, the school hired an assistant principal for Grades 5 and 6, a math and science teacher for Grade 6, a social studies teacher for Grade 7, a literacy specialist, an instructional specialist, a positive behavior resource teacher, and an adjustment counselor.
- Regarding budgeting, the principal reported that schools have “the autonomy to take our funding and allocate it toward where we feel is going to support kids best.” He also stated that the school was able to shift the budget to hire a literacy specialist based on the need to improve reading across grade levels at SCHOOL.
- Similar to previous years, the principal reported that the school has the autonomy to set improvement priorities. As an example, he shared that, this year, Grades 5–8 were broken down into a 5–6 and 7–8 model, with dedicated social workers, assistant principals, and a dean of students in each grade level to “build some structure and consistency” regarding resource and supports provided to students in each grade.
- In line with the *coherent* rating, school leaders at SCHOOL have autonomy to make changes to elements of the school (e.g., scheduling, staffing, professional development), and they regularly use this autonomy to make changes in the school.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.1 Use of Autonomy

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
School leaders have little to no autonomy to make decisions about key elements of the school (e.g., staffing, school schedule) or do not use autonomy to make changes in the school.	School leaders have the autonomy to make decisions about key elements of the school (e.g., staffing, school schedule) and have begun to use this autonomy to make changes in the school.	School leaders have the autonomy to make decisions about key elements of the school (e.g., staffing, school schedule) and regularly use this autonomy to make changes in the school.

Indicator 1.2 High Expectations

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, school leaders understand the importance of high expectations for leadership, staff, and students, but few strategies are in place to ensure that these expectations are met.
- Regarding schoolwide structures and processes in place to ensure high expectations, the principal stated that all staff have clarity about what the school is working toward academically. However, the principal reported that clarity about social-emotional needs, culturally relevant teaching and learning, and student engagement are areas for improvement.
- Although the school is working toward ensuring these expectations, the principal explained that there is often a mismatch between student needs and staff skills in terms of “how they speak to students, build relationships, and create a safe and nurturing learning environment.”
- In line with the principal’s reports, more than two thirds to three quarters of survey respondents agree or strongly agree that all students can be academically successful (67 percent) and that all teachers at the school set high standards for themselves (76 percent).
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that survey respondents have mixed opinions about whether school leaders have high expectations for the staff and students:
 - Slightly less than two thirds of survey respondents (64 percent) agree or strongly agree that school leaders set high expectations for student learning.
 - Two thirds of survey respondents (66 percent) agree or strongly agree that the principal implements strategies and activities that encourage high expectations for school staff.
- Regarding structures to ensure equitable access and opportunity for students who are traditionally underserved, about half of survey respondents agree or strongly agree that they have the supports needed to fully serve ELs (53 percent) and students with disabilities (50 percent).
- Consistent with an *emergent* rating for this indicator, even though some structures, such as communications during staff meetings and monitoring of expectations through formal and informal walkthroughs, are in place to ensure high expectations and equitable opportunity for students who are traditionally underserved, staff have mixed opinions about whether leadership implements strategies and activities that encourage high expectations. Similarly, not all staff reported not having adequate supports needed to fully serve ELs and students with disabilities.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.2 High Expectations

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Little to no evidence indicates that school leaders make high expectations for themselves, staff, and students a priority.</p>	<p>School leaders understand the importance of high expectations for leadership, staff, and students but implement few strategies to ensure that these elements are in place. School leaders understand the importance of providing equitable opportunity for traditionally underserved students (high poverty, English learners, students with disabilities, historically marginalized racial/ethnic groups, etc.) to broad and challenging curriculum and enrichment opportunities, though access may be limited.</p>	<p>School leaders understand the importance of high expectations for leadership, staff, and students and implement strategies to ensure that these elements are in place. Schoolwide structures and processes are in place to provide equitable access and opportunity for traditionally underserved students (high poverty, English learners, students with disabilities, historically marginalized racial/ethnic groups, etc.) to broad and challenging curriculum and enrichment opportunities. A majority of staff believe leadership, staff, and students have high expectations.</p>

Indicator 1.3 Support for School’s Sustainable Improvement Process

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating:	Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------

Findings

- School leaders at SCHOOL have defined and communicated the school’s vision and improvement priorities, and leaders monitor progress using benchmark data at least every six weeks. However, instructional staff survey results indicate that not all staff understand or buy into the transformation plan priorities and take responsibility for improving the school.
- The principal reported that SCHOOL leaders and staff were focused on improving instruction through implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), co-teaching, cultural competencies, and formative assessment data use this year. He explained that school leaders developed indicators based on prior year data on school improvement as well as student assessments. These indicators were then shared with staff and further discussed with the instructional leadership team (ILT) to finalize these indicators of school improvement.
- Relatedly, more than three quarters of instructional staff survey respondents agree or strongly agree that school leaders have developed clear processes for measuring the school’s progress toward improvement goals (78 percent) and established benchmarks for measuring progress (76 percent).
- About two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (65 percent) agree or strongly agree that school leaders communicate about school progress and challenges with teachers and other staff.
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, not all staff have a sense of shared responsibility for student success. Specifically, less than two thirds of respondents (61 percent) agree or strongly agree that nearly all teachers take responsibility for improving the school, and only about half of instructional staff survey respondents (51 percent) agree or strongly agree that nearly all teachers think that the school’s goals for student achievement can be met if all teachers work hard.
- Even though school leaders have defined a set of goals and benchmarks for regularly measuring progress, a lack of schoolwide buy-in and support from some staff keep this indicator at an *emergent* rating.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.3 Support for School’s Sustainable Improvement Process

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>As part of the school improvement effort, none or only one or two of the following elements are in place: (1) School leaders have defined and communicated a theory of action or vision; (2) clear schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities, understood by all or nearly all staff; (3) buy-in and professional investment from all or nearly all staff; (4) benchmarks for measuring progress toward schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities; and (5) regular (e.g., at least every six weeks) monitoring of progress toward schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, three to four of the following elements are in place: (1) School leaders have defined and communicated a theory of action or vision; (2) clear schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities, understood by all or nearly all staff; (3) buy-in and professional investment from all or nearly all staff; (4) benchmarks for measuring progress toward schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities; and (5) regular (e.g., at least every six weeks) monitoring of progress toward schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, all five of the following elements are in place: (1) School leaders have defined and communicated a theory of action or vision; (2) clear schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities, understood by all or nearly all staff; (3) buy-in and professional investment from all or nearly all staff; (4) benchmarks for measuring progress toward schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities; and (5) regular (e.g., at least every six weeks) monitoring of progress toward schoolwide sustainable improvement priorities.</p>

Indicator 1.4 Trusting Relationships

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating: Limited/Partial **Emergent** Coherent

Findings

- Although most relationships between staff and instructional coaches at SCHOOL are guided by trust, not all staff feel relationships are guided by trust.
- Regarding trust between staff and school leaders, a large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (84 percent) agree or strongly agree that the principal has confidence in the expertise of teachers. Slightly fewer respondents (74 percent) agree or strongly agree that the principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
- Regarding trust between staff and coaches, about three quarters of instructional staff survey respondents agree or strongly agree that nearly all teachers have built trusting relationships with instructional coaches (78 percent) and that instructional support is nonjudgmental (73 percent).
- Survey respondents have less favorable opinions about relationships among staff:
 - About two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (65 percent) agree or strongly agree that nearly all teachers at the school trust each other.
 - Slightly more than half of instructional staff survey respondents (56 percent) agree or strongly agree that nearly all staff engage in strategies and activities to promote positive relationships between leadership and staff in the school.
- Open-ended survey responses indicate that, although relationships between teachers and instructional specialists is an area of strength, trust among teachers is an area for improvement at SCHOOL. One respondent noted that “leadership is fine, instructional specialists as well” but staff can be “judgmental and non-receptive to change and suggestions.”
- Survey responses indicate that trust is inconsistent among teachers and between teachers and instructional coaches, keeping this indicator at an *emergent* rating.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.4 Trusting Relationships

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
Relationships between teachers and instructional support staff (e.g., coaches, colleagues) are not guided by trust, or teachers feel that coaching and instructional support are judgmental.	Most relationships between teachers and instructional support staff (e.g., coaches, colleagues) are guided by trust, and most teachers feel that instructional support is nonjudgmental; however, evidence suggests that trust is inconsistent across the school (e.g., trust exists only for some grade-level or content-area teams, and trust exists among teachers but not with coaches).	All or nearly all relationships between teachers and instructional support staff (e.g., coaches, colleagues) are guided by trust, and all or nearly all teachers feel that instructional support is nonjudgmental.

Indicator 1.5 Use of Time for Collaboration

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- Although the schedule at SCHOOL includes regular time for general education teachers to meet in grade-level teams to discuss strategies and challenges, instructional staff survey results suggest that some teachers desire more time to meet with specialists or in content-area teams.
- According to the principal questionnaire, grade-level planning teams meet every Tuesday and Thursday for 52 minutes. The ILT meets bimonthly, the attendance team and student support team (SST) meet weekly, and the positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) team meets monthly. Other teams, including student advisory, cultural competencies team, UDL and co-teaching teams, and formative assessment review teams meet on an ad hoc basis.
- According to instructional staff survey results, nearly three quarters (or more) of respondents reported that they use the common planning time (CPT) at least once per month to
 - consult with other teachers about challenges they are facing in the classroom (78 percent),
 - share ideas about managing student behavior (75 percent), and
 - discuss beliefs about teaching and learning (72 percent).
- About two thirds of respondents reported that they use the CPT once per month (or more) to
 - discuss particular lessons that were not very successful (69 percent) and
 - discuss what they learned in professional development activities with other teachers (63 percent).
- Fewer staff reported that they use the CPT once per month (or more) to
 - examine or change the scope or sequence of the coverage of specific curricular topics (59 percent),
 - work on implementing particular instructional grouping strategies (56 percent),
 - clarify standards for student learning through in-depth discussion and analysis of students' classroom work (56 percent),
 - share and discuss research on effective teaching methods (55 percent),
 - examine the alignment of curricular materials and student assessments at their school (48 percent),
 - develop thematic units or other approaches to integrating instruction across curricular areas (31 percent),
- Even fewer respondents reported that they observe another teacher teaching (13 percent), and have their class observed by another teacher (13 percent).
- Instructional staff survey responses indicate that time to coordinate with specialists, in particular, may be inadequate:
 - One third of instructional staff survey respondents (33 percent) agree or strongly agree that general education teachers have time to meet with EL specialists to coordinate supports as necessary.
 - Less than half of instructional staff survey respondents (43 percent) agree or strongly agree that general education teachers have time to meet with special education specialists to coordinate supports as necessary.
- In line with the survey findings, open-ended responses indicate that collaboration is an area for improvement at SCHOOL, represented by this response: "There needs to be more collaboration with special and general educators and administration on the needs of students with disabilities."
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although the schedule at SCHOOL includes time for collaboration between general education teachers to improve teaching and learning, instructional staff survey results suggest that collaboration does not consistently include EL and special education teachers.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.5 Use of Time for Collaboration

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>The schedule includes little or no time for collaboration between teachers, or existing collaboration time is not used consistently or systematically.</p>	<p>The schedule includes adequate time for collaboration between teachers. Time is generally used well to improve teaching and learning. However, implementation is inconsistent across the school (e.g., collaboration exists only for some grade-level or content-area teams; collaboration does not include English language and special education teachers).</p>	<p>The schedule includes adequate time for collaboration between teachers, including English language and special education teachers, and time is used effectively across all relevant grade-level and subject-area teams.</p>

Indicator 1.6 Communication With Staff

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating: Limited/Partial **Emergent** Coherent

Findings

- SCHOOL leaders communicate with staff through multiple methods and provide opportunities for staff to give feedback; however, instructional staff survey responses suggest that some staff believe that opportunities to provide feedback and engage in two-way communication are limited.
- According to the principal, school leaders use email, a weekly SCHOOL newsletter, and meetings. He added, “There is a coaches’ corner [in the weekly newsletter], so the coaches offer their materials there, and there is opportunity for our PTO [parent–teacher organization] and school site council to be part of that communication to the staff.”
- Consistent with these reports, a large majority of instructional staff survey respondents agree or strongly agree that school leaders communicate with staff regularly in meetings (81 percent) and through electronic correspondence (94 percent).
- Fewer respondents (74 percent) agree or strongly agree that most of the staff’s communication with school leaders is on an as-needed, informal basis.
- Regarding quality of communication from school leaders, slightly more than three quarters of instructional staff survey respondents (77 percent) described communication from school leaders as consistent. However, less than two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (62 percent) described communication as adequate and clear.
- Survey responses indicate that staff have mixed perspectives about opportunities to provide feedback:
 - More than two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (72 percent) agree or strongly agree that there are sufficient and appropriate formal opportunities (e.g., regular meetings, planning sessions, committees) for all or most staff to provide feedback to school leaders.
 - Two thirds of survey respondents (66 percent) agree or strongly agree that staff experience open, two-way communication through which staff can provide feedback to school leaders.
- Several open-ended survey responses note concerns about communication from school leaders. For example, one respondent shared their concern about lack of staff voice regarding professional development: “PD [professional development] is decided by administration and may not be relevant to all staff.”
- Although school leaders have established formal structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives, evidence suggests room for improvement to ensure that more staff experience open, two-way communication with school leaders, which keeps this indicator at an *emergent* rating.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.6 Communication With Staff

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
Structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are informal, are not well defined, or do not exist. Communications are primarily one way (e.g., top-down).	Formal structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are defined but may not be used to build relationships and two-way communication across all or nearly all staff and school teams.	Formal structures are in place and are used effectively to build staff relationships balanced with transparency and open, two-way communication across all or nearly all staff and school teams and between administrators and staff.

Indicator 1.7 Teacher Leadership

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration



Indicator Rating: Limited/Partial **Emergent** Coherent

Findings

- Evidence suggests that opportunities for teacher leadership at SCHOOL are available schoolwide and are designed to support school improvement efforts, but staff have mixed opinion about whether opportunities are distributed effectively.
- According to the principal questionnaire, SCHOOL has several teacher leadership opportunities, including student advisory group, ILT, PTO, PBIS team, attendance team, SST, school site council, cultural competencies team, and UDL/co-teaching teams.
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that a large majority of staff agree or strongly agree that leadership opportunities are available to all or nearly all teachers (88 percent) and that there are opportunities specifically for teachers to take on a leadership role in some aspect of the school improvement process (84 percent).
- However, less than two thirds of staff (61 percent) agree or strongly agree that nearly all teachers take responsibility for improving the school.
- Although slightly more than three quarters of staff (78 percent) agree or strongly agree that leadership structures are effective in shaping school leaders’ decision making, fewer staff (66 percent) agree that school leaders distribute leadership and responsibility effectively across staff.
- Even though several opportunities for teacher leadership exist and are designed to support school improvement efforts, there is some disagreement about how effective or effectively distributed these opportunities are, which keeps this indicator at an *emergent* rating.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 1.7 Teacher Leadership

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
Opportunities for teacher leadership are informal, are not well defined, or do not exist.	Opportunities for teacher leadership are available to some teachers but are not available across all grade levels, subject areas, or interested teachers.	Opportunities for teacher leadership are available schoolwide and are designed to support school improvement efforts.

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator ratings were developed based on review of the principal interview, questionnaire, and relevant extant documents (e.g., the school improvement plan) as well as results from the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* and an anonymous survey of all instructional staff. For each indicator, AIR staff reviewed collected data and compared responses to the standards of *limited/partial*, *emergent*, and *coherent* as defined in the Targeted Site Visit rubric for each indicator. Given the data sources available for this review, the ratings that follow can offer a snapshot of the school’s improvement effort to inform ongoing improvement strategies. The ratings are not intended to be a definitive account of the quality or success of the school improvement effort.

Table 5. Ratings for Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

Indicator	Limited/ Partial	Emergent	Coherent
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction			
2.1 Instructional Expectations		X	
2.2 Instructional Schedule		X	
2.3 Classroom Observation Data Use		X	
2.4 Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)		X	
2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)		X	
2.6 Structures for Instructional Improvement		X	
2.7 College and Career Preparation	X		

The sections that follow highlight ratings for each indicator, as defined in the rubric. For each indicator, we include information from relevant data sources that contributed to the rating.

Indicator 2.1 Instructional Expectations

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, instructional expectations are communicated and understood by most staff, but staff reported mixed opinions about whether school leaders know what is going on in the classrooms.
- During the interview, the principal reported that instructional expectations are shared by the ILT and discussed during staff meetings. He added that he communicates and monitors those expectations also by modeling, conducting formal and informal observations, and reiterating expectations during staff meetings.
- In line with the principal's reports, a large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (87 percent) agree or strongly agree that school leaders make clear to the staff their expectations for meeting instructional goals.
- The principal reported that the school is also working to improve student engagement this year. He explained that one of the instructional expectations is engaging students in the learning process. He added that, as a result, "As I walk in the classrooms now, I see teachers facilitating more and kids doing more of the talking and the work so that tells me, all right, so that message is being conveyed, and it's also being heard and implemented."
- Correspondingly, schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the high range for the Student Engagement domain indicate that instructional practices are meaningfully engaging all students.
- Staff, however, have mixed opinions about how well school leaders monitor the implementation of instructional expectations:
 - Slightly more than two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (69 percent) agree or strongly agree that school leaders actively monitor the quality of teaching in the school.
 - Similarly, slightly more than two thirds of survey respondents (69 percent) agree or strongly agree that school leaders know what is going on in the classrooms.
- Instructional staff also have mixed opinions about whether most teachers adapt instruction and receive supports to ensure that instructional practices actively draw on student backgrounds:
 - Slightly more than two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (69 percent) agree or strongly agree that teachers adapt instruction to ensure that it represents multiple cultural perspectives.
 - About half of instructional staff survey respondents (51 percent) agree or strongly agree that they receive support regarding how to incorporate students' diverse backgrounds into their instructional practices.
- In line with these findings, schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the middle range for the Instructional Support domain indicate that structures for instructional support are not yet resulting in rigorous instruction across all classrooms.
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although both interview and instructional staff survey responses, as well as schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the Student Engagement domain, suggest that instructional expectations are communicated and implemented by most staff, staff reported mixed opinions about whether school leaders monitor the quality of teaching in the school and instructional practices actively draw on student backgrounds. Similarly, schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the Instructional Support domain indicate that instructional supports could be strengthened further across classrooms.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.1 Instructional Expectations

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>School leaders have not articulated clear instructional expectations for teachers, or instructional expectations are not understood by a majority of staff members.</p>	<p>School leaders have articulated clear instructional expectations, which are understood by a majority of staff members; however, leadership does not regularly monitor teacher implementation of schoolwide instructional expectations. Instructional practices occasionally draw upon students' diverse backgrounds as a strategy to deepen learning.</p>	<p>Clear expectations for high-quality instruction are communicated and understood by all or nearly all staff, monitored by school leaders, and consistently implemented schoolwide. Instructional practices actively draw upon students' diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges as a strategy to deepen learning and meaningfully engage students.</p>

Indicator 2.2 Instructional Schedule

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- Staff at SCHOOL reported that the schedule includes adequate uninterrupted blocks of learning time for all students and is routinely adjusted to meet the needs of all students. However, staff opinions are generally mixed in terms of whether all students—especially ELs and students with disabilities—receive adequate intervention time.
- The principal reported that, although the school began with some time built into the schedule for recess and lunches as students transitioned back from remote and hybrid learning, halfway through the year, around the holiday break, the instructional schedule was adjusted to allow more time for academics, including a What I Need (WIN) block for focused interventions to students with disabilities and ELs. However, the principal stated that this change “really did not offer what we were looking for. . . It became more of a make-up work type session.”
- Although more a large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (82 percent) agree or strongly agree that the instructional schedule includes adequate uninterrupted blocks of learning time for all students, similar to the previous school year, respondents reported dissatisfaction with the schedule this year as well. About half of instructional staff survey respondents (51 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that the current instructional schedule meets the academic needs of all students.
- Survey respondents have mixed opinions about how well the current schedule works for ELs and students with disabilities:
 - Half of instructional staff survey respondents (50 percent) agree or strongly agree that they have adequate instructional time to effectively address the needs of ELs in their classes.
 - Slightly more than half of instructional staff survey respondents (53 percent) agree or strongly agree that they have adequate instructional time to effectively address the needs of students with disabilities in their classes.
- Instructional staff survey responses related to the school leaders’ processes for reviewing and making changes to the instructional schedule are also mixed:
 - Slightly more than half of instructional staff survey respondents (56 percent) agree or strongly agree that the instructional schedule is developed in collaboration with teachers.
 - About three quarters of instructional staff survey respondents (76 percent) agree or strongly agree that teachers are asked to provide feedback at least once a year about the effectiveness of the schedule.
 - Three quarters of instructional staff survey respondents (75 percent) agree or strongly agree that the schedule is routinely adjusted to meet the needs of all students.
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although the principal interview and instructional staff survey responses suggest that staff have some opportunities to provide input about the effectiveness of the schedule and the schedule can be adjusted as needed, staff have mixed opinions about whether the schedule meets the academic needs of all students. Further, evidence suggests room for improvement in providing instructional support.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.2 Instructional Schedule

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>As part of the school improvement effort, none or only one of the following elements is in place: (1) The schedule allows adequate core instruction and intervention time for English language arts and mathematics during the school day; (2) instructional support staff are coordinated and deployed strategically across the school day to provide student instructional support; and (3) a process exists for evaluating the schedule and making changes as necessary based on teacher feedback and student data analysis, including taking students' specific needs into consideration.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, two of the following elements are in place: (1) The schedule allows adequate core instruction and intervention time for English language arts and mathematics during the school day; (2) instructional support staff are coordinated and deployed strategically across the school day to provide student instructional support; and (3) a process exists for evaluating the schedule and making changes as necessary based on teacher feedback and student data analysis, including taking students' specific needs into consideration.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, all three of the following elements are in place: (1) The schedule allows adequate core instruction and intervention time for English language arts and mathematics during the school day; (2) instructional support staff are coordinated and deployed strategically across the school day to provide student instructional support; and (3) a process exists for evaluating the schedule and making changes as necessary based on teacher feedback and student data analysis, including taking students' specific needs into consideration.</p>

Indicator 2.3 Classroom Observation Data Use

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- School leaders at SCHOOL reported that they conduct regular informal and formal observations. However, school leaders do not use a formal protocol or rubric to guide observations, and observation data are not typically used to inform professional development.
- According to the principal questionnaire, informal walkthroughs are conducted by coaches, peers, and administrators, and formal walkthroughs are conducted by the ILT and district-based team. Regarding formal observations, the principal reported, on the questionnaire, that four to six formal observations were conducted per staff this year.
- The principal reported that the school leaders had set up a robust system of formal observations in the fall. He explained, “We set up sort of weekly formal observations by myself and the assistant principals and informal coaching sessions with—with everyone else—with the coaches, so that we had a set schedule of where we were going to be each week and it alternated, so that, if one week I was in Grade 5, the AP [assistant principal] was in Grade 6, and the coaches would be coaching them up sort of in between, and then we would shift that next week.”
- However, the system “collapsed” after the winter break, he added, “with attendance concerns of both the staff and students and we never seemed to get that momentum back for the end of the year.”
- About two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (63 percent) indicated being observed by a school leader or instructional specialist *only a few times per year*, and about one third of respondents (31 percent) indicated being observed *once or twice a month*.
- With regard to the feedback that they receive from school leaders following classroom observations, instructional staff reported as follows:
 - A large majority of instructional staff survey respondents agree or strongly agree that they receive feedback that is tied to the school’s improvement priorities (88 percent) and that feedback provides specific ideas about how to improve their performance (91 percent).
 - A large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (81 percent) agree or strongly agree that feedback they receive makes them more reflective about their teaching.
 - A large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (81 percent) agree or strongly agree that, in the long run, students will benefit from the feedback they receive.
- Survey responses indicate some room to improve the quality of feedback. Nearly three quarters of instructional staff survey respondents (72 percent) agree or strongly agree that school leaders provide staff with high-quality, actionable feedback.
- Although there is no formal observation protocol, the principal explained that feedback is provided through TeachPoint form as well as post-conferences.
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although most staff members reported having positive experiences with the observations that they receive and the feedback is tied to the school’s improvement priorities, survey results indicate that most staff were observed only a few times this year and no formal protocol was used to conduct observations.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.3 Classroom Observation Data Use

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>As part of the school improvement effort, none or only one of the following elements is in place:</p> <p>(1) Instructional leaders comply with required evaluation systems and procedures; (2) instructional leaders conduct classroom observations or walkthroughs beyond what is required in evaluation systems; (3) instructional leaders use a rubric or protocol when conducting classroom observations and walkthroughs; (4) instructional leaders provide timely, relevant, and actionable feedback to staff; and (5) instructional leaders use observations to guide professional development and other instructional priorities.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, two or three of the following elements are in place:</p> <p>(1) Instructional leaders comply with required evaluation systems and procedures; (2) instructional leaders conduct classroom observations or walkthroughs beyond what is required in evaluation systems; (3) instructional leaders use a rubric or protocol when conducting classroom observations and walkthroughs; (4) instructional leaders provide timely, relevant, and actionable feedback to staff; and (5) instructional leaders use observations to guide professional development and other instructional priorities.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, four or five of the following elements are in place:</p> <p>(1) Instructional leaders comply with required evaluation systems and procedures; (2) instructional leaders conduct classroom observations or walkthroughs beyond what is required in evaluation systems; (3) instructional leaders use a rubric or protocol when conducting classroom observations and walkthroughs; (4) instructional leaders provide timely, relevant, and actionable feedback to staff; and (5) instructional leaders use observations to guide professional development and other instructional priorities.</p>

Indicator 2.4 Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)



Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

Indicator Rating: Limited/Partial **Emergent** Coherent

Findings

- School leaders at SCHOOL review student data, including i-Ready data, to make decisions regarding schoolwide practices. However, staff have mixed opinions about consistent use of student assessment data to make those decisions.
- According to the principal, SCHOOL teachers administer several common assessments, including i-Ready (mathematics and English language arts [ELA]) three times per year, Writing About Reading assessments, end-of-unit tests, and teacher-created assessments for ongoing progress monitoring throughout the year.
- The principal reported that school leaders reviewed formative and summative assessment data, along with student attendance and behavioral data, to determine school improvement goals for the year.
- As an example of data use for schoolwide decision making, the principal reported that, to improve use of formative assessment data throughout the school, school leaders have been working with teachers on a six-week formative data review cycle. He added that, in the beginning of each cycle, teachers identify “what it is that you want kids to know and be able to do” and, at the end of the cycle, they review “what is the evidence like, what is the data that shows you that.”
- Regarding identifying and monitoring students’ academic needs and progress through the use of data,
 - Two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (66 percent) agree or strongly agree that it is likely or very likely that a team meets to discuss individual student needs and the needs of groups of students.
 - Slightly more than half of instructional staff survey respondents (55 percent) agree or strongly agree that it is likely or very likely that a student’s academic progress is monitored through systematic analysis of data.
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although building and teacher leaders occasionally review student assessment data to make decisions regarding schoolwide practices, staff have mixed opinions on whether student assessment data are considered regularly to make decisions regarding schoolwide practices.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.4 Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
Building and teacher leaders use limited to no student assessment data to make decisions related to schoolwide practices.	Building and teacher leaders consider student results on state assessments when making decisions regarding schoolwide practices. Student results on benchmark and common assessments are considered on a limited basis (i.e., only occasionally throughout the school year).	Building and teacher leaders consistently (e.g., every six to eight weeks) use student results on benchmark and common assessments and state assessments to make decisions regarding schoolwide practices.

Indicator 2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- Most classroom teachers at SCHOOL work collaboratively to use a variety of assessment data to determine action steps for students in their classes, but communication about action steps is not always shared among all relevant staff.
- SCHOOL uses a variety of regular and ongoing assessments to monitor student progress in mathematics and ELA (see Indicator 2.4 Student Assessment Data Use [for schoolwide decision making]). The principal reported that teachers use their own assessments, end-of-unit tests, and exit tickets to provide lesson-specific supports to their students.
- All instructional staff survey respondents (100 percent) reported using student assignments and their own observations moderately or extensively to guide instruction.
- More than three quarters to a large majority of instructional staff survey respondents reported using the following types of assessments moderately or extensively to guide instruction: in-class tests or quizzes (94 percent), student grades (74 percent), and benchmark assessments (75 percent).
- Half of instructional staff survey respondents (50 percent) reported using standardized tests moderately or extensively to guide instruction.
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, a large majority of instructional staff use data moderately or extensively to do the following:
 - Tailor classroom instruction to individual student needs (97 percent)
 - Identify individual students who need additional instructional support, such as tutoring (94 percent)
 - Identify and address gaps in the curriculum (90 percent)
 - Group students for instruction (88 percent)
- Staff have some concerns about the system for using data to monitor progress and communicate about student needs. About half of instructional staff survey respondents *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that a student's academic progress is monitored with systematic analysis of data (45 percent) and that action steps about student academic needs are communicated among relevant staff (50 percent).
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although both interview and instructional staff survey responses suggest that classroom teachers use a variety of assessment data to determine progress toward student and school outcomes and to determine appropriate action steps, there is still room to improve the process for monitoring and communicating about data-driven decisions.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Only a few or emerging practices are in place for analyzing student performance data to inform instruction and assess progress toward intended student outcomes, or the effect of these practices is negligible.</p>	<p>Some classroom teachers are aware of their roles and responsibilities for using a variety of assessment data to inform instruction, and the school has systems in place to promote collaborative data use among the teaching staff. However, not all staff consistently use this practice, or some barriers exist to using data effectively to improve instruction.</p>	<p>Most classroom teachers work collaboratively to use a variety of assessment data (e.g., common assessment data, student work) to determine progress toward intended student and school outcomes, determine appropriate action steps, and monitor the results of those actions.</p>

Indicator 2.6 Structures for Instructional Improvement

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- Interview and instructional staff survey responses suggest that, in addition to providing the three dedicated instructional coaches, SCHOOL offers professional development for staff that is aligned with the high-leverage goals outlined in the school's improvement plan. However, staff have mixed opinions about whether instructional staff have the supports to fully serve students who are struggling and whether teachers receive ongoing support to apply in their classrooms what they learn through professional development.
- According to the principal, decisions about professional development are driven by the priorities defined in the school improvement plan and based on review of student assessment and classroom observation data. As noted in the principal questionnaire, whole-staff professional development opportunities this year focused on supporting social-emotional competency development, identifying students who are struggling academically or behaviorally, using data (Data Wise) to identify student needs, PBIS, UDL, co-teaching, and cultural competencies.
- A large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (80 percent) agree or strongly agree that the principal takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers.
- A large majority of instructional staff survey respondents (84 percent) also agree or strongly agree that nearly all teachers collaborate with instructional coaches to improve instruction.
- Survey responses suggest that *ongoing* professional development for SCHOOL staff has been somewhat limited:
 - Less than two thirds of instructional staff survey respondents (63 percent) agree or strongly agree that they receive ongoing support to apply *academic* training in their classrooms.
 - Half of instructional staff survey respondents (50 percent) agree or strongly agree that they receive ongoing support to apply *behavioral* or *social-emotional learning* training in their classrooms.
- Even fewer respondents (44 percent) agree or strongly agree that they have the supports needed to serve students who are struggling in their classrooms.
- Schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the middle range for the Instructional Support domain indicate that structures for instructional improvement are not yet resulting in rigorous instruction across all classrooms.
- This indicator is rated as *emergent* because, although both interview and instructional staff survey responses suggest that SCHOOL teachers are provided with instructional supports, staff have mixed opinions about whether they receive the ongoing support necessary to successfully apply what they learn in professional development to their teaching. Similarly, few staff feel that they have the support needed to fully serve students who are struggling.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.6 Structures for Instructional Improvement

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>As part of the school improvement effort, none of the following elements are in place for all or nearly all staff: (1) regular professional development or teacher support that is connected to the Common Core State Standards and oriented toward student academic needs; (2) teacher coaching for relevant staff; and (3) additional efforts devoted to instructional improvement or professional development.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, one or two of the following elements are in place for all or nearly all staff: (1) regular professional development or teacher support that is connected to the Common Core State Standards and oriented toward student academic needs; (2) teacher coaching for relevant staff; and (3) additional efforts devoted to instructional improvement or professional development.</p>	<p>As part of the school improvement effort, all of the following elements are in place for all or nearly all staff: (1) regular professional development or teacher support that is connected to the Common Core State Standards and oriented toward student academic needs; (2) teacher coaching for relevant staff; and (3) additional efforts devoted to instructional improvement or professional development.</p>

Indicator 2.7 College and Career Preparation

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, some structures for students to participate in college- and career-related activities exist, but opportunities are limited and are rarely tailored to individual student needs or interests.
- According to the principal questionnaire, the school offers career fairs and visits from professionals, as well as college and career discussions with counselors or advisors, to some students.
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that SCHOOL has somewhat limited opportunities for students related to college and career preparation. Specifically, less than one third of instructional staff survey respondents (31 percent) agree or strongly agree that students are formally provided with opportunities to explore postsecondary opportunities.
- In terms of individualized supports, very few instructional staff survey respondents agree or strongly agree that all or most students work with a group of staff members to develop an individualized academic map for themselves based on their individual interests and goals (21 percent) or that all or most students in every grade level work with a dedicated staff member to design a postsecondary plan centered around their needs and interests (20 percent).
- Because SCHOOL offers few structured opportunities for students to explore college and career options and there is limited evidence that students have developed individualized postsecondary and career plans, this indicator receives a *limited/partial* rating.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 2.7 College and Career Preparation

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
No system or structure for ensuring that all students receive information about career opportunities and postsecondary options is in place. No opportunities exist for students to develop individualized postsecondary and career plans related to skills and interests and connected to college and career advising.	Some structured time exists throughout the school year for some students to participate in college and career advising activities. There is evidence that some students develop individualized plans that map academic goals, document personal/social growth, and engage in career development activities consistent with the student's unique, self-identified interests and needs, to pursue postsecondary and career goals. Parents may be included in postsecondary and career planning conversations.	A framework for college and career advising is in place for each school year for all students throughout their high school career. Staff members work with students to develop postsecondary and career plans aligned with their individual goals and interests. Students have agency over their postsecondary and career plans and discuss options with school staff. Parents and guardians are included in postsecondary and career planning conversations.

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students



Indicator ratings were developed based on review of the principal interview, questionnaire, and relevant extant documents (e.g., the school improvement plan) as well as results from the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* and an anonymous survey of all instructional staff. For each indicator, AIR staff reviewed collected data and compared responses to the standards of *limited/partial*, *emergent*, and *coherent* as defined in the Targeted Site Visit rubric for each indicator. Given the data sources available for this review, the ratings that follow can offer a snapshot of the school’s improvement effort to inform ongoing improvement strategies. The ratings are not intended to be a definitive account of the quality or success of the school improvement effort.

Table 6. Ratings for Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

Indicator	Limited/ Partial	Emergent	Coherent
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students			
3.1 Academic Interventions		X	
3.2 Academic Enrichments	X		
3.3 Teacher Training to Implement Student Interventions (academic and nonacademic)		X	
3.4 Multitiered System of Support (nonacademic)		X	
3.5 Academic Supports for English Language Learners		X	
3.6 Academic Supports for Students With Disabilities		X	

The sections that follow highlight ratings for each indicator, as defined in the rubric. For each indicator, we include information from relevant data sources that contributed to the rating.

Indicator 3.1 Academic Interventions

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- Structured academic interventions are in place at SCHOOL during the regularly scheduled school day, and interview responses suggest that instructional staff review student data during grade-level CPTs to identify academic needs and assign students to these academic interventions (e.g., small-group instruction, one-on-one tutoring). However, instructional staff survey results suggest that these interventions do not adequately address students' needs and students are not assigned to academic interventions consistently and systematically.
- Based on SCHOOL's instructional schedule, students across all grade levels spend approximately 50 minutes of the school day in interventions (i.e., WIN block) in core content areas. Moreover, on the pre-visit questionnaire, the principal provided examples of academic intervention programs utilized by instructional staff, including the following:
 - i-Ready—an online learning program—offered as supplemental (Tier 2) academic support in reading and mathematics
 - IXL—a comprehensive mathematics program
 - Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention—a short-term intervention designed to supplement classroom literacy teaching through intensive, small-group instruction—offered as intensive (Tier 3) intervention in ELA
- However, instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, instructional staff *disagree* that SCHOOL has the resources and supports for students who are struggling academically. A small majority of respondents (60 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that their school has adequate systems in place for providing academic interventions to students who are struggling. In addition, about the same proportion of respondents reported that, when a student's academic needs are identified, the following are *not likely* to occur:
 - The student receives services and supports in a timely manner to address the need(s) identified in the referral (59 percent).
 - The services/supports that the student receives effectively address their needs (65 percent).
 - Multiple services for the student are coordinated with one another (56 percent).
- During the interview, the principal described the process for assigning students to academic interventions. For example, the principal reported that, during CPTs, teachers identify students by using assessment data; consult their grade-level teams and instructional coaches; and then assign students to a teacher, tutor, or paraprofessional during the WIN block. Regardless, the principal characterized this process as “informal” and suggested the need for “a more consistent process” for identifying students who are struggling academically and determining action steps.
- The following instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether instructional staff assign students to academic interventions systematically:
 - A large majority of respondents (91 percent) agree or strongly agree that they use data to screen for and confirm the need for academic support.
 - More than three quarters of respondents (77 percent) reported following a formal, systematic process (e.g., making a referral) for sharing concerns with other staff in the school.
 - Nevertheless, only a small majority of respondents reported that, once a student's academic needs are identified, their academic progress is monitored (55 percent) and a team of instructional staff and specialists meets to discuss their needs (66 percent).
 - Moreover, only half of instructional staff survey respondents (50 percent) concur that action steps are communicated among all staff and teams.

- And, less than one third of respondents (30 percent) reported receiving appropriate follow-up communication about the steps that are being taken to address the student’s needs.
- Interview responses suggest that SCHOOL offers some interventions to support students’ needs for supplemental instruction and intensive academic support and that an informal process is in place to determine and monitor student intervention progress. However, instructional staff survey results indicate that staff have mixed opinions about whether the school has sufficient intervention supports to meet the needs of all students and whether an adequate system is in place for follow-up communication about action steps. This evidence results in an *emergent* rating for this indicator.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 3.1 Academic Interventions

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Structured academic interventions for English language arts and mathematics are not in place during the regularly scheduled school day, interventions are available for only one content area, or existing interventions do not meet the needs of students.</p>	<p>Structured academic interventions for English language arts and mathematics are in place during the regularly scheduled school day, but barriers to effective implementation exist, with misalignment to student needs or a lack of access for all students who may benefit. The intervention system includes one or two of the following characteristics: (1) Intervention assignments are reviewed at least every six weeks; (2) intervention assignments are reviewed by a relevant team of school stakeholders; and (3) a schoolwide system exists for communicating intervention action plans to all relevant staff.</p>	<p>Structured academic interventions for English language arts and mathematics are in place during the regularly scheduled school day, and interventions are implemented effectively for all relevant students. The intervention system includes all three of the following characteristics: (1) Intervention assignments are reviewed at least every six weeks; (2) intervention assignments are reviewed by a relevant team of school stakeholders; and (3) a schoolwide system exists for communicating intervention action plans to all relevant staff.</p>

Indicator 3.2 Academic Enrichments

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, a few enrichment opportunities aimed at extending students' academic learning in ELA and mathematics during the regularly scheduled school day are in place. However, principal interview responses and instructional staff survey results indicate that barriers exist to providing academic enrichment opportunities at the school.
- During the interview, the principal acknowledged that academic enrichment opportunities at SCHOOL are very limited this year because instructional leaders and staff focused on identifying and addressing student learning gaps caused by disruptions during the COVID-19 pandemic. The principal stated, “[We] definitely want to build more [enrichment opportunities] into our programming.”
- Regardless, students have opportunities to participate in accelerated reading and writing groups during the WIN block. In addition, students in sixth grade can engage in advanced mathematics activities.
- In line with interview responses, the following instructional staff survey results reveal that, on average, instructional staff *disagree* that SCHOOL has the resources and supports necessary to provide enrichment opportunities for students:
 - Nearly two thirds of respondents (63 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that their school has adequate systems in place for providing academic enrichments for students.
 - More than half of respondents (55 percent) reported that the instructional schedule *does not include* adequate time for students to participate in academic enrichments during the school day.
 - A small majority reported that they *do not have* adequate preparation time (67 percent) or instructional time (58 percent) to effectively offer academic enrichment for their students.
 - Nearly half of respondents (42 percent) reported *not having* the supports (e.g., technology, resources, staff) to offer academic enrichment for students in their classes.
- Instructional staff survey results and principal interview responses suggest that SCHOOL does not have adequate time and supports to offer academic enrichment that meets the needs of the students in the classrooms. This evidence is consistent with a *limited/partial* rating for this indicator.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 3.2 Academic Enrichments

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Structured enrichments to extend academic learning in English language arts and mathematics are not in place during the regularly scheduled school day, or existing enrichments do not meet the needs of students.</p>	<p>Structured enrichments to extend academic learning in English language arts and mathematics are in place during the regularly scheduled school day; interventions are implemented effectively and attached to a system that includes one or two of the following characteristics: (1) Student enrichment assignments are reviewed at least every six weeks; (2) student enrichment assignments are reviewed by a relevant team of school stakeholders; and (3) a schoolwide system exists for communicating student enrichment action plans to all relevant staff (e.g., review of student progress during common planning time).</p>	<p>Structured enrichments to extend academic learning in English language arts and mathematics are in place during the regularly scheduled school day; interventions are implemented effectively and attached to a system that includes all three of the following characteristics: (1) Student enrichment assignments are reviewed at least every six weeks; (2) student enrichment assignments are reviewed by a relevant team of school stakeholders; and (3) a schoolwide system exists for communicating student enrichment action plans to all relevant staff (e.g., review of student progress during common planning time).</p>

Indicator 3.3 Teacher Training to Implement Student Interventions (academic and nonacademic)

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, not all instructional staff members are provided professional development opportunities related to supporting student academic and nonacademic needs.
- On the questionnaire, the principal noted that all staff participated in professional development sessions focused on the following topics:
 - Supporting social-emotional competency development (e.g., PBIS, cultural competency)
 - Identifying students who are struggling academically, including through the use of data (i.e., Data Wise)
 - Supporting students who are struggling academically (i.e., UDL, co-teaching strategies)
- During the interview, the principal suggested that professional development sessions related to implementing academic and nonacademic interventions need to cover a wider variety of topics, occur more regularly, and be offered to a wider range of staff at SCHOOL. To illustrate, the principal stated the following:

The PBIS [professional development session] was offered to everyone. . . . But there is a smaller subset (the PBIS team) that meets on a monthly basis. It's clear that more [staff] must be involved in this. So, we're continuing to make [PBIS] a priority . . . We decided to move towards restorative circles and restorative justice as well—sort of as an off-shoot of PBIS—to continue to meet kids where they are and provide [them with] those supports.
- The following instructional staff survey results indicate that respondents, on average, have varying views regarding the effectiveness of professional development opportunities related to carrying out academic interventions:
 - A large majority of respondents (84 percent) reported receiving adequate training on effective instructional practices for teaching students who are struggling.
 - However, a smaller proportion of respondents—less than two thirds—agree or strongly agree that they received training on how to implement *supplemental* or Tier 2 (64 percent) and *intensive* or Tier 3 (56 percent) academic supports for students.
 - Moreover, less than two thirds of respondents (63 percent) reported receiving ongoing support to help apply academic training into their classroom practices.
- Likewise, the following instructional staff survey results suggest that most respondents *disagree* that they have participated in professional development sessions focused on implementing nonacademic supports for students:
 - About one third of respondents (39 percent) reported receiving training on how to implement *supplemental* or Tier 2 behavioral and social-emotional supports for students.
 - A similar proportion of respondents (32 percent) reported receiving training on how to implement *intensive* or Tier 3 behavioral and social-emotional supports for students.
 - In addition, half of the respondents (50 percent) reported receiving ongoing support to help apply behavioral and/or social-emotional training into their classroom practices.
- SCHOOL receives an *emergent* rating for this indicator because interview responses and instructional staff survey results indicate that not all teachers receive training and ongoing supports focused on implementing supplemental and intensive academic and nonacademic supports for students.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 3.3 Teacher Training to Implement Student Interventions (academic and nonacademic)

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Staff members are provided little to no professional development opportunities related to student academic or nonacademic intervention needs.</p>	<p>Some but not all staff members are provided professional development opportunities related to student academic or nonacademic needs.</p>	<p>All or nearly all staff members are provided professional development opportunities related to student academic and nonacademic needs, and the school revisits key professional development opportunities or topics regularly throughout the school year.</p>

Indicator 3.4 Multitiered System of Support (nonacademic)

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction
to All Students



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, structured behavioral interventions are in place during the regularly scheduled school day, but instructional staff survey results suggest that barriers to consistently and systematically identifying and monitoring students' needs for nonacademic interventions remain.
- During the interview, the principal acknowledged the roles of several student support staff—social workers, guidance counselor, and school-based positive behavior resource teacher—in providing students with behavioral and social-emotional interventions
- Moreover, the principal noted on the questionnaire that SCHOOL has an SST that comprises the school's administrators, social workers, psychologist, board certified behavior analyst. The SST meets every week to make decisions related to providing students who have behavioral and social-emotional concerns with targeted supports (e.g., counseling services, *Check In/Check Out*, home visits) or social-emotional learning programs (i.e., adjustment, advisory).
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, staff have mixed opinions about whether SCHOOL has structured behavioral and social-emotional interventions in place during the regularly scheduled school day and whether these interventions are implemented effectively for all relevant students. For example, less than two thirds of respondents (61 percent) reported that a system is in place at the school to identify students who are struggling to meet expectations. Additionally, a smaller majority of respondents agree or strongly agree with the following statements:
 - A team of appropriate staff and stakeholders at my school makes decisions about interventions and supports for students who are struggling (59 percent).
 - Staff members at my school follow consistent rules and procedures when they monitor the effectiveness of interventions and supports for students who are struggling (52 percent).
 - My school uses a multitiered system of support to address the needs of students who are struggling to meet expectations (50 percent).
 - Staff members at my school follow consistent rules and procedures to identify students in need of additional support (43 percent).
- The school receives an *emergent* rating for this indicator. Although principal interview responses suggest that SCHOOL has systems in place for identifying students in need as well as a team of appropriate staff (i.e., SST) that makes decisions about nonacademic interventions for students who are struggling, instructional staff survey results indicate that respondents have varying views regarding whether a multitiered system of support is in place for addressing nonacademic needs and not all staff members follow consistent procedures for identifying and monitoring the effectiveness of behavioral and social-emotional student needs.

Descriptions for Indicator 3.4 Multitiered System of Support (nonacademic)

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Structured behavioral interventions are not in place during the regularly scheduled school day, or existing interventions do not meet the needs of students.</p>	<p>Structured behavioral interventions are in place during the regularly scheduled school day, but barriers to effective implementation exist or interventions may not be aligned to student needs. The intervention system includes one or two of the following characteristics: (1) Intervention assignments are reviewed at least every six weeks; (2) intervention assignments are reviewed by a relevant team of school stakeholders; and 3) a schoolwide system exists for communicating intervention action plans to all relevant staff.</p>	<p>Structured behavioral interventions are in place during the regularly scheduled school day, and interventions are implemented effectively for all relevant students. The intervention system includes all three of the following characteristics: (1) Intervention assignments are reviewed at least every six weeks; (2) intervention assignments are reviewed by a relevant team of school stakeholders; and (3) a schoolwide system exists for communicating intervention action plans to all relevant staff.</p>

Indicator 3.5 Academic Supports for English Language Learners



Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, about 21 percent of the student population are classified as ELs, and 56 percent of the population identify as students whose first language is not English. Instructional staff survey results indicate that some instructional staff do not feel adequately prepared to support ELs due to limited time and resources.
- According to the principal questionnaire, to address ELs’ needs for academic support, SCHOOL has a co-teaching model of instruction, with English as a second language (ESL) teachers providing inclusion support, as well as an English language development (ELD) program for newcomers.
- Nevertheless, the following instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, respondents have mixed opinions regarding the sufficiency of resources and time to support ELs at SCHOOL:
 - A large majority of respondents (86 percent) reported receiving adequate training on effective instructional practices for teaching ELs.
 - However, a smaller majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that they have adequate *preparation* time to effectively identify (64 percent) and address (56 percent) the needs of ELs in their classes.
 - A similar proportion of respondents (62 percent) reported having adequate *instructional* time to effectively identify the needs of ELs in their classes.
 - Fewer instructional staff survey respondents (50 percent) reported that there is adequate *instructional* time for them to effectively address the needs of ELs.
 - Moreover, only about half of respondents (53 percent) agree or strongly agree that they have the support (e.g., technology, resources, staff) to support ELs in their classes.
- Furthermore, a review of open-ended responses to the instructional staff survey revealed the need for more ESL educators at SCHOOL. For example, one respondent explained that some ESL teachers transitioned from providing push-in instruction in general education classrooms to implementing ELD programs because of a high number of newcomers at the school. Unfortunately, this shift left some general educators without support for the ELs in their classes. Likewise, other instructional staff described support for ELs in general education classrooms as “sporadic” and “non-existent.”
- Consistent with an *emergent* rating, instructional staff survey results indicate that respondents have mixed opinions about the adequacy of preparation and instructional time and about support necessary for instructional staff to address the needs of ELs at SCHOOL.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 3.5 Academic Supports for English Language Learners

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
A majority of staff do not feel adequately prepared to support English language learners in terms of available resources, staff, or training.	Staff have mixed opinions about the adequacy of supports available to serve English language learners. Staff may report limitations in terms of resources, staff, or training (e.g., serving students in inclusion classrooms).	A majority of staff report that adequate supports are available to serve English language learners. Supports include resources, staff, or training (e.g., serving students in inclusion classrooms).

Indicator 3.6 Academic Supports for Students With Disabilities



Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

Indicator Rating:	Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------

Findings

- Approximately 22 percent of SCHOOL’S student population have identified disabilities. Survey results indicate that not all instructional staff feel adequately prepared to support students with disabilities due to limited time for preparation and instruction and inadequate resources.
- According to the principal, at SCHOOL, six special education teachers deliver instructional supports and services in a mix of inclusive and integrated settings—a pull-out model of small-group instruction, co-teaching strategies, push-in services, and full inclusion classrooms—based on students’ individualized education programs (IEPs).
- However, the following instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether there are adequate resources and time to support students with disabilities at SCHOOL:
 - A large majority of respondents (83 percent) reported receiving adequate training on effective instructional practices for teaching students with disabilities.
 - However, a smaller proportion of respondents—about half—agree or strongly agree that they have adequate *preparation* time to effectively identify (58 percent) and address (51 percent) the needs of students with disabilities in their classes.
 - Similarly, a small majority of respondents reported having adequate *instructional* time to effectively identify (67 percent) and address (55 percent) the needs of students with disabilities in their classes.
 - Half of the respondents (50 percent) reported having the supports (e.g., technology, resources, staff) to support students with disabilities in their classes.
- Based on a review of open-ended responses, several instructional staff identified providing academic supports for students with disabilities as an area for improvement due to the need for more special education specialists. One respondent noted, “We need more support for the kids in special education classes. These classes are almost never checked on, [and special education teachers are not] asked if they need any help.” Relatedly, a different instructional staff respondent wrote, “Paraprofessionals are constantly pulled to cover classrooms due to lack of substitute teachers.”
- Consistent with an *emergent* rating for this indicator, instructional staff survey results suggest that instructional staff at SCHOOL have mixed opinions about whether there are adequate resources and supports in the classrooms, in addition to enough preparation and instructional time, to address the needs of students who receive special education services.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 3.6 Academic Supports for Students with Disabilities

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
A majority of staff do not feel adequately prepared to support students receiving special education services in terms of available resources, staff, or training.	Staff have mixed opinions about the adequacy of supports available to serve students receiving special education services. Staff may report limitations in terms of resources, staff, or training (e.g., serving students in inclusion classrooms).	A majority of staff report that adequate supports are available to serve students receiving special education services. Supports include resources, staff, or training (e.g., serving students in inclusion classrooms).

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture



Indicator ratings were developed based on review of the principal interview, questionnaire, and relevant extant documents (e.g., the school improvement plan) as well as results from the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* and an anonymous survey of all instructional staff. For each indicator, AIR staff reviewed collected data and compared responses to the standards of *limited/partial*, *emergent*, and *coherent* as defined in the Targeted Site Visit rubric for each indicator. Given the data sources available for this review, the ratings that follow can offer a snapshot of the school’s improvement effort to inform ongoing improvement strategies. The ratings are not intended to be a definitive account of the quality or success of the school improvement effort.

Table 7. Ratings for Turnaround Indicators for Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture

Indicator	Limited/ Partial	Emergent	Coherent
4. School Climate and Culture			
4.1 Schoolwide Conduct Expectations	X		
4.2 Adult–Student Relationships	X		
4.3 Expanded Learning		X	
4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners		X	
4.5 Family and Community Engagement		X	

The sections that follow highlight ratings for each indicator, as defined in the rubric. For each indicator, we include information from relevant data sources that contributed to the rating.

Indicator 4.1 Schoolwide Conduct Expectations

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- School leaders and staff at SCHOOL communicate behavioral expectations through a schoolwide PBIS system, and the school’s positive behavior resource teacher helps relate conduct issues to their root cause. However, instructional staff survey results suggest that these expectations may not be applied consistently in classrooms and non-classroom settings; responses to conduct issues may exclude students from academic activities. In addition, leaders and staff do not regularly monitor school climate data.
- According to principal interview responses, school leaders and staff, along with students, developed a behavior expectation matrix that describes what student behavior “should look like in various areas of the school . . . in the classroom, hallway, cafeteria, [and] auditorium.” The principal added that they revisit the school’s behavior expectation matrix throughout the year and use it as a reference whenever students do not meet expectations. Moreover, school leaders and staff reinforce behavior expectations by implementing a PBIS program.
- The following instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, instructional staff *disagree* that the school has effectively defined schoolwide conduct expectations:
 - Nearly one third of instructional staff (31 percent) reported that their school *has not defined* a set of positively worded expectations for student behavior.
 - Half of the respondents (50 percent) reported that their school *has not defined* a set of clearly stated expectations for student behavior.
 - Most respondents (81 percent) reported that their school *does not have* clearly defined consequences for not meeting expected student behaviors.
- Instructional staff survey results also suggest that from one third to about half of the respondents *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that staff at SCHOOL communicate (55 percent), model (33 percent), and positively reinforce (43 percent) expected student behavior.
- When asked about the consequences school leaders and staff apply when student conduct does not align with schoolwide behavior expectations, the principal shared that they “try to figure out what levers would assist us in changing those behaviors.”
- The principal also acknowledged the positive behavior resource teacher’s role in identifying and addressing the root causes of conduct issues. The principal explained, “He will take [students] aside for a little time to talk to them about [the conduct issue] and try to figure out [the cause] . . . and communicate back to the teacher . . . what has happened.”
- Contrary to instructional staff survey results, SCHOOL received schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the high range for the Behavior Management dimension, indicating that among the classrooms observed, clear expectations for student conduct were communicated and implemented consistently.
- However, related instructional staff survey results show that a large majority of respondents (83 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that the school’s schoolwide procedures for managing behavior are adequate for their classrooms. Moreover, a small majority of respondents (57 percent) reported that schoolwide expected student behaviors *are not consistently applied* in non-classroom settings, and nearly all instructional staff (98 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that student behavior is effectively managed in non-classroom settings.
- A review of the open-ended response section of the instructional staff survey revealed that several instructional staff consider SCHOOL’s implementation of schoolwide conduct expectations to be inadequate or ineffective. One respondent added that the lack of effective implementation of schoolwide conduct expectations leads to “unsafe and extremely distracting behaviors [that] prevent all students from learning.” Another respondent noted, “The biggest problem in our school is the lack of

discipline.” Similarly, a third instructional staff respondent commented that students are not held accountable for misconduct. Additionally, a different instructional staff respondent reported that they are “often left out of the loop” concerning conduct issues and “do not often know reasons for suspensions.”

- Principal interview responses suggest that students are occasionally excluded from academic instruction or intervention. For instance, the principal said, “We do have detentions; there is an occasional suspension, unfortunately, here and there, for transgressions that warrant that. But, we try to minimize that and keep kids in school, especially given this climate, as best we can and as much as we can.”
- During the interview, the principal discussed two types of structures in place at SCHOOL to monitor student behavior data:
 - The assistant principals monitor discipline referral data collected using Aspen X2—a web-based student management system.
 - The PBIS team meets monthly to examine student behavior data from Aspen X2 and communicates findings to school staff.
- Nevertheless, instructional staff survey results suggest that a large majority of respondents (90 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that school leaders regularly monitor the implementation of the schoolwide behavior plan.
- Interview responses show that the school’s positive behavior resource teacher relates behavioral issues to their root causes. However, instructional staff survey results suggest that conduct expectations are not clearly communicated or consistently applied across classrooms and in non-classroom settings. Responses to conduct issues can exclude students from academic activities, and discipline referral data are not reviewed regularly. Therefore, SCHOOL receives a *limited/partial* rating for this indicator.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 4.1 Schoolwide Conduct Expectations

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>The school does not have a defined set of conduct expectations or a system of supports aligned to those expectations. Or, if conduct expectations exist, none or only one or two of the following criteria are met: (1) Staff and students are aware of the expectations; (2) responses to conduct issues are applied consistently and equitably; (3) responses to conduct issues are related to the root cause of the behavior; (4) responses to conduct issues do not exclude students from academics/support; and (5) school climate data are reviewed more than one time per year and inform the refinement of school conduct expectations.</p>	<p>The school has a defined set of conduct expectations and a system of supports aligned to those expectations. Also, three or four of the following criteria are met: (1) Staff and students are aware of the expectations; (2) responses to conduct issues are applied consistently and equitably; (3) responses to conduct issues are related to the root cause of the behavior; (4) responses to conduct issues do not exclude students from academics/support; and (5) school climate data are reviewed more than one time per year and inform the refinement of school conduct expectations.</p>	<p>The school has a defined set of conduct expectations, and a system of supports aligned to those expectations. Also, all of the following criteria are met: (1) Staff and students are aware of the expectations; (2) responses to conduct issues are applied consistently and equitably; (3) responses to conduct issues are related to the root cause of the behavior; (4) responses to conduct issues do not exclude students from academics/support; and (5) school climate data are reviewed more than one time per year and inform the refinement of school conduct expectations.</p>

Indicator 4.2 Adult–Student Relationships

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, a few structures to support the development of strong relationships between adults and students are defined; however, instructional staff survey results and schoolwide instructional observation scores suggest that these structures are inadequate.
- On the questionnaire, the principal noted the following structures in place at SCHOOL to support adult–student relationships:
 - Implementation of a Second Step program, which, according to the Second Step website, includes online, teacher-facilitated lessons and advisory activities focused on supporting students social-emotional skills development
 - A review of Devereux Student Strengths Assessment data, a behavior rating scale designed to examine social-emotional competencies of students in kindergarten through Grade 8
 - Promotion of monthly PBIS themes that characterize different social-emotional learning goals
- During the interview, the principal reported that school leaders and staff at SCHOOL intended to use the 50-minute WIN block to “provide time for teachers and students to connect.” However, they found this strategy to be unsuccessful. He suggested, “A separate scheduled day with an advisory block for all students, involving all staff, would be really important to [help] make these connections.”
- Moreover, SCHOOL received schoolwide instructional observation ratings in the middle range for the Emotional Support domain and the Positive Climate dimension, indicating that strategies are not consistently resulting in positive adult–student relationships among most staff and students.
- Instructional staff survey results indicate that, on average, respondents *disagree* that sufficient structures are in place at the school to support adult–student relationships and deliver social-emotional support to students. More specifically, a majority of respondents—from less than two thirds to more than three quarters—*disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the following statements:
 - There are sufficient and appropriate structures (e.g., advisories, mentors) in my school to support adult–student relationships (71 percent *disagree* or *strongly disagree*).
 - The structures to support adult–student relationships are clearly defined (80 percent *disagree* or *strongly disagree*).
 - Structures to support adult–student relationships are implemented consistently for all students (80 percent *disagree* or *strongly disagree*).
 - Structures to support adult–student relationships include a component of social-emotional support for students (59 percent *disagree* or *strongly disagree*).
 - Structures to support adult–student relationships are monitored (at least annually) to determine effectiveness in meeting students’ needs (73 percent *disagree* or *strongly disagree*).
- Instructional staff survey respondents elaborated on their responses by providing examples in the open-ended response section. For example, one instructional staff wrote that some teachers are “disrespectful to children” and address them “in an angry manner.” A different respondent suggested improving the school’s strategies for screening and evaluating candidates to ensure that they hire instructional staff members who “understand that many of our kids have internalized trauma and/or living circumstances which are challenging.”
- Consistent with a *limited/partial rating*, instructional staff survey results suggest that the structures in place that support the development of strong relationships between adults and students are inadequate.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 4.2 Adult-Student Relationships

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs, or social-emotional programs) to support the development of strong, supportive relationships between adults and students are not in place or are inadequate.</p>	<p>Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs, or social-emotional programs) to support the development of strong relationships are defined but may not be available to all students or implemented schoolwide.</p>	<p>Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs, or social-emotional programs) are in place to support relationships among all or nearly all students and adults.</p>

Indicator 4.3 Expanded Learning

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture



Indicator Rating: Limited/Partial **Emergent** Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, students have opportunities to participate in academic and extracurricular expanded learning programs. However, instructional staff survey results suggest that the program does not always target students with high needs for participation in afterschool activities, and interview and open-ended responses suggest barriers to student engagement (i.e., lack of access to transportation).
- During the interview, the principal stated that SCHOOL offered an expansive academic and extracurricular (e.g., arts) afterschool program that enrolled up to 150 students this school year. In addition, the school will be offering a learning recovery summer program and enrichment camp after the school year ends.
- However, principal interview responses and open-ended feedback on the instructional staff survey reveal that students' lack of access to transportation poses a challenge "to getting more kids involved," especially considering the number of students at SCHOOL who travel to the school by bus.
- Despite this challenge, instructional staff survey results indicate that a large majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that the school offers structured opportunities for extracurricular learning outside of the regular school day (88 percent) and nearly all students have access to these extracurricular activities (79 percent).
- A lesser proportion of respondents—less than three quarters (71 percent)—agree or strongly agree that SCHOOL offers structured opportunities for academic learning outside of the regular school day. Moreover, less than two thirds of respondents (60 percent) reported that nearly all students have access to these academic afterschool activities.
- The principal noted that expanded learning opportunities are offered to all students at SCHOOL and that some students are "highly encouraged" to participate. To elaborate, he added, "A lot of efforts and phone calls [to] and meetings [with parents and families] have happened in order to get those kids here."
- Regardless, instructional staff survey results suggest that only a small majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that students with high needs are targeted for participation in academic (59 percent) and extracurricular (59 percent) learning opportunities outside the regular school day.
- Consistent with an *emergent* rating, interview responses and instructional staff survey results show that the school offers academic and nonacademic opportunities for expanded learning; however, students with high needs are not always targeted for participation, and a lack of access to transportation serves as a barrier to student engagement.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 4.3 Expanded Learning

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
Students have limited to no opportunities to participate in academic and nonacademic expanded learning programs.	Opportunities for students to participate in academic and nonacademic expanded learning programs exist, but awareness of and participation in the programs may be limited, or the school operates on an extended-day schedule without additional out-of-school learning opportunities.	All or nearly all students have access to academic and nonacademic expanded learning opportunities that are well defined and well supported.

Indicator 4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- Leaders and staff at SCHOOL understand the importance of wraparound services, and instructional staff survey responses indicate that wraparound services for students are sufficient and appropriate. However, survey results suggest that, for many instructional staff, the system for proactively identifying students who may need these supports throughout the school year is inadequate.
- On the questionnaire, the principal noted that SCHOOL does not have a designated staff member whose time is devoted to coordinating wraparound supports (e.g., mental or physical health services, housing assistance) for students and their families. However, during the interview, the principal acknowledged the role members of the school community—school administrators, teachers, social workers—play in “figuring out what [students] need, and . . . how they can best support them.” And then, the school social workers and guidance counselor reach out to various agencies to provide students and families with the support and services they need.
- Moreover, on the questionnaire, the principal provided examples of external partnerships. For example, the school collaborates with ORGANIZATION—an urban food justice organization in CITY that creates gardens, markets, and educational opportunities for all CITY residents, according to the organization’s website—to promote nutrition education. Moreover, in collaboration with HIGH SCHOOL, COLLEGE, and the Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration, SCHOOL implements the Peer Mediation Program, through which students from each grade level receive training to become peer mediators, allowing them to help solve conflicts among other students through a voluntary mediation process.
- Nevertheless, according to the following instructional staff survey results, respondents have mixed opinions about whether the school has an effective system in place for providing wraparound services to students and their families:
 - Nearly three quarters of respondents (71 percent) reported sufficient and appropriate wraparound support services for students’ families at the school.
 - A smaller proportion of respondents—about two thirds—agree or strongly agree that there are sufficient and appropriate wraparound support services for students at the school (68 percent), that students’ needs for wraparound support are regularly assessed throughout the school year (68 percent), and that wraparound supports are available to all students at the school (66 percent).
 - More than half of respondents concur that wraparound support services at SCHOOL are consistently offered to students at the school, regardless of grade level or classroom (58 percent) and that students with high needs are targeted for participation in wraparound support services at the school (58 percent).
- After school community members determine student needs, the social workers and guidance counselor connect them with wraparound support services. Most instructional staff survey respondents agree that current wraparound support services at SCHOOL adequately address the needs of students and their families. However, instructional staff survey results also indicate that respondents have varying views regarding whether there is an adequate system for proactively identifying student needs. These findings result in an *emergent* rating for this indicator.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>Leaders and staff are aware of the importance of wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals). However, no schoolwide system exists to provide these services to all relevant students.</p>	<p>Leaders and staff are aware of the importance of wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals) and provide these resources to families as needed. However, no system is in place to proactively identify student needs for wraparound support services.</p>	<p>A schoolwide system exists to provide wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals) to students. Leaders and staff use the system to proactively assess the needs of students and families throughout the school year.</p>

Indicator 4.5 Family and Community Engagement

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture



Indicator Rating:

Limited/Partial

Emergent

Coherent

Findings

- At SCHOOL, staff regularly communicate with parents and other family members, and social workers and the guidance counselor are tasked with coordinating family and community engagement activities. However, instructional staff survey responses suggest that the school may not fully engage parents in school events and in school decision making.
- During the interview and on the questionnaire, the principal acknowledged the role played by the school's social workers and guidance counselor in implementing family engagement strategies and coordinating services and supports.
- With regard to routinely reaching out to families to communicate information about their children's progress and needs, school leaders and staff post on social media; facilitate parent-teacher conferences; and utilize ClassDojo, a school messaging system that sends automated calls to parents.
- In line with interview responses, instructional staff survey results suggest that a large majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that the principal encourages teachers to communicate regularly with parents (90 percent) and instructional staff have access to translation or interpretation services if needed to communicate with parents (90 percent).
- However, a smaller majority of respondents—less than two thirds—agree or strongly agree with the following statements regarding communication with parents and families:
 - We work at communicating to parents about support needed to advance the school mission (57 percent).
 - This school regularly communicates with parents about how they can help their children learn (62 percent).
- In addition, a small majority of instructional staff survey respondents *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that there are regular social events and activities throughout the school year to engage families and community members (59 percent) and that parents and families are involved in school decision making (55 percent).
- Furthermore, a large majority of respondents (80 percent) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that parents and families are invited to visit classrooms—either in-person or virtually—to observe SCHOOL's instructional program.
- SCHOOL receives an *emergent* rating for this indicator. Although the school has staff members whose time is dedicated to family engagement and instructional staff survey results suggest that maintaining communication with and translation and interpretation services are available when needed to communicate, parent and family communication and engagement in school events remains challenging.

Rating Descriptions for Indicator 4.5 Family and Community Engagement

Limited/Partial	Emergent	Coherent
<p>The school makes family and community engagement a priority, but none or only one or two of the following conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) the school creates a space that is accessible to all families and provides information about services that support achievement; helps plan family, school, and community events and informational programs; and may make referrals to academic, vocational, and college and career readiness programs; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children’s progress and needs; and (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed.</p>	<p>The school makes family engagement a priority, but only three or four of the following conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) the school creates a space that is accessible to all families and provides information about services that support achievement; helps plan family, school, and community events and informational programs; and may make referrals to academic, vocational, and college and career readiness programs; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children’s progress and needs; and (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed.</p>	<p>The school makes family and community engagement a priority, and all of the following conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) the school creates a space that is accessible to all families and provides information about services that support achievement; helps plan family, school, and community events and informational programs; and may make referrals to academic, vocational, and college and career readiness programs; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children’s progress and needs; and (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed.</p>

Appendix A: Instructional Staff Survey Report

School Name	DISTRICT: SCHOOL
Total Recipients	61
Total Respondents	50
Overall Response Rate	82%

NOTES ON INTERPRETATION: The instructional staff survey is designed to align to key components of the turnaround practices and indicators. Groups of questions are designed to measure staff agreement or disagreement with topics related to the individual indicators; these items have a common 4-point scale (e.g., 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-agree, 4-strongly agree). Variables for items worded in reverse have been recoded to align to the standard scale, with a 3 or 4 being equivalent to a positive response. *Individual items are not intended to inform decision making; they should be used for reference only.* Survey data from items with a response rate of 50 percent or more are used to inform the final Targeted Site Visit ratings. Responses for some questions are limited to subgroups of respondents (e.g., classroom teachers, administrators).

Please note that some item-specific percentages below may not add to 100 percent due to rounding. Responses for open-ended questions (e.g., #9, #19, #26, #32, #33, #34) were not included in this summary.

1	Principal High Expectations and Positive Regard	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1a	The principal at my school has confidence in the expertise of the teachers.	2%	14%	54%	30%
1b	The principal at my school takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers.	0%	20%	52%	28%
1c	The principal at my school looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.	2%	24%	50%	24%
1d	The principal at my school places students' needs first, ahead of other (e.g., personal, political) interests.	2%	20%	58%	20%
1e	The principal at my school implements strategies and activities that create positive relationships among school staff.	2%	33%	51%	14%
1f	The principal at my school implements strategies and activities that encourage high expectations for school staff.	4%	30%	50%	16%
2	Teacher High Expectations and Positive Regard	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
2a	Nearly all staff at my school engage in strategies and activities to promote positive relationships between <i>adults and students</i> in the school.	4%	23%	63%	10%
2b	Nearly all staff at my school engage in strategies and activities to promote positive relationships between <i>leadership and staff</i> in the school.	2%	42%	50%	6%
2c	Nearly all staff at my school want every student to do their best.	2%	4%	63%	31%
2d	Nearly all staff at my school think that all students can be academically successful.	2%	31%	59%	8%
2e	Nearly all staff at my school genuinely care about the students here.	0%	6%	69%	24%
2f	Nearly all staff at my school acknowledge and pay attention to students.	2%	6%	67%	24%
2g	Nearly all staff at my school have enough time to give students extra help.	8%	45%	41%	6%
2h	Nearly all staff at my school treat all students equally well.	2%	27%	57%	14%
3	Support for School Turnaround Process (Vision/Theory of Action)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
3a	Nearly all teachers at my school help maintain discipline in the whole school, not just their classroom.	12%	43%	39%	6%
3b	Nearly all teachers at my school take responsibility for improving the school.	0%	39%	57%	4%
3c	Nearly all teachers at my school set high standards for themselves.	0%	24%	65%	10%
3d	Nearly all teachers at my school feel responsible to help each other do their best.	0%	33%	61%	6%
3e	Nearly all teachers at my school think that the school's goals for student achievement can be met if all teachers work hard.	6%	43%	47%	4%

4	Support for School Turnaround Process (Progress Monitoring)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
4a	The principal and other school leaders at my school have developed clear processes for measuring my school's progress toward improvement goals.	0%	22%	67%	10%
4b	The principal and other school leaders at my school have established benchmarks for measuring progress toward school improvement goals.	0%	24%	63%	12%
4c	The principal and other school leaders at my school communicate school progress and challenges with teachers and staff.	4%	31%	53%	12%
5	Trusting Relationships	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
5a	Nearly all teachers at my school trust each other.	0%	35%	59%	7%
5b	Nearly all teachers at my school respect other teachers who <i>take the lead</i> in school improvement efforts.	2%	18%	71%	8%
5c	Nearly all teachers at my school respect those colleagues who are <i>experts</i> .	0%	24%	61%	14%
5d	Nearly all teachers at my school really care about each other.	0%	27%	59%	14%
5e	Nearly all teachers at my school discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with each other.	0%	20%	55%	24%
5f	Nearly all teachers at my school have built trusting relationships with instructional coaches (individuals who provide instructional support).	2%	20%	61%	16%
5g	Nearly all teachers at my school collaborate with instructional coaches to improve instruction (individuals who provide instructional support).	2%	14%	63%	20%
5h	Nearly all teachers at my school feel that instructional support is nonjudgmental.	4%	23%	54%	19%
6	Use of Time for Professional Development and Collaboration <i>Please indicate how frequently you do each of the following activities with other teachers in your school.</i>	Never	A few times a year	Once or twice per month	Weekly or more frequently
6a	Examine or change the scope or sequence of the coverage of specific curricular topics.	13%	28%	31%	28%
6b	Develop thematic units or other approaches to integrating instruction across curricular areas.	28%	41%	16%	16%
6c	Examine the alignment of curricular materials and student assessments at my school.	6%	45%	26%	23%
6d	Clarify standards for student learning through in-depth discussion and analysis of students' classroom work.	6%	38%	22%	34%
6e	Work on implementing particular instructional grouping strategies.	3%	41%	31%	25%
6f	Discuss particular lessons that were not very successful.	6%	25%	38%	31%
6g	Discuss beliefs about teaching and learning.	6%	22%	34%	38%
6h	Share and discuss research on effective teaching methods.	3%	42%	32%	23%
6i	Observe another teacher teaching.	68%	19%	6%	6%
6j	Have my class observed by another teacher.	68%	19%	6%	6%
6k	Share ideas on managing student behavior.	0%	25%	28%	47%
6l	Consult with other teachers about challenges I am facing in the classroom.	0%	22%	34%	44%
6m	Discuss what I've learned in professional development activities with other teachers.	3%	34%	41%	22%

7	Communication With Staff	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
7a	School leaders communicate with staff regularly in meetings.	4%	15%	64%	17%
7b	School leaders communicate with staff regularly through electronic correspondence.	2%	4%	62%	32%
7c	Communication between school leaders and staff is consistent.	4%	19%	51%	26%
7d	Communication between school leaders and staff is adequate and clear.	4%	34%	45%	17%
7e	Most of the staff's communication with school leaders is on an as-needed, informal basis.	0%	26%	68%	6%
7f	There are sufficient and appropriate formal opportunities (e.g., regular meetings, planning sessions, committees) for all or most staff to provide feedback to school leaders.	6%	21%	60%	13%
7g	There are sufficient and appropriate formal opportunities (e.g., meetings, planning sessions, etc.) in which school leaders and staff experience open, two-way communication.	4%	30%	57%	9%
7h	School leaders provide staff with high quality, clear, and actionable feedback.	2%	26%	62%	11%
8	Teacher Leadership	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
8a	Teacher leadership opportunities are available to all or nearly all teachers.	6%	6%	59%	28%
8b	Teacher leadership structures (e.g., ILT, school-based committees) are effective in shaping school leaders' decision making.	6%	16%	66%	13%
8c	There are opportunities for teachers to take on a leadership role in some aspect of the school improvement process.	0%	16%	59%	25%
8d	School leaders distribute leadership and responsibility effectively across school staff.	6%	28%	56%	9%
10	Administrator Instructional Expectations <i>School leaders at my school...</i>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
10a	Leaders at my school make clear to the staff their expectations for meeting instructional goals.	0%	13%	62%	24%
10b	Leaders at my school understand how students learn.	4%	20%	62%	13%
10c	Leaders at my school actively monitor the quality of teaching in my school.	4%	27%	58%	11%
10d	Leaders at my school set high expectations for student learning.	2%	33%	47%	18%
10e	Leaders at my school expect teachers to implement what they have learned in professional development.	2%	4%	80%	13%
10f	Leaders at my school know what is going on in my classroom.	7%	24%	56%	13%

11	Teacher Instructional Expectations <i>Teachers at my school...</i>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
11a	Teachers at my school receive support around how to incorporate students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds in my practice.	4%	44%	40%	11%
11b	Teachers at my school use students' prior knowledge to make lessons relevant to their everyday lives.	0%	9%	80%	11%
11c	Teachers at my school modify instructional activities and materials to meet the developmental needs of all students.	0%	4%	82%	13%
11d	Teachers at my school modify instructional activities and materials to meet the learning interests of all our students.	0%	4%	84%	11%
11e	Teachers at my school adapt instruction to ensure that it represents multiple cultural perspectives reflective of students' backgrounds.	2%	29%	58%	11%
11f	Teachers at my school know how to distinguish linguistic and cultural differences from learning difficulties.	0%	36%	60%	4%
12	Instructional Schedule [set by district as of March 1, 2021]	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
12a	The instructional schedule includes uninterrupted blocks of learning time for all students, including for all grade levels and students with special needs.	4%	13%	56%	27%
12b	Teachers are asked to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the instructional schedule, at least annually.	4%	20%	56%	20%
12c	The instructional schedule is developed in collaboration with teachers.	7%	37%	47%	9%
12d	The current instructional schedule meets the academic needs of all students in my school.	9%	42%	40%	9%
12e	The instructional schedule is routinely (at least annually) adjusted to meet the needs of all students.	0%	25%	66%	9%

13	Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs	Not likely	Slightly likely	Likely	Very likely
13a	I use data to screen for and confirm the need for academic support.	2%	7%	60%	30%
13b	I follow a formal, systematic process (e.g., making a referral to the Student Support Team) for sharing my concerns with other staff in my school.	9%	14%	57%	20%
13c	A team (e.g., Instructional leadership team, professional learning community) meets to discuss individual student needs and the needs of groups of students.	16%	18%	52%	14%
13d	The student receives services and supports in a timely manner to address the need(s) identified in the referral.	30%	30%	34%	7%
13e	The services/supports that the student receives effectively address his or her needs.	21%	44%	26%	9%
13f	The student's academic progress is monitored with systematic analysis of data.	16%	30%	41%	14%
13g	Multiple services for the student are coordinated with one another.	21%	35%	37%	7%
13h	I receive appropriate follow-up communication about the steps that are being taken to address the student's needs.	26%	44%	21%	9%
13i	I receive information and tools necessary to provide supports to the student.	27%	30%	34%	9%
13j	When student academic needs are identified, action steps are communicated among all staff and teams.	18%	32%	43%	7%
13k	Supports and services for students are provided only when data shows that the student needs them.	11%	27%	50%	11%
14	Classroom Observation Data Use <i>Thinking about the person who is MOST LIKELY to observe your teaching during the school year, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.</i>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
14a	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, this person is able to accurately assess teachers' instruction.	3%	0%	69%	28%
14b	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, this person knows my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.	3%	16%	59%	22%
14c	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, I believe this person has a good idea of how well I teach.	0%	9%	63%	28%
14d	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, I receive feedback that is a fair assessment of my instruction.	3%	0%	66%	31%
14e	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, I receive feedback that provides specific ideas about how I could improve my instruction.	0%	9%	63%	28%
14f	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, the feedback made me more reflective about my teaching.	0%	19%	50%	31%
14g	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, I use feedback to make specific adjustments to my instruction.	0%	19%	53%	28%
14h	Thinking about the person most likely to observe my teaching, this person provides feedback that is tied to specific instructional strategies that guide our school improvement process.	0%	13%	56%	31%

15	Classroom Observation Data Use	Never	A few times a year	Once or twice per month	Weekly or more frequently
	Please indicate how often you are observed by a school administrator and/or an instructional leadership specialist at your school.	0%	63%	31%	6%
16	Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction) <i>To what extent do you use the following types of student assessment data to guide your instruction?</i>	Do not use in this way	Use minimally	Use moderately	Use extensively
16a	Standardized tests	6%	44%	47%	3%
16b	Student assignments	0%	0%	31%	69%
16c	Class test or quizzes	0%	6%	65%	29%
16d	Benchmark assessments	6%	19%	56%	19%
16e	Student grades	3%	23%	45%	29%
16f	Your own observations	0%	0%	16%	84%
17	Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction) <i>To what extent have you used student data for the following activities?</i>	Do not use in this way	Use minimally	Use moderately	Use extensively
17a	Identify individual students who need additional instructional support, such as tutoring.	0%	6%	44%	50%
17b	Tailor classroom instruction to individual students' needs.	0%	3%	50%	47%
17c	Identify and address gaps in the curriculum.	3%	6%	52%	39%
17d	Group students for instruction (either within or across grade levels).	9%	3%	50%	38%
18	Systems for Postsecondary Planning and Workplace Readiness	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
18a	All students are formally provided with opportunities to explore careers and postsecondary opportunities.	24%	45%	21%	10%
18b	All or most of the students in every grade level work with a dedicated staff member to design a postsecondary plan centered around their needs and interests.	34%	46%	17%	2%
18c	All or most students work with a group of staff members to develop an individualized academic map for themselves based on their individual interests and goals.	38%	40%	19%	2%

20	General Academic Interventions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
20a	I have received adequate training on effective instructional practices for teaching struggling students.	4%	12%	64%	20%
20b	I have adequate <i>preparation time</i> to effectively <i>identify</i> the needs of struggling students in my classes.	12%	36%	36%	16%
20c	I have adequate <i>preparation time</i> to effectively <i>address</i> the needs of struggling students in my classes.	12%	40%	36%	12%
20d	I have adequate <i>instructional time</i> to effectively <i>identify</i> the needs of struggling students in my classes.	0%	36%	52%	12%
20e	I have adequate <i>instructional time</i> to effectively <i>address</i> the needs of struggling students in my classes.	4%	36%	56%	4%
20f	I have the supports (e.g., technology, resources, staff) to support struggling students in my classes.	28%	28%	40%	4%
20g	My school has adequate systems in place for providing academic interventions to struggling students.	16%	44%	36%	4%
20h	The instructional schedule includes adequate time for students to participate in academic interventions during the school day.	8%	16%	64%	12%
21	Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (Academic and Nonacademic)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
21a	I have received training on how to use data to identify students who need additional academic supports.	2%	18%	66%	14%
21b	I have received training on how to implement supplemental (Tier II) academic supports for students.	5%	32%	52%	11%
21c	I have received training on how to implement intensive (Tier III) academic supports for students.	7%	37%	44%	12%
21d	I have received training on how to use data to identify student behavioral and/or socio-emotional needs.	14%	27%	50%	9%
21e	I have received training on how to implement supplemental (Tier II) behavioral and/or socio-emotional supports for students.	18%	43%	30%	9%
21f	I have received training on how to implement intensive (Tier III) behavioral and/or socio-emotional supports for students.	20%	48%	23%	9%
21g	I receive ongoing support to help apply academic training into my classroom practice.	7%	30%	56%	7%
21h	I receive ongoing support to help apply behavioral and/or socio-emotional training into my classroom practice.	18%	32%	43%	7%
22	Multitiered System of Support (Academic and Nonacademic)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
22a	A system is in place at my school to identify students who are struggling to meet expectations (separate from the IEP process).	7%	32%	57%	5%
22b	My school uses a multi-tiered system of support to support students who are struggling to meet expectations.	9%	41%	45%	5%
22c	Staff members at my school follow consistent rules and procedures to identify students in need of additional support.	9%	48%	39%	5%
22d	A team of appropriate staff and stakeholders at my school makes decisions about interventions and supports for struggling students.	7%	34%	55%	5%
22e	Staff members at my school follow consistent rules and procedures when they monitor the effectiveness of interventions and supports for struggling students.	9%	39%	48%	5%

23	Academic Enrichment	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
23a	I have adequate <i>preparation</i> time to effectively offer academic enrichment for students in my classes.	14%	53%	28%	5%
23b	I have adequate <i>instructional</i> time to offer academic enrichment for students in my classes.	14%	44%	35%	7%
23c	I have the supports (e.g., [technology,] resources, staff) to offer academic enrichment for students in my classes.	12%	30%	51%	7%
23d	My school has adequate systems in place for providing academic enrichment for students.	9%	53%	33%	5%
23e	The instructional schedule includes adequate time for students to participate in academic enrichments during the school day.	10%	45%	40%	5%
24	Academic Support for English Language Learners	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
24a	I have received adequate training on effective instructional practices for teaching ELs.	0%	14%	58%	28%
24b	I have adequate preparation time to effectively identify the needs of ELs in my classes.	6%	31%	50%	14%
24c	I have adequate preparation time to effectively address the needs of ELs in my classes.	6%	39%	42%	14%
24d	I have adequate instructional time to effectively identify the needs of ELs in my classes.	0%	39%	47%	14%
24e	I have adequate instructional time to effectively address the needs of ELs in my classes.	6%	44%	39%	11%
24f	I have the supports (e.g., resources, staff) to support ELs in my classes.	14%	33%	42%	11%
24g	General education teachers have time to meet with EL specialists to coordinate supports as necessary.	22%	44%	25%	8%
25	Academic Support for Students with Disabilities	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
25a	I have received adequate training on effective instructional practices for teaching students with disabilities.	0%	18%	65%	18%
25b	I have adequate preparation time to effectively identify the needs of students with disabilities in my classes.	0%	43%	48%	10%
25c	I have adequate preparation time to effectively address the needs of students with disabilities in my classes.	0%	49%	44%	8%
25d	I have adequate instructional time to effectively identify the needs of students with disabilities in my classes.	3%	31%	59%	8%
25e	I have adequate instructional time to effectively address the needs of students with disabilities in my classes.	3%	43%	48%	8%
25f	I have the supports (e.g., technology, resources, staff) to support students with disabilities in my classes.	10%	40%	40%	10%
25g	General education teachers have time to meet with special education specialists to coordinate supports as necessary.	15%	43%	35%	8%

27	Schoolwide Conduct Expectations	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
27a	My school has defined a set of clearly stated expectations for student conduct.	38%	12%	43%	7%
27b	My school has defined a set of positively worded expectations for student conduct.	14%	17%	62%	7%
27c	My school has clearly defined consequences for not meeting expected student conduct.	43%	38%	19%	0%
27d	My school's schoolwide procedures for managing conduct are adequate for my classroom.	48%	36%	17%	0%
27e	Nearly all staff in my school communicate expected student conduct.	17%	38%	43%	2%
27f	Nearly all staff in my school model expected behaviors.	7%	26%	62%	5%
27g	Nearly all staff in my school positively reinforce (e.g., verbally acknowledge, reward) expected student conduct.	5%	38%	52%	5%
27h	Schoolwide expected student conduct applies to non-classroom instructional settings.	31%	26%	36%	7%
27i	Student conduct is effectively managed in non-classroom instructional settings.	57%	40%	2%	0%
27j	School leaders regularly monitor the implementation of the school's supports for student conduct.	39%	51%	10%	0%
28	Adult-Student Relationships	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
28a	There are sufficient structures in my school to support adult-student relationships (e.g., advisories, mentors).	15%	56%	27%	2%
28b	The structures to support adult-student relationships are clearly defined.	17%	63%	17%	2%
28c	Structures to support adult-student relationships are implemented consistently for all students	20%	61%	17%	2%
28d	Structures to support adult-student relationships include a component of social-emotional support for students.	12%	46%	39%	2%
28e	Structures to support adult-student relationships are monitored (at least annually) to determine effectiveness in meeting students' needs.	12%	61%	24%	2%
29	Expanded Learning Opportunities	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
29a	My school offers structured opportunities for academic learning outside of the regular school day.	2%	26%	52%	19%
29b	My school offers structured opportunities for extra-curricular learning outside of the regular school day.	0%	12%	59%	29%
29c	All or nearly all students have access to academic learning opportunities outside the regular school day.	5%	36%	48%	12%
29d	All or nearly all students have access to extra-curricular learning opportunities outside the regular school day.	2%	19%	57%	21%
29e	High-needs students are targeted for participation in academic learning opportunities outside the regular school day.	5%	37%	51%	7%
29f	High-needs students are targeted for participation in extra-curricular learning opportunities outside the regular school day.	7%	34%	49%	10%

30	Wraparound Services and External Partners	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
30a	There are sufficient and appropriate wraparound support services for students at my school.	11%	58%	29%	3%
30b	There are sufficient and appropriate wraparound support services for students' families at my school.	13%	58%	26%	3%
30c	Wraparound support services are available to all students at my school.	13%	53%	32%	3%
30d	Wraparound support services are consistently offered to students at my school, regardless of grade level or classroom.	13%	45%	39%	3%
30e	High needs students are targeted for participation in wraparound support services at my school.	8%	50%	39%	3%
30f	I feel responsible for building the capacity of families to support education.	5%	47%	42%	5%
30g	Students' needs with regard to wraparound support services are regularly assessed throughout the school year.	11%	58%	29%	3%
31	Family and Community Engagement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
31a	Parents are invited to visit classrooms to observe instructional program.	22%	59%	17%	2%
31b	The principal encourages teachers to communicate regularly with parents.	2%	7%	56%	34%
31c	My school encourages feedback from parents and the community.	5%	20%	59%	17%
31d	Teachers really try to understand parents' problems and concerns.	0%	22%	59%	20%
31e	Parents are greeted warmly when they call or visit the school.	0%	5%	71%	24%
31f	Teachers work closely with parents to meets students' needs.	2%	29%	54%	15%
31g	My school works at communicating to parents about support needed to advance the school mission.	0%	43%	43%	15%
31h	This school regularly communicates with parents about how they can help their children learn.	5%	33%	45%	18%
31i	I have access to translation or interpretation services if needed to communicate with parents.	2%	7%	59%	32%
31j	My school involves parents in school decision making.	5%	50%	33%	13%
31k	There are regular (e.g., monthly, every other month) social events and activities throughout the school year to engage families and community members.	13%	46%	36%	5%

Appendix B: Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report



SCHOOL DISTRICT

Secondary Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

**Targeted Site Visit Report 1 of 2:
Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report**

June 2022



201 Jones Road
Waltham, Massachusetts
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499
www.air.org

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Positive Climate.....	1
Teacher Sensitivity.....	4
Regard for Student Perspectives	5
Behavior Management	6
Productivity	7
Negative Climate.....	8
Instructional Learning Formats.....	9
Content Understanding.....	10
Analysis and Inquiry	11
Quality of Feedback	12
Instructional Dialogue.....	13
Student Engagement.....	14
Summary of Average Ratings	15
Sample Observations.....	16
References	21

Introduction

The *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* presents ratings for the classroom observations that were conducted by certified observers at American Institutes for Research (AIR) as part of the Targeted Site Visit (TSV). This is one of two reports related to the TSV.

SCHOOL was visited by two observers on June 2, 2022. The observers conducted 18 observations in a sample of classrooms across the school, focused on core subjects (for example, English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies).

The classroom observations were guided by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) for the secondary grades. The CLASS protocol was developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) at the University of Virginia. The protocol includes 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 1), in addition to Student Engagement.

Table 1. CLASS Secondary Domains and Dimensions

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Positive ClimateTeacher SensitivityRegard for Student Perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Behavior ManagementProductivityNegative Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Instructional Learning FormatsContent UnderstandingAnalysis and InquiryQuality of FeedbackInstructional Dialogue
Student Engagement		

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including student engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support or attention, was unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students' problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

Members of the TSV team who visited the classrooms all received training on the CLASS protocol in a two-day session and then passed a rigorous certification exam to ensure that they were able to accurately rate the dimensions. All observers must pass an exam annually to maintain their certification.

Research on CLASS protocol shows that students in classrooms that rated high using this observation tool have greater gains in social skills and academic success than students in classrooms with lower ratings (MET Project, 2010; CASTL, n.d.). Furthermore, small improvements on these domains can affect student outcomes: "The ability to demonstrate even small changes in effective interactions has practical implications—differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students" (CASTL, n.d., p. 3).

In this report, each CLASS dimension is defined, and descriptions of the dimension at the high, middle, and low levels are presented (*definitions and rating descriptions are derived from the CLASS Secondary Manual*). For each dimension we indicate the frequency of classroom observations across the ratings and provide a schoolwide average of the observed classrooms.

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain

Positive Climate reflects the emotional connection between the teacher and students and among students and the warmth, respect, and enjoyment communicated by verbal and nonverbal interactions (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 21). Table 2 (as well as tables for the remaining dimensions) includes the number of classrooms for each rating on each dimension and the school average for that dimension.

Table 2. Positive Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average ($n = 18$)

Positive Climate School Average*: 5.9

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations				3	2	6	7

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 2, the school average is computed as: $([4 \times 3] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 7]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 5.9$

Ratings in the Low Range. All indicators are absent or only minimally present. Teachers and students appear disinterested in one another. Affect in the classroom is flat, and there are rarely instances of teachers and students smiling, sharing humor, or laughing together. There are no, or very few, positive communications among the teacher and students; the teacher and students do not provide positive comments or indicate positive expectations of one another. There is no evidence that students and the teacher respect one another or that the teacher encourages students to respect one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some indications that the teacher and students share a warm and supportive relationship, but some students may be excluded from this relationship, either by the teacher or the students. Some relationships appear constrained—for example, the teacher expresses a perfunctory interest in students, or encouragement seems to be an automatic statement and is not sincere. Sometimes, teachers and students demonstrate respect for one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There are many indications that the relationship among students and the teacher is positive and warm. The teacher is typically in close proximity to students, and encouragement is sincere and personal. There are frequent displays of shared laughter, smiles, and enthusiasm. Teachers and students show respect for one another (e.g., listening, using calm voices, using polite language). Positive communication (both verbal and nonverbal) and mutual respect are evident throughout the session.

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain

Teacher Sensitivity encompasses the teacher's timely responsiveness to the academic, social-emotional, behavioral, and developmental needs of individual students and the entire class (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 27).

Table 3. Teacher Sensitivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Teacher Sensitivity School Average*: 6.3

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations					5	2	11

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the school average is computed as: $([5 \times 5] + [6 \times 2] + [7 \times 11]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.3$

Ratings in the Low Range. In these sessions, the teacher has not been aware of students who need extra support and pays little attention to students' needs. The teacher is unresponsive to and dismissive of students' academic and social-emotional needs and cues for support. The teacher is not effective in addressing students' needs and does not appropriately acknowledge situations that may be upsetting to students. The teacher is not effective at helping students solve problems; thus, student problems or confusion persist. Students rarely seek support from the teacher and minimize conversation with the teacher, not sharing ideas or responding to questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher is sometimes aware of student needs or aware of only a limited type of student needs, such as academic needs, not social-emotional needs. The teacher does not always realize a student is confused and needs extra help or when a student already knows the material being taught. The teacher may be responsive at times to students but at other times may ignore or dismiss students, and the teacher does not respond to students' academic and social-emotional needs. The teacher may respond only to students who are upbeat and positive and not support students who are upset. Sometimes, the teacher is effective in assisting students, but not always. Students sometimes seek support and share ideas with the teacher, although the types of interactions are not consistent or observed across the majority of students.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher's awareness of students and their needs is consistent and accurate. The teacher is consistently responsive to students' academic and social-emotional needs and cues for support. The teacher consistently addresses students' problems and concerns and is effective in doing so. Problems and confusions of students are resolved. Students are obviously comfortable with the teacher and share ideas, work comfortably together, and ask and respond to questions, even difficult questions.

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain

Regard for Student Perspectives captures the degree to which the teacher is able to meet and capitalize on the social and developmental needs and goals of students by providing opportunities for student autonomy and leadership. Also considered are the extent to which student ideas and opinions are valued and content is made useful and relevant to students (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 35).

Table 4. Regard for Student Perspectives: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average ($n = 18$)

Regard for Student Perspectives School Average*: 3.8

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	6	7	4		

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the school average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 6] + [4 \times 7] + [5 \times 4]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 3.8$

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher exhibits an inflexible, rigid adherence to his or her plan, without considering student ideas or allowing students to make contributions. The teacher rigidly adheres to the structure of the class and does not follow students' leads. The teacher does not connect the class content or materials to student experiences and does not present students with information about how or why the material is of value. Students have few, if any, meaningful choices within the lesson and are not provided opportunities for leadership or responsibility. There are few opportunities for students to talk and express themselves. Peer-peer interactions that are meaningful within the context of the lesson are discouraged.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher exhibits control at times and at other times follows the students' lead and gives them some choices and opportunities to follow their interests. The material is sometimes meaningfully connected to student experiences, and sometimes the teacher explains how or why the material is of value to students. Students have some choices within the lesson for leadership or responsibility, although the opportunities may be somewhat controlled by the teacher. The teacher provides only superficial opportunities for peer-peer interactions.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher is flexible in following student leads, interests, and ideas and looks for ways to meaningfully engage students. The material is meaningfully connected to the experience of students and presented in a way that students understand how or why it is of value to them. Students are provided with meaningful choices within lessons and are given authentic opportunities for responsibility and leadership. The teacher promotes meaningful opportunities for peer-peer interactions that are integral to the lesson.

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain

Behavior Management refers to the teacher's use of effective methods to encourage desirable behavior and prevent and redirect misbehavior (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 41).

Table 5. Behavior Management: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Behavior Management School Average*: 6.9

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations						2	16

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the school average is computed as: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 16]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, behavior expectations for students are absent, unclear, or inconsistently enforced. The teacher does not monitor the classroom effectively and responds only reactively to student disruption, which is frequent. There are frequent instances of misbehavior in the classroom, and teacher attempts to redirect misbehavior are ineffective. The teacher ignores some behavior. A number of students exhibit defiant behavior. The misbehavior is frequent and/or the classroom is chaotic. A large amount of instructional time is lost.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Although rules and expectations may be stated, they are not consistently enforced, or the rules may be unclear and difficult to follow. Sometimes, the teacher proactively anticipates and prevents misbehavior, but at other times the teacher ignores behavior problems until it is too late. The teacher sometimes misses early indicators of problems. Misbehavior may escalate because redirection is not always effective. Episodes of misbehavior are periodic but generally brief and limited to a small number of students.

Ratings in the High Range. In the high range, the rules and guidelines for behavior are clear, and they are consistently understood by everyone in the class. The teacher is consistently proactive and monitors the classroom, preventing problem behaviors from developing. The teacher's strategies to redirect misbehavior do not result in a loss of instructional time. Students are compliant and there are few, if any, instances of misbehavior.

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain

Productivity considers how well the teacher manages instructional time and routines so that instructional time is maximized. This dimension captures the degree to which instructional time is effectively managed and downtime is minimized for students (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 49).

Table 6. Productivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Productivity School Average*: 6.9

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations						1	17

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the school average is computed as: $([6 \times 1] + [7 \times 17]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low level, the teacher provides few or no tasks for students. There are lengthy and frequent disruptions that cut into learning time. The class is disorganized, and students do not know what to do. Students spend a lot of time in transition, and the teacher does little to facilitate more effective transitions. The teacher does not have activities organized and ready, seems to be caught up in last-minute preparations, or is unprepared.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, most of the time students have tasks, but learning time is sometimes limited because of disruptions and/or inefficient completion of management tasks. Some routines are in place, but also there are times of uncertainty and disorganization. Students spend more time than necessary in transitions, and the teacher does not consistently facilitate transitions. The teacher is mostly prepared for activities and/or the lesson but takes time away from instruction for last-minute preparations.

Ratings in the High Range. The classroom runs very smoothly. The teacher provides a steady flow of tasks for students, so they do not have downtime and are not confused about what to do next. The routines of the classroom are efficient, and all students know what is expected and how to go about doing classroom tasks and activities. Transitions are smooth, and there is little downtime from one lesson or activity to another. The teacher is fully prepared for the lesson.

Negative Climate

Classroom Organization domain

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.¹

Table 7. Negative Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Negative Climate School Average*: 6.9

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations						2	16

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the school average is computed as: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 16]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

Ratings in the Low Range. Negativity is pervasive. The teacher may express constant irritation, annoyance, or anger; unduly criticize students; consistently use a harsh tone; and/or take a harsh stance as he or she interacts with students. Threats or yelling are frequently used to establish control. Language is disrespectful and sarcastic. Severe negativity, such as the following actions, would lead to a high rating on negative climate, even if the action is not extended: students bullying one another, a teacher hitting a student, or students physically fighting with one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some expressions of mild negativity by the teacher or students. The teacher may express irritability, use a harsh tone, and/or express annoyance—usually during difficult moments in the classroom. Threats or yelling may be used to establish control over the classroom, but not constantly; rather, more as a response to situations. At times, the teacher and students may be sarcastic or disrespectful toward one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There is no display of negativity. No strong expressions of anger or aggression are exhibited, either by the teacher or the students. If there is such a display, it is contained and does not escalate. The teacher does not issue threats or yell to establish control. The teacher and students are respectful and do not express sarcasm.

¹ When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring.

Instructional Learning Formats

Instructional Support domain

Instructional Learning Formats refer to the ways in which the teacher maximizes students' engagement in learning through clear presentation of material, active facilitation, and the provision of interesting and engaging lessons and materials (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 61).

Table 8. Instructional Learning Formats: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Instructional Learning Formats School Average*: 4.7

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	1	5	7	4	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the school average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 1] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 4]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 4.7$

Ratings in the Low Range. The teacher has not described clear learning targets. The teacher communicates in a disorganized and unclear way and does not draw student attention to the objectives of the lesson. The teacher offers information in a single mode, with little or no variety in strategies or materials. Students have little opportunity to interact with materials and activities. The teacher is uninvolved in the work of students and appears disinterested in their work or class participation. The students do not appear interested or engaged in the lesson.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher may have discussed learning objectives, although the objectives are not always clear. The teacher may use preview and/or summary statements, but these statements are brief and not in depth; the statements do not focus students' attention on the learning objectives. Students are sometimes given information in a variety of modalities, strategies, and/or materials, and students have some opportunities to interact with materials and activities, although not in depth. The teacher intermittently facilitates student involvement through questioning, appropriate pacing, and the active display of interest and engagement in students' work. At other times, the teacher seems uninvolved and uninterested. Some of the time, the students are interested or engaged in the instruction, or they are mildly engaged.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher clearly communicates learning objectives and gains students' attention on the objectives. The teacher presents information through multiple modalities and strategies and uses multiple materials. Students have consistent opportunities with materials and activities. The teacher actively facilitates students' involvement through questioning, appropriate pacing, and the active display of interest and engagement in students' work and participation. Students are consistently interested and engaged.

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain

Content Understanding refers to the depth of the lesson content and the approaches used to help students comprehend the framework, key ideas, and procedures in an academic discipline. At a high level, this dimension refers to interactions among the teacher and students that lead to an integrated understanding of facts, skills, concepts, and principles (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 68).

Table 9. Content Understanding: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Content Understanding School Average*: 4.3

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	5	2	7	3	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the school average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 2] + [5 \times 7] + [6 \times 3]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 4.3$

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the focus of the class is mainly on presenting discrete pieces of topically related information, absent broad, organizing ideas. Class discussion and materials fail to effectively communicate the essential attributes of the concepts and procedures to students. When presenting new information, the teacher makes little effort to elicit or acknowledge students' background knowledge or misconceptions or to integrate previously learned material. Content or procedural knowledge is not accurate or presented clearly.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The focus of the class is sometimes on meaningful discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. At other times, the class is focused on discrete pieces of relevant information. Class discussion and materials communicate a few of the essential attributes of concepts and procedures, but examples are limited in scope and not consistently provided. The teacher makes some attempts to elicit and/or acknowledge students' background knowledge or misconceptions or to integrate information with previously learned material. These moments are limited in depth and not consistent. Content and/or procedural knowledge is sometimes effectively and accurately conveyed to students. At other times, the information is confusing and/or inaccurate.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the focus of the class is on encouraging deep understanding of content through meaningful, interactive discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. Class discussion and materials consistently and effectively communicate the essential attributes of concepts and procedures to students. New concepts and procedures and broad ideas are consistently linked to students' prior knowledge in ways that advance understanding and clarify misconceptions. Content and procedural knowledge is effectively and accurately communicated to students.

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain

Analysis and Inquiry assesses the degree to which students are engaged in higher level thinking skills, such as inquiry, analysis, reasoning, and creating, through the application of knowledge and skills to novel and/or open-ended problems, tasks, and questions. Opportunities for engaging in metacognition also are included (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 76).

Table 10. Analysis and Inquiry: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Analysis and Inquiry School Average*: 3.4

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		3	7	6	2		

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the school average is computed as: $([2 \times 3] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 6] + [5 \times 2]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 3.4$

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, students do not meaningfully engage in higher order thinking skills through analysis and inquiry. Instruction is rote, and the teacher offers no opportunities for students to engage in novel or open-ended tasks. Students are not challenged to apply previous knowledge and skills to a new problem. Students are not encouraged to think about, evaluate, or reflect on their own learning or to plan their own learning experiences.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, students occasionally engage in higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry, but these episodes are brief or limited in depth. The teacher provides opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills within familiar contexts, with teacher guidance available, but does not provide opportunities for analysis and problem solving within novel contexts and/or without teacher support. Students have occasional opportunities to think about their thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning. These opportunities are typically brief and limited in depth.

Ratings in the High Range. At this range, students consistently engage in extended opportunities to use higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry. The teacher provides opportunities for students to independently solve or reason through novel and open-ended tasks, requiring the students to select and utilize or apply existing knowledge and skills. Students have multiple, extended opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning.

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain

Quality of Feedback assesses the degree to which feedback expands and extends learning and understanding and encourages student participation. In secondary classrooms, significant feedback also may be provided by peers. Regardless of the source, the focus here should be on the nature of the feedback provided and the extent to which it motivates learning (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 93).

Table 11. Quality of Feedback: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Quality of Feedback School Average*: 4.2

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	5	4	5	3	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the school average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 5] + [4 \times 4] + [5 \times 5] + [6 \times 3]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 4.2$

Ratings in the Low Range. The feedback is nonexistent or perfunctory. Students are not provided with assistance, hints, or prompting from the teacher or peers when participating in classwork but are left to complete work without assistance. The teacher and/or peers move on quickly after a student has provided an answer or presented work, without building on student responses in a way that clarifies learning. Students rarely receive encouragement or affirmation of their work or participation.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are occasional feedback loops between the teacher and students or among students, but, at other times, feedback is perfunctory. The teacher and/or peers sometimes scaffold student learning, but the interactions are brief and not of sufficient depth to allow students to fully perform at a higher level. The teacher and/or peers sometimes build on student responses to expand students' learning and understanding, but these exchanges are brief and/or limited in depth. The teacher and other students occasionally offer encouragement of students' efforts that increases involvement and persistence, but this encouragement is brief and/or not consistent.

Ratings in the High Range. There are frequent feedback loops between the teacher and students or among students, which lead students to obtain a deeper understanding of materials and concepts. The teacher and/or peers often scaffold student learning, allowing students to perform at a higher level than they would be able to perform independently. The teacher and/or peers often build on student responses in a way that expands students' understanding. The teacher and other students often encourage students' efforts in a way that increases involvement and persistence.

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain

Instructional Dialogue captures the purposeful use of content-focused discussion among teachers and students that is cumulative, with the teacher supporting students to chain ideas together in ways that lead to deeper understanding of content. Students take an active role in these dialogues, and both the teacher and students use strategies that facilitate extended dialogue (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 101).

Table 12. Instructional Dialogue: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Instructional Dialogue School Average*: 3.8

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	7	5	4	1	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the school average is computed as: $([2 \times 1] + [3 \times 7] + [4 \times 5] + [5 \times 4] + [6 \times 1]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 3.8$

Ratings in the Low Range. There are no or few discussions in the class, discussions are unrelated to content or skill development, or discussions contain only simple question-response exchanges between the teacher and students. The class is dominated by teacher talk, or there is no discussion. The teacher and students ask closed-ended questions; rarely acknowledge, repeat, or extend other students' comments; and/or appear disinterested in other students' comments. Many students are not engaged in instructional dialogue.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are occasional content-based discussions in class among teachers and students. However, the discussions are brief or quickly move from one topic to another without follow-up questions or comments. The class is mostly dominated by teacher talk, but there are times in which students take a more active role, or there are distributed dialogues that involve only a few students in the class. The teacher and students sometimes use facilitation strategies that encourage more elaborated dialogue, but the strategies are brief, inconsistent, or ineffective and do not consistently engage students in extended dialogues.

Ratings in the High Range. There are frequent, content-driven discussions in the class between teacher and students or among students that build depth of knowledge through cumulative and contingent exchanges. Class dialogues are distributed such that both the teacher and the majority of students take an active role or students are actively engaged in instructional dialogues with each other. The teacher and students frequently use facilitation strategies that encourage more elaborate dialogue, and students are observed responding to the techniques by fully participating in extended dialogues.

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain

Student Engagement is intended to capture the degree to which all students in the class are focused and participating in the learning activity presented or facilitated by the teacher. The difference between passive engagement and active engagement is reflected in this rating (*CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 101).

Table 13. Student Engagement: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (n = 18)

Student Engagement School Average*: 6.6

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations						8	10

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the school average is computed as: $([6 \times 8] + [7 \times 10]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.6$

Ratings in the Low Range. The majority of students appear distracted or disengaged.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Students are passively engaged, listening to or watching the teacher, or there is a mix of student engagement, with the majority of students actively engaged for part of the time and disengaged for the rest of the time. Sometimes, there is a mix of student engagement, with some students actively engaged and some students disengaged.

Ratings in the High Range. Most students are actively engaged in classroom discussions and activities.

Summary of Average Ratings

Table 14. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Emotional Support Domain		1	6	10	11	8	18	5.4
Positive Climate				3	2	6	7	5.9
Teacher Sensitivity					5	2	11	6.3
Regard for Student Perspectives		1	6	7	4			3.8
Classroom Organization Domain						5	49	6.9
Behavior Management						2	16	6.9
Productivity						1	17	6.9
Negative Climate**						2	16	6.9
Instructional Support Domain		7	25	22	25	11		4.1
Instructional Learning Formats		1	1	5	7	4		4.7
Content Understanding		1	5	2	7	3		4.3
Analysis and Inquiry		3	7	6	2			3.4
Quality of Feedback		1	5	4	5	3		4.2
Instructional Dialogue		1	7	5	4	1		3.8
Student Engagement						8	10	6.6

*The school average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the school average is computed as: $([4 \times 3] + [5 \times 2] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 7]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 5.9$

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: $([6 \times 2] + [7 \times 16]) \div 18 \text{ observations} = 6.9$

Sample Observations

The following table includes example comments derived from the CLASS manuals that describe typical classrooms scoring in the range your school scored in for each dimension. Comments are not specifically tailored to the school.

Table 15. Sample Observation Comments for Each Dimension

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Secondary)	Sample Observation Comments
Emotional Support	Positive Climate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Relationships ■ Positive Affect ■ Positive Communications ■ Respect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers and students share warm, supportive relationships with one another. They appear comfortable being in close proximity with one another and appear interested in helping one another. ■ Teachers appear genuinely interested in students' lives outside of school, asking them questions when appropriate and appearing genuinely interested in student responses. ■ Teacher and student affects are often shared (e.g., students and teachers show excitement or enthusiasm for the same things). ■ Most teachers communicate positive expectations for students (e.g., "I know you will all do a great job on this"). ■ Teachers and students are very respectful to one another. They consistently use respectful language (e.g., "Please" and "Thank you"), listen when another person is speaking, and work collaboratively with one another. ■ Teachers and students often share smiles and laughter.
	Teacher Sensitivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Awareness ■ Responsiveness to Academic and Social-Emotional Needs and Cues ■ Effectiveness in Addressing Problems ■ Student Comfort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers consistently monitor the classroom, walking around and checking in with students to see if anyone needs additional support. ■ Teachers frequently notice if students are struggling to understand a lesson or appear upset or anxious. ■ Teachers often anticipate problems and plan accordingly. ■ Teachers often adjust the pacing of lessons in response to student needs. ■ Teachers are consistently responsive to both academic and social/emotional needs of students. They respond to needs in a supportive and understanding manner, providing appropriate direction, assistance, and redirection. ■ Teachers appear effective in addressing student needs as evidenced by the students' ability to move on with the lesson after receiving help from the teacher. ■ Teachers often notice if students are not focused on the lesson and reengage these students in the activity. ■ Students appear comfortable seeking support from the teacher. They often raise their hands to ask questions or approach the teacher for assistance when appropriate.

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Secondary)	Sample Observation Comments
	Regard for Student Perspectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Flexibility and Student Focus ■ Connections to Current Life ■ Support for Autonomy and Leadership ■ Meaningful Peer Interactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers provide some opportunities for students to share their ideas, thoughts, and opinions. Teachers occasionally incorporate student ideas into the lesson. ■ Some teachers make meaningful connections to students' lives and experiences. ■ Teachers occasionally remind students of the usefulness of the skills they are learning and how they relate to students' future experiences. ■ Some teachers allow students to be as autonomous as possible within lessons. Students are provided with meaningful choices and responsibilities. However, other teachers do not provide opportunities for student choice or autonomy within the lesson. ■ Students are occasionally provided with meaningful leadership opportunities. For example, some students are asked to lead the class in solving a math problem at the board. However, in some classrooms, these types of opportunities are rare or only available for one or two students.
Classroom Organization	Behavior Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Clear Expectations ■ Proactive ■ Effective Redirection of Misbehavior ■ Student Behavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Behavioral expectations are understood by everyone in the class. ■ Rules are consistently enforced. ■ Teachers frequently monitor the classroom and intervene before any problems occur. ■ Teachers often use subtle cues to regain students' attention (e.g., eye contact, touch, physical proximity, using students' names). ■ Students are often well behaved. Any behavioral disruptions are very brief and do not take away from instructional time.
	Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maximizing Learning Time ■ Routines ■ Transitions ■ Preparation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Students have tasks to do throughout the whole observation. ■ Teachers provide clear directions or options for students who finish a task early. ■ No time is lost on teachers completing managerial tasks. ■ Students have clear instructions and know what they should be doing. ■ There is little or no wandering in the classroom. ■ Teachers provide time cues for transitions (e.g., "You have one minute to get into your groups"), and no instructional time is lost during transitions. ■ Teachers are prepared for lessons and have all materials out and easily accessible.
	Negative Climate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Negative Affect ■ Punitive Control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ In nearly all classrooms, there is no evidence of negative climate. ■ Teachers and students are not observed using harsh voices.

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Secondary)	Sample Observation Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Disrespect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers do not yell, punish, or physically control students. ■ Teachers and most students are not sarcastic or disrespectful to each other.
Instructional Support	<p>Instructional Learning Formats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Learning Targets and Organization ■ Variety of Modalities, Strategies, and Materials ■ Active Facilitation ■ Effective Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Some teachers clearly communicate learning objectives and reorient students to these objectives if necessary. ■ Some teachers present information in multiple modalities (e.g., lectures, slide presentations, diagrams) and use multiple instructional strategies (e.g., whole group, small group, individual) and occasionally offer students hands-on opportunities. However, other teachers rely on one or two modalities and instructional strategies (e.g., lecturing to the whole group). ■ Some teachers consistently use active facilitation strategies to increase student involvement (e.g., questioning, appropriate pacing, and actively showing interest in students' participation). However, this type of facilitation is not consistently present across most classrooms. ■ In some classrooms, most students appear consistently actively engaged. They listen to the teacher, raise their hands to answer questions, volunteer comments, and participate in group or partner work. However, in some classrooms engagement is mixed and in others most students appear disinterested or disengaged.
	<p>Content Understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Depth of Understanding ■ Communication of Concepts and Procedures ■ Background Knowledge and Misconceptions ■ Transmission of Content Knowledge and Procedures ■ Opportunity for Practice of Procedures and Skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers occasionally help students apply the lesson to real world events and situations that make concepts more meaningful. ■ Teachers occasionally present multiple varied points of view. However, there are some instances where teachers appear to encourage students to adopt a "correct" point of view. ■ In some classrooms, teachers often present the essential components of concepts and further enhance understanding of concepts by providing multiple examples and non-examples. However, this is not consistent within or across classrooms. ■ Teachers occasionally relate new concepts to students' background knowledge and occasionally encourage students to make connections between new concepts and previously learned information. ■ Teachers occasionally provide clear and accurate definitions; however, there are instances where teachers do not clarify student misconceptions, and students appear confused after receiving help from the teacher. ■ Teachers occasionally give students time for guided or independent practice. Teacher feedback during this practice varies within and across classrooms.

Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Secondary)	Sample Observation Comments
<p>Analysis and Inquiry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Facilitation of Higher Order Thinking ■ Opportunities for Novel Application ■ Metacognition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking or cognitively challenging tasks are inconsistent within and across classrooms. ■ Some teachers ask students to identify and investigate problems, think about alternative approaches, and make predictions. ■ Teachers occasionally present opportunities for students to independently reason through open-ended tasks (e.g., there is no single correct answer). However, this is not consistent within or across classrooms. ■ Students are occasionally asked to evaluate and defend their own work. ■ When a student gives a wrong answer, teachers occasionally ask questions to understand why the student reached a different answer and help correct the errors in their reasoning.
<p>Quality of Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Feedback Loops ■ Scaffolding ■ Building on Student Responses ■ Encouragement and Affirmation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers and students occasionally have back-and-forth exchanges. However, these exchanges often are not sustained interactions (e.g., the teacher makes one comment and moves on) and they do not lead to a deeper level of student understanding. ■ Teachers occasionally provide hints or assistance to help get students thinking in the right direction. However, this is not consistent within or across classrooms. ■ Teachers occasionally prompt students to explain their thinking or ask students to expand upon their initial responses to help students understand how they arrived at the answer. ■ Teachers occasionally encourage student persistence by focusing on student effort. However, feedback is occasionally vague (e.g., “Nice”) and does not always encourage students’ continued active involvement in the activity.
<p>Instructional Dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cumulative Content-Driven Exchanges ■ Distributed Talk ■ Facilitation Strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There are many conversations in the classrooms. At times, these conversations are meaningful and tied to content. However, at other times, conversations are mostly social. ■ There are occasional extended dialogues that encourage students’ depth of understanding of the content. ■ In some classrooms, teacher talk dominates, and students have some opportunities to participate and share their ideas. In other classrooms, there are many opportunities for students to have their voice heard, however these opportunities are only available to a few students. ■ Teachers ask a mix of open-ended and closed-ended questions.

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Secondary)	Sample Observation Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Teachers occasionally repeat or expand on student comments. ■ At times, most students actively listen, respond to comments, and ask follow-up questions. However, this is not consistent within or across classrooms.
	<p>Student Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Most students are actively engaged in classroom discussions and activities. ■ Students respond to teachers' questions, volunteer information, share their ideas, and work with materials. ■ Most students appear to be on task. ■ Students appear interested in the activities.

References

Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf>

MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Secondary*. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.