

**Amplify** insight.

# Lead Partner Presentation

George Washington Community High School

*Presentation to the State Board of Education  
September 4, 2013*

# Agenda

- Scope of work
- Service delivery
- School priorities and key outcomes
- School data, goals and achievement
- Challenges
- 2013-2014
- Appendix

# Scope of Work

- **Goal:**
  - Every teacher and administrator uses data to guide instruction and provide the right support for each child.
- **Scope of work:**
  - Conduct a **Needs Assessment** to determine GWCHS needs
  - Facilitate **Professional Learning Communities** (PLCs) to build data use skills and develop student engagement strategies
  - **Coach Teachers** in the classroom, with modeling, observation, and feedback, to improve teaching and learning
  - **Support Administrators** in setting the school's vision, using data to guide instructional decisions, and supporting teachers
  - **Deliver Targeted Professional Development and Support** based on school needs and priorities, on topics such as **RTI, community engagement**, etc.

# Service Delivery – Staffing

- **On-site core team**

- 1 Leadership Coach (2 days/week)
- 2 Instructional Coaches (5 days/week)
- 1 Project Manager (3 days/week)

- **Specialists and support**

- 1 Response to Intervention Specialist (1 day/month)
- 1 Special Education Specialist (1 week)
- 1 Senior Advisor (1 day/month)
- 1 Executive Sponsor (2 days/week for first month, then 1 day/month)

# Service Delivery – Activities

- **Weekly**

- Eight 40-minute PLC meetings (i.e., 2 x 40-minute PLCs for every teacher)
- One 90-minute administrator PLC meeting
- Approximately 50 classroom observations and coaching sessions
- Seven 1-hour administrator coaching sessions
- Four 30-minute Success Periods
- Status, planning, and logging activities

- **Bi-weekly or monthly**

- Status meetings with GWCHS, IPS, and IDOE (one phone, one live)
- Monthly metrics tracking
- SBOE monthly project overview

- **As needed**

- RTI professional development (7 days)
- Success Period restructuring (10 days)
- Special Education review and recommendations (5 days)

# Service Delivery – PLCs, Coaching

- **59 teachers served during the 2012-13 school year**
- **PLC topics across the year:**
  - 2011-12 data review to inform ELA focus across the curriculum
  - Connecting instructional and assessment practices
  - Co-teaching and inclusion best practices
  - Data-driven literature circles (with Katie McKnight)
  - Engaging students and providing feedback
  - RISE Teacher Evaluation Rubric - Domain 2: Effective Instruction
- **Topics woven into coaching conversations:**
  - Data-driven instructional action plans
  - Plan and share ELA supports across content areas
  - Domain 2 reflection – Where am I now; how to progress
  - Lesson planning

# School Priorities and Key Outcomes

We collaborated with the school, district and state to set five school-wide priorities based on the School Improvement Plan.

| Priority   | Key Outcomes  |
|--|---|
| Increase Student Engagement and Instructional Rigor                | Key teacher practices exhibited by 80% of teachers (from 45-60%)                    |
| Build Teacher Capacity to Work with ENL Students                   | Key teacher practices exhibited by 70% of teachers (from 45-58%)                    |
| Implement RTI Program  | RTI implemented, Success Periods differentiated and data-informed                   |
| Improve Reading and Writing Across All Content Areas in All Grades | 85% of teachers co-planned to embed reading/writing in content areas (from 50%)     |
| Support Leaders in Managing School Change                          | Leadership team supports a consistent school vision and provides classroom feedback |

*Note: See Appendix for full set of priorities and metrics.*

# School Sub-priorities – Examples

| <b>SAMPLE Sub-Priorities</b><br><i>(Note: See Appendix for full set of metrics)</i>   | <b>Sept</b> | <b>May</b>  |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| Priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2 Collect and analyze student engagement data</li> <li>1.4 Provide meaningful, specific, and immediate feedback</li> </ul>  | 60%<br>48%  | 80%<br>78%  |
| Priority 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.3 ENL teachers utilize a formative assessment to inform ENL instruction</li> <li>2.4 Non-ENL teachers will utilize student data to identify an action research focus</li> </ul> | 50%<br>58%  | 75%<br>80%  |
| Priority 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1 Student support team meets monthly</li> <li>3.2 Success Period will show evidence of differentiation during 30-minute observation period</li> </ul>                           | No<br>55%   | Yes<br>93%  |
| Priority 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.4 Teachers will consistently co-plan ways to embed effective reading and writing strategies within all content areas</li> </ul>   | 50%         | 85%         |
| Priority 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.4 Leadership team is able to use individual and aggregate school data</li> <li>5.5 Leadership team articulates a cohesive and coherent vision for the school</li> </ul>         | 72%<br>72%  | 60%<br>100% |



# School Data

- Student Population
  - Increased from 662 to 1,037 students from 2011-12 to 2012-13; mostly transfers from Emma Donnan Middle School and T.C. Howe High School
    - In MS: Up 233 students (from 266 to 499)
    - In HS: Up 142 students (from 396 to 538)
  - Class sizes swelled to 40+ students in the fall before new staff was hired
- Leadership Retention
  - Three principals in two years
  - Administrative team retention:
    - 5 of 7 returned 2012-13 to 2013-14
    - 3 of 6 returned 2011-12 to 2012-13
- Staff Retention
  - 52 of 60 staff members (87%) returned from 2012-13 to 2013-14

# School Goals and Achievement

|                             | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | Goal                  |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| <b>ECA Alg 1</b>            | 67%   | 59%   | 59%   | 55%<br>(incr. to 65%) |
| <b>ECA Eng 10</b>           | 45%   | 48%   | 39%   | 50%<br>(incr. to 55%) |
| <b>Non waiver grad rate</b> | 77%   | 64%   | TK    | 70%                   |
| <b>Math ISTEP+ 7</b>        | 41%   | 54%   | TK    | 60%                   |
| <b>Math ISTEP+ 8</b>        | 39%   | 66%   | TK    | 75%                   |
| <b>ELA ISTEP+ 7</b>         | 49%   | 33%   | TK    | 40%                   |
| <b>ELA ISTEP+ 8</b>         | 23%   | 37%   | TK    | 45%                   |

# Challenges

- Increase of student population
- Leadership turnover
- Teachers transitioned out of the classroom in testing subjects/grades
- Lack of progress monitoring assessment
  - only interim/benchmarks available
  - no item- or question-level data available for instructional planning
- PLCs versus “professional development”
- Late start in 11-12 (mid-January) due to contracting

# Suggested Scope 2013-14

- Leadership Development
  - Ensure consistent Leadership at the school
  - At least weekly Leadership Coaching – support administrators and teacher leaders in providing instructional leadership
  - Develop teacher leaders through systematic coaching
- Data Use for Instruction
  - Implement a data system that provides (bi-weekly) progress monitoring data that can be disaggregated to the item/question level
  - Support and hold teachers accountable for vertical and horizontal instructional planning using data
- Continue Response to Intervention
  - Use item-level data to plan for and monitor Success Periods
  - Provide reading *and behavior* interventions across curriculum, track progress of all Tier 2 and 3 students

# Appendix

- School Priorities and sub-goals
- Example metrics and rubrics
- Non-academic data
- In their words

# Completion of School Priorities

|   |  | Sept   | May    |
|---|--|--------|--------|
| <b>1. Increase student engagement and instructional rigor</b> |  |        |        |
| 1.1   | Use questioning and assessment during instruction  | 45%    | 82%    |
| 1.2   | Collect and analyze student engagement data  | 60%    | 80%    |
| 1.3   | Actively plan for engagement and achievement   | 50%    | 85%    |
| 1.4   | Provide meaningful, specific, and immediate feedback   | 48%    | 78%    |
| <b>2. Build capacity to work with ENL students</b>            |  |        |        |
| 2.1   | Teachers (ENL and non) show evidence of use of ENL strategies  | 45%    | 72%    |
| 2.2   | Develop an ongoing formative assessment to track student growth  | No     | Yes    |
| 2.3   | ENL teachers utilize a formative assessment to inform ENL instruction  | 50%    | 75%    |
| 2.4   | Non-ENL teachers will utilize student data to identify an action research focus  | 58%    | 80%    |
| 2.5   | At least three new opportunities will be offered allowing students to learn from real world experiences with community partners                                | 1      | 2      |
| <b>3. Implement RTI program</b>                               |  |        |        |
| 3.1   | Student support team meets monthly   | No     | Yes    |
| 3.2   | Success Period will show evidence of differentiation during 30-minute observation period   | 55%    | 93%    |
| 3.2   | RTI support team will identify and utilize a short-cycle assessment for monitoring RTI practice  | Yes    | No     |
| <b>4. Improve reading and writing across content areas</b>    |  |        |        |
| 4.1   | ELA teachers will develop a consistent portfolio showing reading and writing growth over the school year   | 100%   | 100%   |
| 4.2   | Students identified as below proficient will receive 30 minutes of intervention per day during success period  | 30 min | 30 min |
| 4.3   | At least three new opportunities will be offered allowing students to learn from real world experiences with community partners                                | 1      | 2      |
| 4.4   | Teachers will consistently co-plan ways to embed effective reading and writing strategies within all content areas   | 50%    | 85%    |
| <b>5. Support leaders in managing schools change</b>          |  |        |        |
| 5.1   | Leadership team agrees that collective coaching sessions practicing instructional conversations (feedback) helped improve instructional practices and outcomes | 86%    | 100%   |
| 5.2   | Leadership team agrees that individual coaching sessions improved their leadership skills  | 86%    | 100%   |
| 5.3   | Leadership team intentionally schedules short and long classroom observations and meetings to provide observational feedback                                   | 85%    | 100%   |
| 5.4   | Leadership team is able to use individual and aggregate school data  | 72%    | 60%    |
| 5.5   | Leadership team articulates a cohesive and coherent vision for the school  | 72%    | 100%   |

# Sample Monthly Metrics Report

A spreadsheet was provided to GWCHS, IPS, IDOE, and the State Board each month tracking monthly school goals. Metrics were set in collaboration with school, district, and state including applicable data sources for measurement.

| GWCHS - Monthly Performance Metrics  |           |   | 2012 |     |     |     |     | 2013 |     |     |      |     |
|--|-----------|---|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Priority 3: Assist in the implementation of a Response to Intervention   | EOY Goal  | Sept  | Oct  | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar  | Apr | May | June |     |
| 1. Student support team meets monthly  | Plan      | 9 monthly meetings  | n/a  | y   | y   | y   | y   | y    | y   | y   | y    |     |
|  | Actual    |   | n/a  | y   | y   | y   | y   | y    | y   | y   | n/a  |     |
| <i>Data Source: Meeting sign-in and notes</i>  | Comments: | This team prioritized creating a differentiated Success Period as an RtI focus. The initial team meeting was in October and the Success Period plan was rolled out to staff in November. The RtI team created data-driven ELA and Math groups for success period and created some lessons and utilized the IPS Toolkit for others.  |      |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |      |     |
| 2. Success Period will show evidence of differentiation during a 30-minute                                     | Plan      | 95%   | 50%  | 60% | 65% | 70% | 70% | 75%  | 80% | 85% | 90%  | 95% |
|  | Actual    |   | 55%  | 40% | 46% | 69% | 90% | 90%  | 90% | 93% | 93%  | n/a |
| <i>Data Source: Data-driven success period groupings and success period observations</i>                       | Comments: | Data driven groupings and lessons are being created regularly. There are still a small number of teachers who are not teaching designated lessons during Success Period. Evaluators were made aware and were discussing this with them. A large majority of teachers are providing Success Period instruction with fidelity to the RtI plan.  |      |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |      |     |
| 3. Response to Intervention Support Team will identify and utilize a short-cycle assessment for monitoring RtI | Plan      | monthly RtI monitoring  | n/a  | n/a | y   | y   | y   | y    | y   | y   | y    |     |
|  | Actual    |   | n/a  | n/a | y   | n   | n   | n    | n   | n   | n/a  |     |
| <i>Data Source: Short-cycle assessment in place informing success period</i>                                   | Comments: | In October, a short cycle assessment had been identified and the team was waiting for applying for approval for funding to use it. A statement of need was submitted to IPS by Principal Ezell. By December, the short cycle assessment the RtI team wants to use has not been through an approval process. Principal Ezell reported that the short cycle assessment was not approved by IPS. District Benchmark data will be used to measure progress. EOY - Principal Gagyi wants to continue to use IPS assessments to track student growth so no short cycle assessment will be utilized. |      |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |      |     |

# Sample Educator Growth Rubrics

A rubric was used during teacher observations to determine whether teachers were showing evidence of priority activities.

| George Washington Community High School-Wireless Generation<br>Progress Report Metrics – Educator Growth Rubrics |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Teacher PLCs   |  |   |  |  |
| Component  | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4  |
| Evidence: Uses relevant data   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Analyzes various student data sources in isolation</li> <li>-Collects student artifacts to begin reflecting on instructional practice and student outcomes</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Recognizes patterns across multiple sources of data</li> <li>-Begins to see what instructional adjustments are needed based on student data</li> <li>-Reflects on instructional practice by reviewing current and past student artifacts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Uses multiple data sources, weekly, to plan and determine the effectiveness of instruction</li> <li>- Uses student data to drive instructional planning decisions and real-time adjustments to increase student engagement</li> <li>-Determines how student learning will be assessed</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continues to drive instructional planning towards standard or beyond for all students</li> <li>-Determines how student learning will be assessed and defines student proficiency in collaboration with colleagues</li> <li>-Uses relevant data to make grade- and school-level decisions in addition to decisions about own class(es)</li> <li>-Supports colleagues in using multiple sources of data</li> </ul> |
| Collaboration: Collegial Support   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues to fulfill required duties</li> <li>-Plans individually without including others</li> <li>-Reflects on thoughtful questions concerning of others in the group</li> <li>-Provides input when asked</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Listen to and employs practices shared by others</li> <li>-Asks questions of others in the group</li> <li>-Shares personal instructional and assessment practices sparingly</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Shares personal practice openly</li> <li>-Request support for colleagues</li> <li>-Asks thoughtful questions of others</li> <li>-Utilize common assessment or instructional data to make decisions</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Takes initiative in promoting positive relationships through sharing personal practice fostering a culture of professional inquiry.</li> <li>-Respects shared ideas and suggestions from colleagues</li> <li>-Delivers on assigned tasks and next steps</li> <li>-Redirects groups when</li> </ul>   |



# Sample Educator Growth Rubrics

| Teacher Coaching / Instructional Practice               |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Component   | 1   | 2   | 3  | 4  |
| <b>Content: Aligned Structure</b>                       | -Correlation of lessons, activities, assignments and assessments inconsistently align to standards and pacing guides                  | -Alignment of lessons, activities, assignments and assessments roughly correlate to standards and pacing guides<br>-Identified standard or instructional topic is briefly discussed             | -Alignment of lessons, activities, assignments and assessments closely correlate to standards and pacing guides<br>-Attempts to link content to relevant subjects and disciplines when appropriate<br>-Identified standard or instructional topic is discussed and displayed | -Alignment of lessons, activities, assignments and assessments directly correlate with standards and pacing guides<br>-Links content to relevant subjects and disciplines when appropriate<br>-Clearly identified standard and instructional outcome is discussed and displayed in student friendly terms  |
| <b>Questioning and Feedback Strategies: Scaffolding</b> | -Acquires responses from volunteers<br>-Limited use of questioning strategies<br>-Limited meaningful feedback after student responses | -Elicits answers from select students<br>-Begins to ask supportive questions to lead students towards deeper understanding<br>-Provides feedback about whether answers are correct or incorrect | -Acquires answers from all students<br>-Asks questions which lead to deeper student thinking<br>-Scaffolding of questions is based on individual student data<br>-Provides feedback that leads address student misunderstandings   | -Creates a culture of rigor and inquiry through purposeful, data-driven questioning for each student<br>-Teacher regularly asks supportive questions for increased understanding<br>-Questions regularly promote deep curricular connections<br>-Students are asking themselves, each other, and the teacher questions that reflect critical thinking and transfer of learning to new context<br>-Teachers and students collaborate to identify where there is clear |

# Non-academic Data

|       | Attendance Rate | Discipline Data - Suspensions | Discipline Data - Expulsions | Discipline Data – >10 Unexc. Abs. |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Goal  | 95%             | 15%                           | 15%                          | Unknown                           |
| 12-13 | TK              | TK                            | TK                           | TK                                |
| 11-12 | 93%             | 172                           | 11                           | 244                               |
| 10-11 | 93%             | 93                            | 13                           | 217                               |

# In their words...

*“We are so much more focused now. We have a purpose for what we’re doing in the classroom every day that we didn’t feel like until [Wireless Generation] came in.”*

– ELA teacher, GWCHS

*“I have gained information about chunking activities for students to gain a greater understanding of content material and using a visual timer for students to remain on task.”*

– Inclusion teacher, GWCHS

*“We interviewed 15 students in the after school program. Their responses about how the teachers... care about them and insist that they learn... They had not had that before. They were saying such positive things about the uniqueness of the school.”*

– Researcher, NAACP

*“I think that all administrators could benefit from having a leadership coach. Someone from outside the district often has a different approach or idea for situations. It is like having my own personal education consultant.*

*I feel that our team has really come together since coaching started. The majority of the team was new in July and we weren’t collaborating nearly as well as we are now.*

– GWCHS administrator